University of Richmond

UR Scholarship Repository

1994

Public policy issues

Aaron J. Heffron
University of Richmond

Recommended Citation

Public Policy Issues

by

Aaron J. Heffron

Senior Project

Jepson School of Leadership Studies

University of Richmond

Richmond, VA

April 1994

Leadership Case Studies

Focus on:
Public Policy Issues

Aaron J. Heffron

Senior Project
Jepson School of Leadership Studies
Dr. Joanne Ciulla
April 20, 1994

CONTENTS

Introduction

The following pages are a collection of three case studies assembled with the intent to facilitate discussion about key leadership issues related to the public policy realm. Critics of leadership studies have often pointed to the theoretical nature of the discipline to criticize the worth . One method to teach leadership is the utilization of case studies, or "real world" examples. If your position is that leadership can only be taught through practical experience, these case studies should present an interesting exercise. They seek to inculcate the idealistic world of theoretical studies with doses of realistic situations.

For these case studies to be a successful teaching tool, all students must actively participate in a discussion led by the instructor. Reading a case study independent of discussion is virtually worthless. While certain ideas about action can be formulated, only true learning can take place during the defense of one's particular position. Other viewpoints exist that one might not initially consider. Leadership is a participative, reciprocal process. Therefore, learning to convince people and influence others with regards to one's own decision is important to success outside the world of the case study.

Each case study in this collection is a compilation of research from second-hand sources. Some information was obtained through text of personal speeches or documents, but a majority of the analysis comes through the eyes of other interpretators. I can hope for the most accurate depictionof the data as provided to me through these sources. If any facts or figures are misrepresented or skewed to a certain way of thinking, please consider it unintentional. One can be aware of biases of authors, but may have difficulty separating them from reality.

All case studies come with a short abstract that introduces the main topic and issues contained within the study. At the conclusion of the case will be questions

for discussion among class members. These questions are to be discussed from a variety of angles and it is the responsibility of the facilitator to ensure that the true essence of the question is answered.   The questions will pose common dilemmas and merge some formal leadership theory. At the beginning of the collection are the reasons for the selection of each case study. Hopefully each one of these case studies will help the students further understand the leadership dilemmas that can occur in the realm of public policy implementation and analysis.

Aaron J. Heffron (1994)

Choosing topics for a leadership case study is a relatively easy task. Choosing detailed, insightful topics for careful analysis and scrutiny is a different story. The three cases in this collection were chosen for a variety of reasons. Each had to satisfy the following criteria:

- Deal with a issue in the public realm, preferably of national scope

- Contain pressing issues of leadership that can by transferred to other situations.

- Contain not clear, single answers, but a myriad of issues one might agree with but say " I agree, but..."

- Have enough facets to spur a discussion of leadership that transcends one particular style.

The cases chosen after some research were Al Gore's attempts to start "reinventing government" through his National Performance Review, the current environmental case between the Environmental Protection Agency and the oil refining company Unocal regarding the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990, and the present implementation and funding problems of the Head Start program initiated during the Johnson administration. Each case has a unique quality that separates it from the other two. Each, though, has at least one leadership issue that transcends time and situation. The cases will now be individually explained as to their particular purpose.

Pop Culture Politics

This case study was chosen because it ventures into a realm that leaders in today's society have had to operate to a greater and greater extent. This is the realm of cross-generational appeal and utilization of different media avenues. While the Nixon-Kennedy debate was said to be won by the image Kennedy projected on the screen, the world of media politics has developed much further. Media consultants coupled with image makers and consultants are all now part of a politicians entourage.

In the past, the president of the United States has worked to become one of the people. The theory behind a democratic society is that the president is just an ordinary person that could have been part of any walk of life. By following the political leaders of this country continuously, the media has developed a certain image of politicians that breaks from this conventional theory. The politician is someone seen only on the television news, or in press conferences. They are constantly dealing with issues that can not be directly influenced by the public. Our leaders have grown more distant from the constituency that has elected them.

