

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Undergraduate Honors Theses

Honors College

2012

Who Shapes The Classroom? A Case Study of Congress, the President, and Their Motivations For Involvement in Federal Educational Policy

Kyle Swalls

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/honors_theses



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), and the [Education Policy Commons](#)

WHO SHAPES THE CLASSROOM?

A CASE STUDY OF CONGRESS, THE PRESIDENT, AND THEIR
MOTIVATIONS FOR INVOLVEMENT IN FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL POLICY

(TITLE)

BY

KYLE SWALLS

UNDERGRADUATE THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF

UNDERGRADUATE DEPARTMENTAL HONORS

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, ALONG WITH
THE HONORS COLLEGE,
EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2012
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS UNDERGRADUATE THESIS BE ACCEPTED
AS FULFILLING THE THESIS REQUIREMENT FOR
UNDERGRADUATE DEPARTMENTAL HONORS

5-4-12
DATE

THESIS ADVISOR

5-4-12
DATE

HONORS COORDINATOR

5-4-12
DATE

DEPARTMENT CHAIR

Who Shapes The Classroom?

A Case Study of Congress, the President, and Their Motivations For Involvement in Federal Educational Policy

Kyle Swalls

Department of Political Science

Eastern Illinois University

Departmental Honors Thesis

April 2012

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my friends and family who are understanding of my busy schedule and were supportive of me through this thesis. I would like to thank Dr. Jeff Ashley and Dr. Kevin Anderson for serving on my defense committee. Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank Dr. Mueller, for her time and dedication in reviewing multiple drafts of work, her patience with my busy schedule, and her caring and motivating attitude as my thesis advisor and a member of my defense committee. Thank you all for your time and help.

Abstract

This paper examines three major influences on legislative and presidential decision-making. These three influences are 1) an officeholder's personal views, generated by socialization and experiences prior to holding office, 2) the political institutions, which speak to the complexities and many actors involved who shape the prioritization of issues, and 3) an office-holder's responsibility to a constituency which is motivated by reelection hopes. To create this model, a case study of four members of the U.S. House of Representatives and President Barack Obama was conducted regarding their involvement with federal educational policy. This framework can be further developed for the purpose of being used to describe legislative and presidential decision making in general.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – Introduction	p. 5
Chapter 2 – Literature Review	p. 11
Chapter 3 – Methodology	p. 22
Chapter 4 – Analysis	p. 25
Chapter 5 – Conclusion	p. 44
Appendix A	p. 47
Works Cited	p. 49

Chapter 1

An Introduction to Federal Educational Policy

A Brief History

There have been many pivotal moments in the history of the federal government and its involvement in educational policy. Many different events have increased the level of involvement of the federal government in a policy area delegated mostly to the states. Some of the first big steps of federal involvement in educational policy and enforcement came about between the years of 1944–1959 and include the G.I. bill (1944), the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or HEW (1953), and the Supreme Court's decision the following year desegregating schools in *Brown V. Board of Education* (1954). The federal government also increased federal funding to education during the cold war through the National Defense Education Act because of the launch of the Russian spacecraft Sputnik (1959). Each of these steps in these early years of federal educational policy set the precedence to be followed in future decades. The huge increase in the level of involvement is a model that has been followed subsequently and the federal government continues to play a vital role.

In the 1960s and 1970s, there was a great deal more involvement in federal educational policy. Some of the largest increases in federal involvement in education in this time period were the beginning of the Head Start program (1965), which was implemented to insure that low-income families could break the poverty cycle by giving preschoolers the same type of opportunities that a high-income family preschooler would have. In 1972, the federal government banned discrimination in schools based on sex by putting forward Title

IX, which has given women the opportunity to participate in the same school activities as men. The Education For All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 changed the way that disabled children would receive their education. "It mandated that each handicapped child have an individualized education program (IEP) and be educated in the least restrictive environment" (New York State Education Department 2006). In 1979, President Carter reorganized the Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) department and made the Department of Education a separate Cabinet level department. This obviously put a great deal of emphasis on the executive's interest and involvement in federal educational policy.

There were also efforts to improve educational policy in the 1980s and 1990s. One particularly influential piece of legislation was the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, enacted in 1997. This law expanded the federal government's involvement in educational policy by making it mandatory that the states provide education curtailed to a child specific needs when they fall between the ages of 3-21 years old. This law was an amended version of 1975 Education For All Handicapped Children Act and provided for increased federal involvement in educational policy. America 2000 was a set of goals set forward by the George H. W. Bush administration in 1991 and included a proposal for national standards, national standardized testing, and other provisions. The bill didn't pass, but set the stage for future governmental involvement in education (New York State Education Department 2006). Ten years later, his son, George W. Bush, in 2001 proposed the No Child Left Behind Act.

"No Child Left Behind, a reauthorization of ESEA, was enacted with bi-partisan support. It requires that all students be "proficient" in reading, mathematics, and science by 2014, with Adequate Yearly Progress measures to determine school

success; annual standardized tests (developed by the states) in grades 3-8 in reading and mathematics; reports from all schools by disaggregated groups of students; sanctions on schools not meeting AYP requirements and school plans to close achievement gaps. Opponents (including NSBA, AASA, NEA, National Conference of State Legislatures) claim that low funding and high costs will create financial crisis for state and local governments” (New York State Education Department 2006).

There were many complaints and grievances with No Child Left Behind by a whole range of critics including teachers. However, the main thing to take away from No Child Left Behind is significant increase in federal involvement in education policy. President Obama has taken a different approach with his “Race To The Top” program, enabling states to work on incentives to better their school system by promising state financial rewards (Obama For America 2012).

“Since 2010, the administration has awarded Race to the Top grants, including Early Learning Challenge grants, to 21 states and the District of Columbia, which serve 65 percent of the nation’s children and 59 percent of all low-income students in the country. Overall, the Race to the Top competition has encouraged states to adopt a high-quality framework of educational standards—and 46 states have already adopted the reforms” (Obama For America 2012).

Over the past half century the federal government has become increasingly involved with educational policy. It is empirically evident that the Department of Education and

different policies concerning education have grown in number, creating a situation in which the federal government is now a major actor in a policy area originally completely left up to the states. President Obama's proposed budget is \$69.8 billion for fiscal year 2013 for the Department of Education. This is an increase of \$1.7 billion, which indicates that at least from the President's perspective, there is still need for continued and increased involvement by the federal government in educational policy (Department of Education 2012).

Politics and Federal Education Policy

The involvement of the legislature and the past and present Presidents of the United States in educational policy has made me interested in asking the questions of "who is involved in current federal educational policy and why are they involved in it?" Legislative behavior as a whole has been studied a great deal in the past. But looking at the behavior of members of the House of Representatives and the President from the lens of educational policy and their involvement with it has rarely been specifically addressed. While a study like this may have some particularized results due to its narrow focus of examples, there is certainly a more general theory that is formulated by this research that can be applied to other research in political science.

In this study, legislative and presidential behavior will be examined through their involvement in federal educational policy. I will be looking at a case study of four members of the United States House of Representatives from the state of Illinois and will be assessing their behavior in comparison to their colleagues from their home state. I will also be doing

a case study on President Barack Obama and his interest in different educational policy measures that he has put forth since taking the Oval Office.

Based on previous research, I have developed a framework for understanding legislative and presidential behavior that entails three main areas of influence that have the most important role in influencing actors within the education policy network. These are three areas that largely affect the decision-making process for members of congress and the President. The first is the pre-office socialization that any elected official has. Officials are exposed to certain viewpoints by their prior experiences to taking office. These viewpoints are carried with them into office and probably played a major role even in their decision to run for office. The second is the influence of actors within the institutions of the legislative and executive branches. A member of either of these branches faces a great deal of influence by colleagues, advisors, and interest groups, and each of these actors plays a role in shaping the decisions of office holders. The third realm of influence is the constituency. The amount of influence this plays in decision-making can vary greatly, but many times it is a driving force behind a majority of the decisions that officeholders make. These three areas of influence have been explored in Political Science research a great deal and previous research and work done before this study has laid the foundation for understanding members of Congress and the executive's decision making and level of involvement in federal educational policy.

In the following chapters, the question of why federal educational policy has changed by such drastic measures will be explored. The increased involvement of the federal government in educational policy, in great part, is due to those that govern deciding to take more of an interest in it as a policy area. Chapter 2 contains a literature review of

the relevant research on the topics of legislative and presidential behavior and decision-making. In Chapter 3, the framework of the study is explored by explaining how case studies on members of Congress and the President will be helpful to understand motivations for policy involvement. Chapter 4 will outline the empirical evidence provided by the case studies conducted. In Chapter 5 a conclusion will be offered suggesting possible relevance to other policy areas and a discussion of how this study can be expanded on and perhaps improved upon.

Chapter 2

A Review of the Literature

The three main areas of influence that I stated in the introduction--pre-office socialization, influential actors in the institutional framework, and an officeholder's constituents--have all been studied previously by many political science scholars. The literature on each of these areas will be important for understanding how members of congress behave when taking on their role of influencing federal educational policy.

Socialization and Congressional Behavior

The first area of influence, an officeholder's socialization and mindset, is important for understanding a President or a member of Congress's legislative behavior. However, this factor has been neglected in previous literature. I would accredit that some of the neglect is due to the fact that members of Congress can't do their work unilaterally and have any success whatsoever. While the President does have to work with others, this is particularly true for Congress members who have to work within a constraining framework and respond to the needs of their particular constituency. Because members of Congress are viewed more as representatives of a particular constituency instead of a national constituency, their interests often have to be put aside to if they conflict with their constituents' interests. Furthermore, as previously stated, Congress is a complex political system in which power is not easily attained. Even when power is attained in Congress, the amount of pressure within the institution by different actors such as party leaders,

committee chairpersons, interest groups, and the like cause for many members of Congress to be forced to put their interests often times on hold.

Despite these facts however, I would argue that it is imperative to study presidents' and representatives' socialization. A Congress member or President may specialize on certain policies; their particular area of interest may very well have existed before they held office. Furthermore, if someone is a community leader in dealing with education or educational issues, we can expect that if this is well known among colleagues in the House, that perhaps a committee assignment or bill sponsorship in that subject area will follow.

Burden's book *Personal Roots of Representation* (2007) is a testament to this way of thinking about representation. Burden shows when looking at vouchers and school choice, tobacco laws, and other issues, that Congress members actually actively supported or opposed bills in these policy areas despite their constituents and or their party having different views on those matters. This willingness to go against the party and their constituents shows that when great personal conviction exists, legislative behavior can only be explained through this personal conviction. Burden's research can be applied to the office of the presidency as well. Many presidents have acted unilaterally in the past putting forth initiatives that weren't necessarily on the rest of the party's agenda because of their great personal interest in taking a particular policy issue and taking strong action on it.

Another key study is Gross's work "Representative Styles and Legislative Behavior" (1978). He discusses the different ways that members of Congress decide to carry out their duty of representation. The three views on representation identified in the study are the delegate, politico, and the trustee. Representatives' view of how to best represent their constituents can certainly change while they are in office, or because they are in office

through the other influences that they face. However, a great deal of decision making on how you plan to represent your constituents would have to take place before taking the position. The delegates are members who believe their constituents' desires dictate what policies they should pursue, while the trustees are members who believe that because they were elected to public office that they should use their own prerogative and vote for what they think is best due to their constituents' apparent trust in them. Finally, the politico takes both perspectives into consideration, depending on the issue (Gross pg.361). The role that congress members believe that they should play helps us decide whether or not the constituency is the really the key influence or if it is simply members' own ideas that drive them to the policies they are pursuing.

Institutions, Political Actors and Congressional Behavior

The second area of influence is one that concerns the complex institutions of The House of Representatives and the Presidency and the actors that take a part in the policy process. Aldrich and Rohde's (2009) state, "the two principal organizing structures in Congress are political parties and committees" (pg. 194). There are also a great deal of other actors in the political process including interest groups, bureaucracies, other branches of government, and other forms of influence that hold sway in the way that the entire institution operates. However these are outside forces, and for the purpose of this paper, I will be focusing on the internal forces that are influential in the decision-making process for members of Congress. Because these two are what give Congress its structure, there has been a great deal of research on both. From studies on committee work in an extremely partisan era, we can grow a better understanding of what we can expect from

committee work on education (Aldrich and Rohde 2009, Frisch and Kelly 2004). We can see in our case studies which of our chosen members to study are actively involved in education committee and subcommittee work, and how effective we can expect them to be in the extremely partisan era that we're currently in when dealing with issues in these committees. It's been said that the real work of Congress is done behind closed doors in committees (Fenno 1973, Aldrich and Rohde 2009). So looking at committee work on education will be significant in understanding what we can expect for the future of education, and what involvement congress members from Illinois have in this process.

In the past thirty years, political parties have taken a more significant role in the decision-making of members of Congress than the committee structure. Smith and Gamm's (2009) work "The Dynamics of Party Government in Congress" discusses the fact that strong party leadership emerges when there is strong party cohesion and extreme polarization. Smith and Gamm claim that this is happening today, that powerful parties, and therefore powerful party leadership is emerging, which will have an impact on legislative decision making.

Hasecke and Mycoff (2007) focus on how much party loyalty to party leaders plays a role in legislative success. If someone is attempting to get an educational policy agenda through the convoluted body that is the House of Representatives, it would certainly help to have a positive connection to the Speaker, who sets the scheduling and agenda for the House. If party loyalty is important for getting measures that a member of Congress cares about passed, then how much does this relationship shape their educational policy agendas? Are candidates able to keep this influence in balance? Or is it possible that a candidate subscribes less to an individual view of educational policy, and adopts the party's

vision for the future of American education? These will be some interesting questions regarding influencing a member's behavior towards educational policy as well.

Understanding a member's position within the body in which they serve is important in understanding how effective that member can be when pursuing educational policy goals as well.

Kingdon's (1977) model of voting show us that the an individual hoping for legislative success in the House has to adjust to and identify how to best act to achieve their goals in the complex institution that is Congress. Kingdon's work shows us that understanding how people make decisions through a model of voting helps us understand ultimately why congress members have chosen the path that they did. Kingdon discusses how the environment that a bill is under can shape what a member of congress decides to do about the bill a great deal. In Kingdon's model, if there is a low amount of pressure to decide one way or the other, then the representative will just go with the majority of his party or those he or she would normally align with. However, a different environment, one involving "cross pressure" from different groups concerning an issue makes the decision-making process much different for a legislator. Lipinski's (2009) chapter on lawmaking, written from the perspective of a Congress member, is also important for this research. From his chapter, readers can understand what a member of Congress deals with on a daily basis, how policy decisions are being made from the personal perspective of a member of Congress from Illinois, and consequently what we can expect from them when they are making decisions.

It will be important to make a comparison of Kingdon's model of legislative behavior and Lipinski's personal story for one example of how accurate Kingdon's model is

in the real world of politics. And when we have a glimpse of what the inside of an actual Congressional member's day is like, we may be better to understand why they are saying what they are saying about education, and pursuing the particular educational policies or agendas that they are pursuing.