This case study shows an example of one leader trying to influence followers and institute change by breaking from this idea. Al Gore with his National Performance Review has tried diligently to bring himself back to the people in hopes of gaining their favor. He needs the people of the United States to work with him on the task of "reinventing government". Criticism rains in because of this type of behavior. Critics state that Gore will compromise the authority of the executive branch by mocking himself and the office. By appearing on talk shows and other forms of pop media , critics say he is trivializing his role in the government and will, because of the loss of respect for his authority, lose the ability to enact drastic measures of government. These are issues with which a leader has

to grapple. Does becoming "one of the guys" compromise the authority of the position and will the followers respect that kind of the leader after such incidences?

Ends and the Means: The EPA vs. Unocal

This case study ventures from the popular headlines of the news media. But the case study enters the area of environmental politics that has many pitfalls for implementors of public policy measures. Ethical dilemmas come into play along with the dynamics of delegation of authority and trust. Every leader will encounter circumstances where a certain earlier decision is difficult to follow because of later situational changes. Also within a group certain tasks are doled out by the leader under the good faith that the follower will perform those tasks to both the satisfaction of the group and the leader. These were the scenarios of this case that led to its choice.

Unocal made a business decision they felt was in compliance with the new Clean Air Act amendments and their particular governing agency, South Coast Air Quality Management District. Technically, the EPA had given the right to SCAQMD to make decisions regarding construction permits for new plants. SCAQMD did not make the decision that the EPA wanted, so the EPA came in, changed the ruling, and proceeded to regulate in place of the local ruling body.

The EPA ruling blocked Unocal from proceeding on schedule to rework their refinery to meet Clean Air Act deadlines that were to be in place by January 1, 1995. The EPA said the construction was in violation of existing codes. This raises an interesting question for the leaders of the EPA; should they restrict a plant from building to improve long term environmental concern, even if short tern codes are broken? Every leader will face question such as this. Does the ends justify the

means? When must short term sacrifices be made to satisfy the long range goals of the group.

The other facet of this case up for analysis is the jurisdiction of a certain agency. The EPA superseded the ruling of the organization to whom the EPA gave rights to the decision. Is it right for a leader to question the decision of their own follower, if that follower was asked to decide? Or does the leader have the responsibility to oversee these decisions and step in when necessary to correct what they see as an error? What does this do for the confidence and loyalty of the followers?

Head Start to a Tough Race

Finally, this case was chosen because initially it was seen as a successful endeavor but as the years went by, while still remaining a vital program , it lost some of the initial enthusiasm. This is a study of the Head Start program started by Sargent Shriver during the Johnson administration . This is a perfect example on how social pressures and enthusiasm can push a project to perform outside and past its means. While in the short run it experiences great success, no firm institution is built to ensure its smooth running throughout the years.

Head Start was the product of somewhat flawed thinking but evolved into a program that has been popular and beneficial. While not demonstrating definite results of raising a child IQ, the Head Start center provided other services for both the children and the parents. As a leader Shriver set certain goals and expectations in motion within this program that have maintained the sanctity of the initiative throughout lean budget years, economic recessions, and tight spending legislators.

A leader has to create an institution that he or she knows will continue when he or she is not there. By emphasizing the poverty-stricken children of the program, Shriver made the goals supersede any in-fighting that may have occurred; the cause itself was uplifting. In addition a leader must be able to revitalize a program or group when a set back occurs. That is what is needed now in the Head Start program.

The final point of the case has to deal with decisions a leader has to make about follower satisfaction. If followers do not see immediate results or are not immediately rewarded for their effort, they will not perform consistently up to their capacity. A social program poses difficulties in demonstrating immediate success. Shriver found this problem, and tried to remedy it by calling upon IQ testing as a means of evaluation. Any leader of a group working on a long term project is faced with the problem of showing the follower that they are performing well and accomplishing great things.

Pop Culture Politics

Aaron J. Heffron

Abstract:

This case study addresses one of the questions that has arisen in the past few years with regards to political coalition building and garnering of support. As a leader of a government for the people, does one sacrifice their own referent power and sacrifice possible future needs for power to develop support for present policy initiatives.

Popular culture humanizes people. Should our leaders, such as Bill Clinton and Al Gore, utilize television and comedy to make themselves popular? What are the long term effects of a leader who pokes fun and demeans, in the public eye, him or her self? The example to be used is the National Performance Review and the "reinventing government movement" by the Clinton administration.