Mann and Ornstein's (2009) work is also important for understanding the chance a member of Congress actually has to get educational policy through such a partisan driven branch of government. For instance, if a member of Congress has an educational policy goal, but he or she is in the minority party in the House of Representatives, how does this change the likelihood of them being able to keep their promises that they made about educational policy out on the campaign trail? The reason Congress is considered the "broken branch" according to Mann and Ornstein, is the continuous usurpation of power by the majority party in the House. When one party takes over, it increasingly excludes the minority party, which generally leads to bitterness. When the minority party wins the majority, over the vicious cycle begins again. In a system such as this, how does a member in the minority operate? Further, how does this system affect what members are saying to their constituents about educational policy?

Constituencies, Reelection Goals and Congressional Behavior

The third major area of influence is the constituencies that members of Congress and the President represent and are therefore responsible to. Mayhew's (1974) book is essentially focused on reelection as the single most important decision-making factor for members of Congress. While others have said that there is a great deal more complexity to

the picture painted by Mayhew, it is widely accepted that reelection is one of the greatest concerns on the mind of a member of a Congress, and officeholders in general.

Many scholars have devoted time to how members of Congress make decisions with their constituency and their reelection in mind. Related research focuses on topics such as “Does it matter how I present myself to my constituents and which constituents I present myself to most often?” (Fenno 1978), “What type of actions are going to help me gain reelection while in Congress due to credit-claiming?” (Arnold 1990), and “Does a committee assignment that has my constituencies concerns at hand give me a better shot at accomplishments to explain to my constituents for reelection?” (Frisch & Kelly 2007).

There has also been research done on how constituents feel about their representative and what is most important to those constituents. Sulkin (2009) looked at what seemed like conventional wisdom, that politicians distort their campaign promises and found that politicians actually have an interest in keeping their promises if they can help it to secure reelection. She called a member’s constituents a “discerning electorate” that will punish someone who they feel has betrayed them.

Erikson and Wright’s 2009 study is valuable to this research since it focuses on how politicians behave during the campaign season to appeal to voters. When incumbents or new candidates are running for election to the House of Representatives, we expect them to be more centrally appealing due to the fact that most of the general public is fairly non-partisan. It will be important to take the behaviors analyzed by this study, and apply it to what candidates for Congress are saying about educational policy. How do these candidates remain true to their beliefs and yet present ideas that are eclectic in nature? Do these educational ideas have any substance when you look at what’s being said, or is it just

rhetoric or fluff? Do candidates really intend to pursue these agendas that they claim to have? Because we are looking at an array of influences on a member of Congress, research may conclude that although they intend on keeping their campaign promises, they may not be as easy to keep, especially in the case of a newly elected member, members alienated by members of their own party, or minority party members. Baumgartner, Gray, and Lowery's (2009) study also gives us an understanding of how policies produced at the federal level can affect constituents at the state level which is apparent due to the increase in state lobbying agencies in response to federal policy activity.

Research on Presidential Behavior

I think each of the three areas of influence outlined above are also prominent in the President's mind due to the fact that the President certainly brings policy preferences into office, faces institutional pressure inside the executive, and is responsible to his constituency on a national level for his reelection. However, there is some additional literature on Presidents in particular that will be useful in explaining the role the President plays in federal educational policy.

The first area of influence on officeholders, their prior experience and personal goals is an influence that is extremely important for understanding Presidential behavior as well. In Barber's 1992 book, *The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House*, Barber states his belief that you can predict Presidential performance by understanding the personality of a President. This, along with Burden's (2007) research shows that the personality and goals of a President play a large role in the way that they behave while holding that office.

There has been research conducted that can add to the understanding of how President Obama arrived at his educational policy preferences. Mack and Chen's (2004) study on Barack Obama helps us to understand the policy preferences and experiences that President Obama had before he took the highest office. Understanding what shaped President's goals before he entered the Oval Office is important because it helps us to understand the influences that a President experiences. We will be able to see that when a President's preferences are displayed early in their political careers, their preferences can also influence their choices as presidents. On the other hand, when presidents follow a policy contrary to what they have previously displayed or talked about, we can consider the pressures applied to them during their years in office.

The second area of influence that I argue plays a role in any officeholder's decision making is the other actors within the institution. Although this area of influence does exist for Presidents, it's my belief that it is perhaps the weakest area of influence for many Presidents. There is evidence that some Presidents have put a great deal of weight on their cabinet's input and others that have been only interested in the cabinet serving their personal and political interests as President. Because my goal is to apply this study to understanding Presidential decision making in general, I think it's important to include it.

Richard Rose's 1977 article, "The President: A Chief But Not An Executive" discusses the importance of those working alongside the President in playing a role of making sure that the President's priorities are given attention, as well as working to keep the president out of trouble (Rose 1977). Those that the President works beside within the executive make sure the President's personal priorities are being looked after, and serve as a buffer between the President and the public.

Polsby's (1978) article notes that even when a President picks his Cabinet, regardless of whether he will pay attention to their advice, presidents have a strong interest in putting forth a cabinet with shared goals in mind. I don't think it's any mistake that Arne Duncan, a Chicago educator, was picked as President Obama's Secretary of Education when they were both involved in the Chicago education system and would have similar goals in mind for federal educational policy.

The third factor in the model focuses on the President's responsibility to his national constituency as an influence on his behavior. The President and the media have a very special relationship because of the importance of relaying the President's messages to his constituents. Because this strong relationship exists, how the media portrays a President is very important, for president's reelection goals.

Kernell's (1997) book *Going Public: New Strategies in Presidential Leadership* discusses how Presidents are increasingly being elected as "Washington outsiders" and are making more use of the media. Presidents are "going public" by reaching out to voters to get their support on measures that the President is interested in getting through a Congress that refuses to act. This shows the President's strong dependence on the media and reliance on support from his national constituency on important measures.

Cornfield (2010) continues on this theme of discussing new technology and the success of President Obama to get elected in 2008. Re-election weighs heavily on the minds of officeholders and can influence their behavior (Mayhew 1974). President Obama during his 2008 Presidential campaign began to understand and apply new forms of communication technology to reach out to voters. This strategy can be used to convey a message to certain groups of people (in this case young voters). However, because the

President has been elected and is responsible to the voters for re-election, the President has continued using podcasts, YouTube videos, Facebook, Twitter, and other social media to communicate to his national constituency. This step towards new media use has, and will continue to have an impact on the way that officeholders, especially Presidents and Presidential candidates communicate to their constituency to achieve the goal of re-election.

Edwards & Wayne (2010) discuss how going public through the use of media to connect to constituents can have a negative effect on a President's popularity and can sometimes hurt their re-election goals. The strong communication and connection between the President and his constituents through the media was seen as something contributing to declining presidential popularity in the cases of Bill Clinton and healthcare reform (pg. 143), George W. Bush and Tax cuts (pg. 143), and President Bush and the War in Iraq (pg. 144). As our current President makes decisions about what issues to go public about, certainly the fact that declining popularity can be a result of going public will play a role in helping the President to decide when to communicate with his constituency about issues that he sees as important.

The research done in these three areas of influence of legislative and presidential decision-making and behavior will be of great use in this study for understanding why members of Congress and the President are pursuing the actions to best suit their personal priorities, their institutional priorities, and their constituents' priorities on federal educational policy. The research done up to this point has laid a firm foundation for understanding that there are many different influences on an office-holder's decision-making.

Chapter 3

The Methodology For Studying Legislative and Presidential Behavior

To execute this study on federal educational policy and political behavior, I will be conducting a case study on four members of the United States House of Representatives from the State of Illinois and the President of United States Barack Obama. The level of their involvement in education policy will be judged by viewing the amount of proposed legislation and policy reforms by these four members of Congress and the President. The four members of Congress' level of involvement will largely be viewed from the lens of comparing them with their colleagues from the state of Illinois. To gain an understanding of why these members of Congress and the President feel a need to be involved in federal educational policy, we will be looking at three main areas of influence that I will assert dictate the behavior of officeholders.

The first influence that exists for members of the House of Representatives and the President are their pre-office experiences and socialization. To understand the experiences that members of Congress and the President have, I will look at the officeholder's educational background and professional experience. I will also look at the Congress members' and the President's biographical information.

The second area of influence happens within the institutions in which officeholders work. Members of the House of Representatives face all kinds of varying pressures within their institution from other members on their committees, caucuses, party leaders, committee chairs, and other pressures. Outside pressures can include interest groups,

government agencies, and the like. For this study, I will focus on Congress members' involvement in different committees, subcommittees, and caucuses dealing with education policy.

For a President, it's much more difficult to gauge this measure of influence compared to members of Congress. A President really can't afford to be a policy specialist. Presidents deal with a whole array of issues, forcing him to be a generalist. Although there are Presidents who have different leadership styles and seek out different types of cabinets for themselves, many of them, when they have a strong pre-office mindset in a particular policy area are not likely to put someone in office that disagrees with them or has different ideas completely in that policy area. They have certain strategies that are put forward when they select members of their cabinet that assist them in achieving their goals (Polsby 1978). To make this case in this case study on the Obama administration, I will be applying the idea that Secretary of Education Arne Duncan and President Obama's similar educational background and their shared involvement in educational policy in Chicago.

The third area of influence in this study is the constituency. Members of Congress and the President will both be measured the same when looking at this area of influence. Gauging what members of Congress and the President are saying to their constituents will represent this area of influence. Although some may be skeptical of measuring speech as an indicator of influence, Sulkin's (2009) article makes the case that although officeholders aren't always keeping their promises, that they have an interest in doing so for reelection purposes and will do what they can to keep their promises. I will analyze speeches and messages from websites, press releases, and YouTube videos.

The overall involvement of the members of Congress from the state of Illinois and the President in federal educational policy is being measured by the amount of laws that they have proposed (and for the president the amount of impact some of his major policy proposals will have). Appendix A can be referenced to view the amount of involvement of all the members of Congress from Illinois to understand the relative involvement in educational policy of the four selected to be analyzed in the case studies.

By using four members of the House of Representatives and a sitting President and their involvement in federal educational policy through a case study, a model for understanding motivations for involvement and decision-making processes of these officeholders will be established. Like any model however, there are weaknesses in this study. One weakness is that the sample size for comparing the amount of involvement in federal educational policy in relation to other members of the House is small. In this study the House members' involvement is measured in relation to other Representatives only from their state and in the current congress. For the President's portion of the case study, a major weakness is that there is not a comparison between President Obama and past Presidents to measure whether President Obama is any more interested and involved in educational policy in relation to past Presidents. Although these weaknesses exist, the framework in this study will be somewhat indicative of the relative interest of these officeholders in the policy area of federal educational policy and is a model that can be used in the future and expanded upon to achieve more thorough results.

Chapter 4

Analysis

Congressional Case Studies

The four members of the United States Congress from the state of Illinois that will be analyzed in this case study are Judy Biggert (R-13), Randy Hultgren (R-14), Danny Davis (D-7), and Jan Schakowsky (D-9). These four House members have introduced at least one bill in the 112th congressional term that is considered to directly concern educational policy in the United States. It should be noted here that in future studies, it may be valuable to conduct research over a long period of congressional history for members instead of a single term.

To conduct this study on legislative behavior and educational policy, it is imperative that a workable framework is set up, built from previous research to help us understand why federal educational policy is a priority to these members of congress to be studied. My hypothesis is that various pressures reinforce the idea of introducing legislation on education for these four members, with some pressure perhaps greater than others. It is my belief that the three most important areas that influence legislative behavior are the member of congress's personal experiences and interests before becoming a member of congress (in other words, the views and priorities within their pre-congressional political mindset), the actors within the Washington political system, and a member of Congress's constituency.

The first area addressed here, the pre-congress mindset and prioritization of policy goals will be explored through understanding members of Congress as members of their

communities and as citizens that have personal interests, goals and aspirations. It is my hypothesis that we should be able to draw a very obvious connection between a member of Congress's personal, professional, and political involvement in their respective communities and their personal, professional, and political involvement and prioritization of goals (including educational policy goals) as a member of congress (Burden 2007).

The second area to be discussed will be how each member of Congress works in Washington and the internal influences that can play a serious role in their decision making process and voting behavior (Kingdon 1977). Members of congress will make different decisions and tackle legislation in different ways because of pressures within Washington. These pressures come from a variety of actors within the Washington political framework including party leaders, lobbyists, and colleagues from their respective parties.

And the third area of influence on legislative behavior is the makeup of a member's constituency. First and foremost, members of Congress have to have reelection as their main goal if they hope to achieve any other legislative goal that they have (Mayhew 1974). This means that they are responsible to their constituents, and their constituents' expectations of their role as a legislator. Because members of Congress are responsible to their constituents, the problems that concern their constituents also concern them, which will have an impact on their priorities. For instance, if a member's constituency has a large number of factories in a particular industry, that member will have the concerns of those industries at the top of his or her list, even if those industries were not particularly interesting to the member beforehand.

It is my belief that these three actors are the greatest influences on the role that a member of congress has. He or she will act in accordance to please all facets of the position

they hold: themselves, their colleagues and other inside political actors, and their constituents. And it is through this framework, that we will be enabled to understand the forces behind why a representative has expressed interest in presenting bills concerning federal educational policy.

Judy Biggert

Judy Biggert (R-13) is a seven-term House member and has introduced more bills concerning educational policy than any of the other representatives from the state of Illinois in the current 2011-2012 congressional term. Her prior experience and interests before holding office certainly indicates that Representative Biggert had a great amount of personal interest in educational policy and should be looked at as an indicator of personal interest in educational policy. She was the President of the board of education in the Hinsdale school district, and President of the Oak School PTA (Biggert 2012). This involvement directly suggests that she was very interested in educational policy at the local level and it is evident that she has more prior experience in educational policy than any of the other members of Congress in this case study.

To address Representatives Biggert's involvement in educational policy within the institution of the House of Representatives, we can first of all look at the fact that she was assigned to the committee on Education and the Workforce (edworkforce.house.gov/ourteam/meetthemembers.htm). Committees show the interest and specialization of House members. Due to the interest and previous experience that Biggert can bring to the table in this committee, it seems that it was an appropriate placement and exemplifies her interest in educational policy.

During the current term, Representative Biggert has introduced several bills that focus on education:

- H.R. 32 amends the McKinney–Vento Homeless Assistance act to include children that are declared homeless by one of various government agencies. This bill enables children that fall under its categorization of homeless to receive assistance in all types of areas including education.
- H.R. 35 increases the amount of tax deductions that teachers can claim for their expenses.
- H.R. 36 promotes the awareness of eating disorders and how they can affect educational advancement.
- H.R. 1253 is a bill that again amends the McKinney–Vento Homeless Assistance Act and increases the funding and functions of state and local educational offices in the venture of assisting homeless children in their education.

(thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery)

Each of these bills attempts to increase federal assistance to educators and students. It is clear that in the institutional framework within which congresswoman Biggert is working allows for her to engage in educational assistance and she has certainly attempted to take advantage of that.