On September 8, 1993, Vice-President Al Gore stepped onto the stage of the Ed Sullivan Memorial Theater in New York City. He was the featured guest on the "Late Show" with David Letterman. Far from a comfortable arena for discourse for Gore, the "Late Show" was being used as an avenue to propel his "reinventing government" theme into the national spotlight. While he was not the first high ranking official to appear on a predominantly comedic show, Gore was one of the first to utilize this venue for a policy initiative. The *National Performance Review* was not an ordinary policy initiative, therefore ordinary means of garnering support and implementation were not going being used.

There has been growing opinion in the United States that the government is not designed to serve the citizens. E.J. Dionne, Jr. in his book, Why Americans Hate Politics, describes many reasons for the ever growing distrust and distaste all Americans have toward the governmental system as it is currently functioning.

"Americans view politics with boredom and detachment. For most of us, politics is increasingly abstract, a spectator sport barely worth watching." (p.9)

Citizen do not feel they can change the way government is running, therefore apathy has reigned supreme and turnout for voting has decreased.

" Voters doubt that elections give them any real control over what the government does, and half of them don't bother to cast ballots." (p.10)

Bill Clinton and Al Gore, in the fall of 1992, rode what was far from a overwhelming public approval into the Oval Office. Elected by only 43% of the voters, Bill Clinton had to take some action that would gain the support of the masses. A President from the "baby boomer" generation, Bill Clinton has fought an

uphill battle against the stereotypes and rumors matched only by the growing resentment of government by the American people. The Clinton/Gore administration began searching for an issue that could easily be taken to the masses and would regain the stature of the government of the United States.

Approximately the same time, David Osborne and Ted Gaebler published a book that would give inspiration to the administration. Reinventing Government discussed the waste inherent in the bureaucratic system. The book was fraught with wasteful examples of governmental procedure. Successful campaigns that ran in the face of established procedure were trumpeted. Government was sick and Osborne and Gaebler were out to cure it. By proposing a new concept called *entrepreneurial government,* (actually a campaign slogan of Massachusetts governor Bill Weld) these two men were breaking down the barriers of the existing bureaucracy and paving the way for a more cost and time- efficient government.

Clinton and Gore saw this book as an opportunity to regain the trust of the American people, if not in just them, in the entire government. The book's phraseology connoted American values of rugged individualism, capitalism, and teamwork.

"Most entrepreneurial governments promote *competition* between service providers. They *empower* citizens by pushing control out of the bureaucracy and into the community. They measure the performance of their agencies, focusing not on inputs but *outcomes.* They are driven by their goals- their *missions-* not by their rules and regulations. They redefine their clients as *customers* and offer them choices...They *prevent* problems before they emerge. They put their energies into *earning* money, not simply spending it. They *decentralize* authority, embracing participatory management. They prefer *market* mechanisms to bureaucratic mechanisms."

(p.19-20)

The Osborne and Gaebler system seemed to be what the doctor ordered for the United States. Government would function more for the people, rather than against the people. Clinton and Gore wanted to be "for the people".

On March 3, 1993, President Bill Clinton presented the new initiative to the American public, "Our goal is to make the entire federal government both less expensive and more efficient, and to change the culture of our national bureaucracy away from the complacency and entitlement toward initiative and empowerment. We intend to redesign, to reinvent, to reinvigorate the entire national government." President Clinton proceeded to name Vice-president Al Gore as the head of the new project. Gore was to become the leader of the six-month project that would yield a report on how to make the government better. What effect the report would have after its completion was still questionable.

In the preface to the final report, *Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less*, Gore discussed the methodology for compiling this report. Shortly after the directive from the President, Gore organized federal employees with great experience within the government to become part of the evaluation team. Outsiders were not capable of dissecting the government, and remedying the ailments in the vital organs of the system. The employees themselves knew what ailed the system, and they would come up with the solution. All cabinet positions were required to form evaluation or "Reinvention Teams" that would look specifically at their department. This entire program utilized thousands of federal employees. Only the employees could fix the system.

Gore also cited the use of letters and other informal suggestions from the American public: "We also heard from citizens all across America, in more than 30,000 letters and phone calls. (p.ii)" Gore wanted to hear examples of successful initiatives within communities. These projects could possibly be extrapolated to work for the entire country. This six month study sought to utilize as many

resources as possible, and provide something fresh and new for the American public.