Keeping in mind that Representative Biggert is responsible to her constituents, it is important that we take a look at what she is saying to them through social networking sites, her website, press releases, and the like. Representative Biggert speaks about empowering local and state governments through federal money to further their ability to help students get a great education. In a press release, Biggert was largely supportive of the

Race To The Top program and although she felt the new program needed more input from localities, she seemed to be very much in favor of federal funding to support state and local governments in their quest to better educate their youth. Biggert also has said in videos how important education of our youth is in a global economy. She says as a committee member on the Education and the Workforce committee that she plans on putting forth bills that will support strong education for our youth at an early age (biggert.house.gov/education).

On February 9, 2012, the National Education Association endorsed Judy Biggert for Congress. They have also contributed to her campaign through their political action committee, and have endorsed her as a candidate since the 2008 election cycle. You can see that the perception of congresswoman Biggert is one of great leadership in the area of education. A comment on her abilities and interests in education from an education leader follows:

We are pleased to support Rep. Judy Biggert, said Illinois Education Association President Cinda Klickna. She has been an independent leader on public education issues and a strong voice for teachers and school employees. Rep. Biggert has been a strong supporter of fully funding IDEA, increasing access to early education programs, and of comprehensive changes in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to allow more flexibility to local districts (States News Service 2012).

Jan Schakowsky

Jan Schakowsky (D-9) is a seven-term House member who has sponsored two bills that concern education in the current term. Representative Schakowsky's main connection with education prior to taking office is that she received a bachelor's degree in elementary education from the University of Illinois in 1965. This may very well indicate Representative Schakowsky's strong interest in the education of youth in America. And despite the fact that she has only introduced two bills, I would argue that her actions still indicate a great deal of significance. Because a member of Congress's time is so valuable to them and because there are a great many issues a member is called upon to tackle in office, the fact that Representative Schakowsky has delegated enough time and resources to sponsor a bill in the current term shows an interest in federal educational policy.

Representative Schakowsky as a member of the House has not had the advantage in the educational policy arena to sit on the Education and The Workforce committee like Representative Biggert and consequently is more limited in her involvement in educational policy. That being said however, Representative Schakowsky as a member still has showed an interest in educational policy by introducing the following:

- H.R. 1833 is a bill that is intended to improve mental health services on college campuses
- H.R. 2914 is a bill that requires the Secretary of Education to allocate funding to schools for building repairs as well as technology updates to provide the best facilities and the best tools to educate America's youth (thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery).

Representative Schakowsky has also been engaged in seeking out funding for schools that reside in her district. “Ridgewood High School officials say the new improvements of the 52-year old compound will help reduce distractions, facilitate a better learning environment, and estimate the school will see between \$75,000 to \$100,000 a year in energy cost savings. Ridgewood High School is also planning to install a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education Coalition lab for a STEM program to begin next fall. About 30 to 40 construction workers have been employed to complete the renovations including installing new flooring and cabinets” (Federal Information and News Dispatch 2011).

Schakowsky sees this project as a large victory for empowering a local school to create an environment more conducive to learning. It is always important for legislators to do the best that they can to associate themselves and to work hard on projects that are federally funded, and locally connected. When projects like this are a success, members of congress have something to tell their constituents when they go home (Federal Information and News Dispatch, Fenno 1978). This is one of the stories that I’m confident Representative Schakowsky will tell on the campaign trail.

Representative Schakowsky, on a visit to Oakton high school in her district discussed the importance of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math) studies for students in America, saying that the future of America lies in Green jobs and that there is a shortage in these fields. She also seemed interested in finding ways to increase the amount of females in these study areas, saying that at the current level (at that time in 2009) was below what would be a representative number of females in these fields. Representative Schakowsky’s responsibility to her constituents in educational policy can be noted not only

in what she is doing in congress, but also through her speech to her constituents, saying that she supports programs further educational development for students especially in the STEM studies.

Danny Davis

Danny Davis (D-7) is another member from Illinois in the 112th Congress who has addressed the issue of education through bill sponsorship. Representative Davis has a doctorate degree, which may suggest one reason academic success is important to him as a policy priority. Another indicator is that Representative Davis was at one time a high school teacher, showing that his interest in education was important to him even professionally and may give him more insight into issues on educational policy compared to his colleagues who have little or no experience with being employed in an educational institution (davis.house.gov). During the current term, Representative Davis has introduced these bills as examples of involvement:

- H.R. 975 is a bill that amends the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities act to further the ability of school teachers and administrators to combat the problem of bullying in schools so that students are provided with a safer, more positive learning environment.
- H.R. 3165 is a bill that increases the ability for local school districts to put more emphasis on positive behavior and allows for more intervention at an early age to increase a child's educational experience through providing better counseling at school (thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery).

Although this doesn't apply to Representative Davis in the current term, he has served on educational committees while serving in Congress and that experience could have increased his awareness about federal educational policy, as well as added to his ability to understand how to navigate the legislation through congress.

Representative Davis's responsibility in the area of education to his constituents is very important considering the number of higher educational institutions in his district and the impact that they have on his district's makeup. Although Representative Davis has introduced a total of 4 bills that had some connection to educational policy, only two are bills that have a great deal of involvement in the actual process of education. But according to Representative Davis's website, his speeches to his constituents about the advantages of education and his desire to close the achievement gap for black students have shown us his deep concern for education. Representative Davis has also put out statements to the public strongly opposing some of the Republican proposals to get rid of \$600 million dollars in federal government grants to students. Representative Davis pointed out that "Pell grants help nearly ten million low - and moderate - income Americans access and succeed in college." Representative Davis points out that this funding is less than years past and strongly disagrees with reducing the funding in Pell and other federal government grants. Representative Davis also has a strong concern for his African American and other minority constituents who are receiving Pell grants. According to Davis, "47% of African Americans" receive Pell grants. It is because of his concern for his constituency, along with both his influences while a part of the institution of Congress, and before being a part of the institution that Davis has been drawn to support a continuance of Pell grants and student aid (davis.house.gov).

Randy Hultgren

Randy Hultgren (R-14) is serving in his first term of as a member of Congress and although there isn't a great deal mentioned in Representative Hultgren's professional or personal life prior to congress in his small website biography, he has still taken a part in his first term on federal educational policy. Representative Hultgren has introduced these bills dealing with education policy as examples of involvement:

- H.R. 2874 that gives grant rewards to health education programs that teach the advantage of abstinence
- H.R. 2910, which requires that a parent must give written consent to release the school records of home schooled students (thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery).

Both of these bills work to improve the educational awareness of abstinence and the human anatomy to students and protect the rights of students from having their records released if they are home schooled. Although these bills seem to support educational programs through federal funding, it will be interesting to see if Representative Hultgren will take a more active role in educational policy in the future. Representative Hultgren's subcommittee assignment to the committee on Research and Science Education may expand upon his involvement in federal educational policy, particularly in the area of science.

Representative Hultgren put out a public statement in support of the federal government's commitment to scientific research saying:

I believe it's time for the federal government to reaffirm its commitment to basic scientific research, by reforming the budgeting process to ensure greater stability and predictability. . .The eighty-six universities that comprise the Universities Research Association plan for the future and Congress should help them by doing the same. In the 21st Century, with 21st Century challenges, 21st Century technology, and 21st Century resources, there is no reason why we should still be restrained by an 18th Century budget process (Prairie State Report 2012).

This statement relays a strong belief in the ability of government to support research that will advance the U.S. in the fields of science and technology in particular. This statement also shows that Hultgren is interested in at least maintaining a majority of the funding used to assist universities across the United States in efforts to advance themselves in scientific research.

Representative Hultgren also tells his constituents that he is an advocate of legislation that supports more parental involvement in the educational process and one of his main involvements in educational policy to this point has been to attempt to level the playing field for abstinence in sexual education because he claims that the current administration has funded contraceptive education over abstinence education 16 to 1. His statements often reflect family values, which would appeal to his constituent base, and the bill concerning sexual education and the increase in funding for abstinence education will, I suspect, please his constituency (www.youtube.com/watch?v=-MW13tK-WLE).

These four case studies on members of Congress from the state of Illinois have shown that in one or more of the three major areas of influence, there is evidence to

suggest that the involvement of these members of Congress in federal educational policy is something that very well may have been driven due to these influences. Even this small sample size represented different ethnicities, genders, parties, levels of seniority, and difference in constituency make-up and the involvement still existed in a strong way with all four house members. The evidence shown through these case studies has shown my hypothesis to be a probable cause for legislative motivations due to these three areas of influence.

Case Study of President Obama

The office of the American Presidency is arguably far more complex an office than that of a sitting member of congress. Due to the very different responsibilities that this office encompasses, it would be difficult to provide the same amount of emphasis on different areas of influence as that shown in the framework that we applied to members of congress discussed in the previous section. Although a member of Congress may partly view his or her constituency as a national constituency, that view is surely always the main viewpoint of a President. There isn't somewhere where a president can display their "home style" (Fenno 1978). When a President takes the oath of the oval office, he or she becomes a representative of every individual in the United States of America, not just district three in Illinois. This itself shows the complexity and differences in the offices of a member of congress and the president.

However, there are several similarities in the offices that allow the framework put forward for members of Congress to be used for analyzing decision-making influences in the office of the Presidency. For instance there is a similarity in the fact that we know that

presidents are at least somewhat concerned with public support. However, when representing a diverse national constituency, one would have to assume that many of the actions taken by a President won't fit the viewpoints of at least one group the President represents as a national leader at any given time. This causes different emphases to be put on the President's agenda than perhaps a member of Congress who represents a single geographical constituency.

While we recognize that the President can't possibly be concerned with the "constituency" to the degree that a member of Congress can, we also have to point to the fact that a President faces very different institutional pressures within Washington than a member of Congress would face. The multi-faceted office that is the Presidency of the United States faces pressure from Congress, the judicial system, department chiefs, interest groups, and a whole array of other governmental entities, making it improbable for this study to fully tackle the wide range of institutional pressures that the President faces. The focus that was put on institutional involvement earlier is also relatively difficult to use for a measure of the President's interest in particular areas. The President can't afford to be a specialist on public policy. The institution calls for a generalist with the ability to delegate responsibilities not handled by the president himself to trusted officials who have the interests of the President himself at the very heart of their own decision-making process. Although admitting that Presidents do talk about and put forth certain public policies sometimes in a specialist manner, they certainly have to give attention to a wide range of issues to avoid being accused of negligence on any level by the public or by those that work with the President.

Despite having greater difficulties in understanding the influences on the office of the Presidency, I do believe that the three-fold framework of pre-office mindset, institutional pressures, and being responsible to a constituency are still relevant and appropriate measures for understanding the impact they have on motivations and decision-making of presidents.

One especially important factor is the pre-office mindset and the prioritization of policy goals. I argue that the pre-office mindset of a President is the single most important driver of the policy goals that Presidents pursue. The prioritization of issues that takes place through the socialization and life experiences that Presidents experience is the key to understanding Presidential behavior while in office.

A strong argument could be made that the issues of the time are a stronger motivator that pushes a President's priorities to the back seat. Although there is merit in this argument, when we review Presidents under similar circumstances, we have seen the same types of issues handled fairly differently. Some of this stems from differences in leadership style, but much of it, I argue, is due to the prioritization of policies that puts a different perspective on a current issue than it would for a different President who would look at the same issue, but with a different lens.

The educational and socializing experiences that have been experienced by lawmakers and those involved in government will clearly guide their policy goals in that area. Obama's commitment to his education was clear even at a young age. He graduated high school with honors, attended undergraduate school at Columbia in New York, and graduated Magna Cum Laude from Harvard Law School in 1991. His commitment to excellence in academic achievement was also exemplified when he was attending Harvard

and was elected the first African American editor of the Harvard Law Review (www.biography.com/people/barack-obama).

A politician's commitment to school shouldn't be taken lightly. However, most of those in high offices in politics today did fairly well in the educational institutions they attended. I think the main difference is what happened directly after President Obama graduated Harvard when he became a law professor at Chicago University Law School. When a governmental official has the experience of being an educator in the classroom, it has the ability to greatly change their perspective on the needs of education and this experience is something that will stick with them throughout their elected positions in office (www.biography.com/people/barack-obama).

Being an educator gives that person the ability to have an experience that gives them a view that is able to understand many facets of the public educational system. As instructors, people have the potential to better understand the needs of students. Having a grasp on what goes on in the classroom from day to day at any level can help bring awareness to an individual once in office of the needs of the classroom (Burden 2007, Barber 1992). They may have a better understanding on how much needs to be spent on classroom materials and aids to instructing. They have the opportunity to understand the best methods to improve students' learning. As an instructor, most schools will require a member of the faculty to be a part of the teacher's union. Being a part of this organization can make a teacher more aware of all the issues that are facing teachers and the dilemmas that they face in the workplace. Also, because Obama was employed at a private school as an instructor in the law, it's possible that it gave him an opportunity to better understand the private school educational system as well. This experience shows that President Obama

has had a very strong opportunity to become socialized on educational policy through his experiences in the classroom as a student, but much more importantly, as an instructor of students (Burden 2007, Barber 1992).

The experience that President Obama has had as an educator in an Illinois school has made him aware of the importance of the issues facing the educational system in America today. The time spent in the classroom, and the willingness to even take that particular job show that Obama's concern for educational policy started well before he took the office of the President of the United States. While for members of Congress, perhaps the strongest motivator for policy action is a representative's constituency (Mayhew 1974); I argue that the President's strongest area of influence for policy action is that of pre-office socialization (Barber 1992). It is fairly apparent with President Obama that his experience in the classroom has played a role in his line of thinking because he has put forward several educational policy initiatives to improve education and educational opportunity. The "Race To The Top" initiative put forward in 2009 is testament to President Obama's belief that the federal government should have a role in improving education, but that the choice of how to best accomplish that should be left up to the states (www.barackobama.com/record/education). Another extremely strong example of President Obama's interest in changing federal educational policy is the funding for students seeking an education. President Obama's experience as a teacher and student had the ability to make him aware of the rising cost of tuition at schools and often points back to a time when he was taking out a great deal of money in loans just to get through college. Evidence for this lies in the "pay as you earn" act which says that people paying on student

loan debt won't have to pay more than ten percent of their income

(www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education).

In the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act, 40 billion dollars in additional funding will be put towards Pell grants to make college more affordable. A strong reason that President Obama has pursued this policy and others with college loans and student aid is his experience with having gigantic debt accrued due to loans. President Obama's personal experience as a middle class student struggling to pay for his college has helped influence him, through his personal experiences, to put more federal dollars forward to assist students in paying for their education (www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education).

These policies and others like them would be much more difficult to achieve if President Obama had appointed a cabinet member over education that had very different ideas about how to best tackle the educational problem in America with federal authority. President Obama appointed Secretary of Education Arne Duncan while he was serving as the Chicago school chief. Duncan's commitment to education may have stemmed from watching his parents--his father was a professor at University of Chicago and his mother ran a tutoring program. Duncan, after just three years of being the Chicago Schools Chief, saw an increased level in first day school attendance from 76% in 2001 to 89% in 2004 (www.time.com/time/politics/article). His experience, passion, and willingness to try new and creative ideas to tackle programs in the educational system made him an attractive candidate for his position to Obama. Because Obama has a clear goal for the federal government to assist in improving America's education, I think he chose someone like-minded that would have the same type of ideas for combating educational problems (Polsby 1978). The ability to see their similarity on views come from the similarity of

backgrounds in education and the fact that they were both involved in the Chicago school systems makes their ideas or at least their prioritization of goals in education similar. It is because of this that Obama faces institutional pressure from someone with similar goals as him to achieve something in the policy area of education that he is influenced to pursue his goals as President a great deal and is positively instead of negatively influenced by his Secretary of Education to achieve the policies that he thought were a priority before he even took the office of President of the United States (Polsby 1978, Rose 1977).