After this six month study Gore's "reinventing government" team produced a weighty document with four key principles and a mission statement:

1. *Cutting Red Tape-* freeing people from rule laden organizations, and encouraging people to achieve results.

2. *Putting Customers First-* restructure system to fit and change to the customer's needs.

3. *Empowering Employees to Get Results-* solve your own problem, don't always "pass the buck".

4. *Cutting Back to Basics: Producing Better Government for Less.*

Each one of the above mentioned principles is the subject of one section of the proposal. Cutting Red Tape is one of the more popular sections because of the endless log of government restrictions on various products. Government restrictions were placed on items ranging from ash trays to floor wax. For the most part, each one of these regulations was focused far enough to allow only one producer and supplier. This would secure a government contract for a particular company, usually a "pet" company of a specific government official. For any other brand of a certain product to enter an agency, miles of red tape had to be traversed.

Throughout the report different recommendations are given to help the system. These are labeled as *actions* , and are usually followed by examples of agencies that have already taken this advice to heart. For example

Action: The President should issue a directive requiring all federal agencies that deliver services to the public to create customer service programs that identify and

survey customers. The order will establish the following standard for quality: Customer service equal to the best in the business. (p.47)

After this action, new customer service standards recently issued by the United States Postal Service are listed. It is cited that these were a result of the analysis that occurred during the tenure of this study. This proposal was designed to be very action oriented.

September 7, 1993, saw the culmination of six months of Al Gore's work. During an elaborate presentation on the White House lawn, Al Gore delivered the document to President Clinton. In addition to this 163 page report, Gore employed two forklifts to carry "some" of the unnecessary governmental regulations. Two large stacks of paper were placed in the backdrop of this ceremony. Upon the waste paper's arrival Al Gore told President Clinton, "If you want to know why government doesn't work look behind you. (Hume, p.20)" This presentation began the onslaught of both negative and positive reactions to this plan.

Shortly after an article in the National Review, presented some criticism of the effort. The article cited phrases from the proposal that made government, "more responsive to its customers." One of the problems of today's government is not the responsiveness toward the customers of government, purports the author, but exactly who the customers of government are. It seems that the American system seems genuinely responsive to the needs of the *real* customers, the activists and special interest groups (National Review, Oct. 4, 1993. p.14). The idea of "reinventing government" to serve the customers was valid, but new identification of the customers was needed.

In a surprise response the governmental employees unions supported the report that seemed to cut federal jobs. The report clearly sought to harbor the support of this group with phrasing like, "The problem is not lazy or incompetent

people; it is the red tape and regulation." and, "The federal government is filled with good people trapped in a bad system. (p. 2)" This type of attitude emanating from the study encouraged the workers to develop efficient means of functioning. The report itself stated that it "focused primarily on how government should work, and not on what it should do."

On the same day as the ceremony on the White House lawn, the New York Times published an article basically against the Gore report. Its main argument rested on the idea that unless the government scales back on the number of ambitious tasks it undertakes, "reinvention" is impossible; "The fundamental problem of government is not inept administration, but an overload of policy mandates (Winnick, p. A17). The government of the United States of America has to be scaled back, or *disinvented,* before it could be *reinvented.* Political scientist James Q. Wilson stated, "You can have less bureaucracy only if you have less government."

In light of this criticism from the "experts", Gore and Clinton enacted a policy implementation approach that was vastly different from the convention. To this point, a policy measure usually has to pass the litmus test of the special interest groups and lobbyists for it to be successful. These two policy innovators began utilizing the existing structure as an example to the American public of a government gone awry. Within the report they state, "[We] must avoid the pull of implementation models that are familiar and comfortable but poorly suited to today's world. (p.121)" Both Clinton and Gore feared that this report would get bogged down or diluted; "This policy review will not produce another report just to gather dust in some warehouse. We have enough of them already. (p.121)"

The approach taken was one of grassroots movement. Clinton and Gore felt that the American public was the body most affected by the changes in government. They also felt that the public originally called for this transformation of government

and therefore should play an active role in the implementation of the prescribed measures printed in the report.