President Obama's national constituency can certainly play a role in influencing his decision-making. President Obama has attempted to explain to the public the importance of the educational policies that he has pursued in helping students pay for their education, and helping schools improve their performance (www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education). While Race to the Top and increased funding for student's education has been something that President Obama has been able to talk favorable about to his constituents, the most important selling point that President Obama has put forward is that he believes that there is a strong connection between our economy and how educated our youth are. He has constantly asserted in a time of economic crisis that out-educating other countries will put America in front of any other economic world power. He has used terms like "educate to innovate" to describe programs that will put the economy back on track by improving the education of American students in STEM fields and claims that there is strong connection between this program and improving education in general, and the future success of America as a world economic power in a global economy (www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education). The importance to Obama in making this connection to voters is important when understanding his responsibility to his constituents

and his hopes for reelection. When economic times are tough, it's important as an officeholder to explain your policy goals in other areas as a part of the overall picture for future economic recovery and as a step forward in prohibiting the fall of our economic system to this degree again.

The case study conducted on President Obama has been indicative of his pre-office socialization, institutional influences, and constituency all playing a role in his involvement in federal educational policy. Although the Presidency is a very different office to study from that of Congress, this case study and the one done with the four members of Congress from the state of Illinois were helpful in setting up a model that I feel can be expanded to other officeholders for determining why they are particularly involved and interested in the policy areas that they are. The case study on the President was important for establishing the fact that this model has further implications than just applying to members of the United States House and can be used as a model to understand motivations for other officeholders at various levels and in different positions in public office.

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Further Applications

This study has set out to establish a framework within which broader applications can be made about legislative and Presidential behavior and decision-making. Through looking at case studies of four members of the United States House of Representatives and the President of the United States and their level of involvement in federal educational policy, we have been able to gain a greater understanding of why their high level of involvement exists through the influences that they have faced. Leaving with an understanding that not all three areas of influence (pre-office socialization, institutional pressures, and a responsibility to a constituency) play the same role for every political actor, we can see that all three at least play a minor role in affecting the behavior of officeholders. Education seems to be an area that most elected officials would say they are concerned about, but their methods or priorities within this policy area differ a great deal in part due to the great differences in the influences that an officeholder has had.

To strengthen and expand on this research, my first suggestion would be to increase the size of the study so that a comparison can be made in a policy area that perhaps has the amount of bills proposed by a member of Congress for every member of Congress instead of just those from a single state. This will most likely increase the ability to make stronger comparisons about how high a level of involvement is considered a high level of involvement in comparison to the entire House instead of just that from members from Illinois.

Another way that this research could be expanded is to come up with a model of behavior through using these three influences that explains voting, policy or bill proposals,

and the like in Congress. It would seem fitting that now we know that they exist to show what the decision-making process looks like with three influences. To do this, you could adopt models of voting from the past like Kingdon's but put more emphasis on the pre-office mindset and their responsibility to their constituents as other major contributing factors in decision-making instead of mainly just focusing on the institutional pressures that members of Congress face in Kingdon's model.

More research could certainly be contributed in the area of Presidential decision-making in general, and that on federal educational policy in particular as well. It would be beneficial in the future to study past Presidents and make more comparisons in their level of educational policy goals instead of only looking at one so that more of a comparison is available for understanding why Presidents who were most involved in shaping educational policy were that way and by which of these three influences they were motivated to take a great deal of action on these public policies.

In future studies, it may also be easier to compare more divisive issues that show stronger signs, party line voting, and constituency opinion than education. I think a possible policy area could be the regulation of business and labor policies by the federal government. I would expect that it would be easier to prove pre-office socialization, institutional pressures, and the influence of a member of Congress's constituency in an area like business regulation and labor because of the polarizing affect that it has. Another difference that may develop in an issue like business regulation and/or labor is that if there is a difference of opinions somewhere within the three influences, it will be interesting to see which of the three influences the member of Congress or President decides to take a stronger case for making a decision as opposed to another influence. For example, if a

member of Congress is a Republican with a mindset of less business regulation, but represents a constituency is different in opinion in a particular area within business regulation, how will the member of Congress react when his/her personal convictions and party are influencing them to vote against business regulation in a particular area but their constituency is asking that they vote for business regulation in a particular area? It would be interesting to expand on this research by finding cases like this and conducting a case study on it to further understand the influences that I've suggested exist in this study.

The framework set up in this study is one that I hope will be a part of contributing to political science research in understanding legislative and presidential behavior and decision-making and is something that can hopefully be used and greatly expanded upon through looking at decision-making through a different lens in future studies by looking at other policy areas that are important to the understanding the involvement of the federal government in different policy areas.

Appendix A: Illinois Members of Congress and Education Policy 2011

District Number	Representative Name	Website	Project Vote Smart	Proposed Bills	Proposed Education Bills
1	Bobby Rush - D	0	1	0	0
2	Jesse Jackson, Jr. - D	1	1	0	0
3	Daniel Lipinski - D	0	0	0	0
4	Luis Gutierrez - D	1	1	0	0
5	Mike Quigley - D	1	0	1	1
6	Peter Roskam - R	0	1	0	0
7	Danny Davis - D	1	1	5	5
8	Joe Walsh - R	0	2	0	0
9	Jan Schakowsky - D	0	1	1	1
10	Robert Dold - R	2	2	0	0
11	Adam Kinzinger - R	0	1	0	0
12	Jerry Costello - D	1	1	0	0
13	Judy Biggert - R	2	1	6	6
14	Randy Hultgren - R	0	2	1	1
15	Tim Johnson - R	0	2	0	0
16	Donald Manzullo - R	0	2	0	0
17	Bobby Schilling - R	0	2	0	0
18	Aaron Schock - R	0	0	0	0
19	John Shimkus - R	0	1	0	0
	Total Ed. Speech	7	16	10	10

Website Coding:

0 = Representative does not mention education on website

1= Representative mentions education in an increased federal government involvement perspective

2= Representative mentions education in a decreased or no change amount of federal government involvement in education

Project Vote Smart Coding:

0= The representative did not mention education on project vote smart AND project vote smart could not come up with data to represent an officeholder's views on education.

1= The Representative or project vote smart showed a representative's view that the federal government's role should increase in the area of education.

2= The Representative or project vote smart showed a representative's view that the federal government's role should either decrease or remain the same in the area of education.

Proposed Bills Coding:

The numbers indicated in the "proposed bills" column simply represent the quantity of bills proposed by members of congress from Illinois.

Pro-Ed Bills Coding:

The numbers indicated in the "Pro-Ed bills" column simply represent the number of bills proposed by a particular representative that were increasing the involvement of the federal government into education.