"It will take more than a dedicated president and vice-president to make this vision a reality, however. It will take more than dedicated employees. It will take dedicated citizens, willing to work long and hard to improve their government." (p.124)

The president and vice-president issued a call to arms of the citizens of the United States. The American public must make government accountable for every action they take. They must make sure they are treated like the most valued customers in the system. The citizens can not only ask for this change, they must demand it. Finally, every person must be willing to act on the basis of the information they received about their government's actions.

Bill Clinton and Al Gore have played a very active role in pop culture, utilizing the medium of television extensively. During the election campaign of 1992 Bill Clinton was seen on a variety of popular programs that appealed to the younger generation of voters, the generation that grew up on MTV and sound bites. Clinton and Gore were not afraid to use the popular media to their advantage. They were of a younger generation than most of the Washington DC. crowd, they should act like it. They held the same view with relation to this policy initiative.

The shining example of this approach to policy implementation was Al Gore's appearance on the "Late Show" with David Letterman. For the past decade, Letterman has been an icon of popular culture. Witty sarcasm and a propensity for the absurd propelled Letterman to the top of the ratings among a college age crowd. His irreverent humor holds no prisoners as he bombasts everyone from his current bosses to Madonna. As a guest on the "Late Show" one has to show not only the ability to accept good nature ribbing, but a knack for retaliation and self deprecation. This hardly seems like the arena for a high ranking government official to tout a government initiative.

Gore, often criticized for a certain inflexibility and spontaneity, seemed doomed from the moment he agreed to be on the show. However, because of a certain amount of preparation and a wit not normally apparent during official government functions, Gore's appearance seemed to dispel the previous image of himself. Gore mocked Letterman's signature *Top Ten List* with one of his own. The title was "Top ten good things about being vice-president". This list included "You get all the French fries the President can't get to", a reference to Clinton's lust for fast food, and " Secret Service code name, Buttafuoco", referring to the Amy Fisher-Joey Buttafuoco saga. Gore even managed to strike a subtle jab at Letterman by referring to him during one answer as "pinhead".

On the show, Gore demonstrated the absurdity of one government regulation regarding specifications placed on ash trays. By smashing the tray into small pieces, Gore showed what kind of unusual tests that something as simple as an ash tray has to go through to be purchased by the federal government. Extra testing and specifications raises costs; rising costs raises government expenditure. Gore wanted to show the American public that the government under Clinton was practical and hit close to home. This type of show addressed an audience as of yet completely unclaimed by a specific party.

One major question arises from this display. Was the vice-president humanizing himself too much? Bob Lichter, the director of the Center for Media and Public affairs states with regards to Gore's appearance on the show, "In narrow terms, Gore performed well. He humanized himself. My qualms are that in the long run, the power of the presidency depends on a certain larger-than-life aura. And popular culture shrinks that aura. It's telling people at the outset: This isn't serious, It's all a joke. (Kolbert, p. A12)" Would future attempts to implement public policy initiative be compromised for this short-term success?

This was not the first time a high profile politician utilized the popular culture venue of television to promote specific goals. Richard Nixon, to aid in his presidential campaign appeared on cult-television sensation *Rowan and Martin's Laugh In*. Coining the popular phrase, "Sock it to me!", Nixon tried to transcend the generation gap to employ the aid of the twenty-something generation of the time. While Gore was not running for political office, he was hoping to garner the support for an initiative that originated in the masses distrust and distaste for wasteful government. Massachusetts Representative Barney Frank reflected upon the trend in politics, "Politicians are doing this to ingratiate themselves with the voters. We're seen as pompous and self-important. Humor is a way to humanize ourselves. (Senior, p.1+)" Gore wanted the younger American public to adopt this initiative and as he claimed in the report, hold the governmental official responsible for making the change. Gore was using the situational humor of his role on the "Late Show" to get this point across.

Whether it was on a comedy show such as "Late Show" or on a talk show like *Oprah* or *Donahue*, politicians, and our national leaders, were trying to become one of "the common folk". During the elections of 1992, politicians ran amuck on the talk show circuit. To make their intentions known, these figures sought the close conversation with the American public. Clinton's appearances on talk shows, especially the *Arsenio Hall Show* , according to one writer, "transported "politics" into a cultural space ordinarily devoted to comedy, celebrity, and the celebration of youth culture, particularly the culture of urban black youth. The value of such action rests in overcoming the isolation of politics from those cultural spheres in which ordinary (and forgotten) Americans find personal meaning. (Rosen, p.24)" The talk show was an avenue to make politics more human, "The more human you make it seem, the more "popular" and meaningful politics may become. (Rosen, p.24)"

Discussion Questions

1. Do you think that Al Gore and Bill Clinton have sacrificed their referent power as leaders by utilizing the popular media and poking fun at themselves?