Works Cited

- A & E Networks. 2012. "Barack Obama" www.biography.com/people/barack-obama-12782369 (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Aldrich, John and David Rohde. 2000. "The Republican Revolution and the House Appropriations Committee," *Journal of Politics* 62: 1-33.
- Aldrich, John H. and David W. Rohde. 2009. "Congressional Committees in a Continuing Partisan Era." In *Congress Reconsidered*, eds. Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce I. Oppenheimer. Washington DC: CQ Press.
- Arnold, Douglas R. 1990. *Logic of Congressional Action*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Asher, Herbert. 1973. "The Learning of Legislative Norms" *American Political Science Review* 67(2): 499-513.
- Barber, James David. 1992. *The Presidential Character; Predicting Performance in the White House, 4th edition*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Baumgartner, Frank R., Virginia Gray, and David Lowery. 2009. "Federal Policy Activity and the Mobilization of State Lobbying Organizations". *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 62, No. 3, pp. 552-567.
- Burden, Barry C. 2007. *Personal Roots of Representation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- CLCR Video. 2009. "U.S. Rep Schakowsky On Educational Programs In Science, Math, Engineering, and Technology". www.youtube.com/watch?v=mDa74zLWz38. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Congressman Randy Hultgren. 2012. "Education". hultgren.house.gov/index.cfm?sectionid=15§iontree=5,15. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Congressman Randy Hultgren 2012. "Biography". hultgren.house.gov/index.cfm?sectionid=63§iontree=2,63. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Congresswoman Judy Biggert. 2012. "Education". biggert.house.gov/education/. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Congresswoman Judy Biggert. 2012. "Biography". biggert.house.gov/about-judy/. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Congressman Danny Davis. 2012. "Education Priorities". davis.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=237&Itemid=109. (Accessed March 7, 2012).

- Congressman Danny Davis. 2012. "Biography". davis.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=13&Itemid=39. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Congresswoman Jan Schakowsky. 2012. "About Jan". schakowsky.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2577&Itemid=8. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Cooper, Joseph and David Brady. 1981. "Institutional Context and Leadership Style: The House from Cannon to Rayburn." *American Political Science Review* 75:411-425.
- Cornfield, Michael. 2010. Game Changers: New Technology and the 2008 Presidential Election. In Sabato, Larry J. (editor), *The Year of Obama: How Barack Obama Won The White House*, (pgs. 205-230). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Druckman, James, Martin Kifer, and Michael Parkin. 2009. "Campaign Communications in U.S. Congressional Elections," *American Political Science Review* 103(3): 343-366.
- Davidson, Roger H., Walter J. Oleszek, and Frances E. Lee. 2011. *Congress and Its Members*, 13th ed. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.
- EdLaborRepublicans. 2009. "Meet The Members: Rep. Judy Biggert". www.youtube.com/watch?v=MRN0hH9wUeg. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Edwards, George C., III, and Wayne, Stephen J. 2007. *Presidential Leadership: Politics and Policymaking, 8th edition*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Education Week. 2012. "K-12 America Since 1981". www.edweek.org/ew/collections/30-years/timeline.html. (Accessed March 28, 2012).
- Erikson, Robert S. and Gerald C. Wright. 2009. "Voters, Candidates, and Issues in Congressional Elections." In *Congress Reconsidered*, eds. Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce I. Oppenheimer. Washington DC: CQ Press
- Fenno, Richard. 1973. *Congressmen In Committees*. New York City, New York: Little, Brown.
- Fenno, Richard. 1978. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Frisch, Scott and Sean Kelly. 2004. "Self-Selection Reconsidered: House committee Assignment Requests and Constituency Characteristics," *Political Research Quarterly* Vol. 57, No. 2: 325-336.
- Gross, Donald A. 1978. "Representative Styles and Legislative Behavior", *The Western Political Quarterly* Vol. 31, No. 3 pp. 359-371.

- Hasecke, Edward B., and Jason D. Mycoff. 2007. "Party Loyalty and Legislative Success; Are Loyal Majority Party Members More Successful in the U.S. House of Representatives"? *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 60, No.4 pp. 607-617
- Hicken, Allen and Joel W. Simons. 2008. "The Personal Vote and the Efficacy of Education Spending" *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 52, No. 1, pp-109-124
- HSequity. 2007. "Ensuring Success For Students of Color Congressman Danny Davis". www.youtube.com/watch?v=L_XMdf64M3A. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Jenkins, Henry. 2006. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York, New York: New York University Press.
- Kernell, Samuel. 1997. *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*, 3rd edition. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc.
- Kingdon, John W. 1977. "Models of Legislative Voting", *The Journal of Politics* Vol. 39, No. 3 pp. 563-595.
- The Leonore Annenberg Institute for Civics. "Educational Policy Timeline". www.annenbergclassroom.org/Files/Documents/EducationPolicy.pdf. (Accessed March 28, 2012).
- The Library of Congress: Thomas. 2012. "Bill Summary and Status Search" thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery. (Accessed February 15, 2012).
- Lipinski, Daniel. 2009. "Navigating Congressional Policy Processes: The Inside Perspective on How Laws Are Made". In *Congress Reconsidered*, eds. Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce I. Oppenheimer. Washington DC : CQ Press.
- Mann, Thomas J. and Norman J. Ornstein. 2009. "Is Congress Still the Broken Branch?" In *Congress Reconsidered*, eds. Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce I. Oppenheimer. Washington DC: CQ Press.
- Mayhew, David. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Miskel, Cecil and Mengli Song. 2004. "Passing Reading First: Prominence and Processes in an Elite Policy Network". *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 26, No. 2 p. 89-109.
- New York State Education Department. 2006. "Federal State Education Policy Chronology 1944-2002". www.archives.nysed.gov/edpolicy/.../ed_research_chronology.pdf. (Accessed March 28, 2012).
- Obama For America. 2012. "The President's Record On Education". www.barackobama.com/record/education?source=primary-nav. (Accessed March 7, 2012).

- Parker, David and Craig Goodman. 2009. "Making a Good Impression: Resource Allocation, Home Styles, and Washington Work." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 35: 493-524.
- Pickert, Kate.. 2008. "Education Secretary Arne Duncan". *TIME*.
www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1867011,00.html. (Accessed March 29, 2012).
- Polsby, Nelson. 1978. "Presidential Cabinet Making: Lessons for the Political System". *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 93, No. 1 p. 15-25.
- Polsby, Nelson. 1968. "The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives." *American Political Science Review* 62: 144-168.
- Project Vote Smart. 2002-2012. www.votesmart.org. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Rae, Nicol. 2007. "Be Careful What You Wish For: The Rise of Responsible Parties in American National Politics," *Annual Review of Political Science* 10(1): 169-91.
- Rep. Hultgren. 2011. "Congressman Hultgren Speaks in Support of the Abstinence-Centered Education Reallocation Act". www.youtube.com/watch?v=-MW13tK-WLE. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Rose, Richard. 1977. "The President: A Chief But Not an Executive" *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pgs. 5-20.
- Sinclair, Barbara. 2012. *Unorthodox Lawmaking: New Legislative Processes in the U.S. Congress*. 4th ed. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.
- Smith, Steven S. and Gerald Gamm. 2009. "The Dynamics of Party Government in Congress". In *Congress Reconsidered*, eds. Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce I. Oppenheimer. Washington DC: CQ Press.
- States News Service. February 9, 2012. "Educators Endorse Judy Biggert For Re-election To U.S. House of Representatives. (Accessed March 7, 2012).
- Sulkin, Tracy. 2009. "Promises Made and Promises Kept." In *Congress Reconsidered*, eds. Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce I. Oppenheimer. Washington DC: CQ Press.
- United States Department of Education. 2012. "The Federal Role In Education".
www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html. (Accessed March 29, 2012).
- The White House. 2012. "Educate To Innovate". www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education/educate-innovate. (Accessed March 29, 2012).
- The White House. 2012. "Education". www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education. (Accessed March 28, 2012).

The White House. 2012. "Making College More Affordable".
www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education/higher-education. (Accessed March 28, 2012).