2. Does a leader have to remain aloof from the followers to be successful?

3. Are you drawn to Al Gore's project because of his utilization of the popular media or in spite of his use of this medium?

4. A study by Pfeffer in 1981 showed that an effective leadership technique called co-opting, or undercutting the critics by addressing their concern before they raise it, can be used to silence critics and gain their support. Do you think that Clinton and Gore are utilizing this technique to "beat their critics to the punch"?

5. What suggestion would you give to Al Gore to help garner support for this program? Should he be relying on the public, or as a leader has he misidentified his constituency?

Ends and the Means:
The EPA vs. Unocal

Aaron J. Heffron

Abstract:

This case study addresses the problems the EPA has had in implementing environmental regulations. The EPA has established a litany of regulations and procedures and designated certain agencies to administer these regulations in different parts of the country.

The leadership questions that arise are: can long term benefits justify exceptions to the rules in the short run? Also what right does a leader have to reverse the decision of a subordinate that the leader gave the power to make that specific decision? The case used is a dispute between the United States EPA, Unocal Oil company, and the local environmental agency, the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

Environmental issues have come to the forefront of the American political landscape over the past two decades. Since the original Earth Day in 1970, the citizens of the United States have worked to improve the environment. Along with this grass roots movement, the idea developed that the government should help regulate environmentally hazardous materials and emissions. Businesses have responded to government regulations with a mixture of praise and scorn. Consistent throughout the arguments against strict environmental restrictions is the possibility of decreased efficiency and production. Businesses also cite increased production cost leading to higher prices for the consumer. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) responds with prospects of lower long term costs and a better living environment.

Included with this dispute is the question of jurisdiction and the main purpose of governmental regulations and restrictions. The revisions to the original Clean Air Act amendments of 1970 that occurred in 1990 have led to many disagreements between the EPA and a variety of business and industries that either failed to comply to the new regulations or are making some efforts to do such. One example of this type of dispute is currently going on in California with an oil refining company called Unocal.

Most people agree that the main purpose of environmental legislation is to clean the environment and provide good living conditions and natural resources for future generations. In 1990 a poll taken by Yankelovich Shulman for Time magazine showed that 94% of those surveyed considered protecting and cleaning the environment a very important task; 63% supported stricter guidelines and regulations to accomplish this task (Linden, p.48). The problem arises in the definition of the word "clean". Economist and policy analyst Robert Hahn addresses

this issue of "clean". He questions the way one looks at the legislation to improve the environment:

> "One of the more curious notions to emerge from the constant stream of political rhetoric on the environment is that Americans have an *inalienable right* to breathe clean air. If we take this as religious truth, it follows that costs should be no object in pursuing our goal. But what about the goal itself- how clean is clean?" (Hahn, p.25)

The American public has a difficult time differentiating between the claims of the environmentalists, conservationists, and the industrial and economic "experts". The two groups pose a false dilemma for the citizens of this country. Environmental responsibility is often seen as the antithesis of economic growth and prosperity; for a business to succeed and flourish environmental measures can not be taken into consideration. These environmental concerns are too costly and lower the profit margin for the company. Georgetown professor Madeline Albright states, "To some people, the whole concept [of environmentalism] is a luxury. In the future, as the economy tightens up, it is conceivable that people will think we can't afford environmental improvements. (Linden, p.48)" Economic concerns are always on people's minds.

The passage of the largest group of amendments to the Clean Air Act since 1977 marked what many trumpet as a positive move for the future of the country. Daniel Weiss, director of the environmental program for the Sierra Club states, "There is no question that 10 years from now our air will be significantly cleaner. Our work isn't finished, but this is a bill of historical proportions. (Lemonick, p.33)" This bill contained the following amendments to the act:

> - *protection of the ozone layer by banning use of CFCs in aerosol sprays and regulation of their use as refrigerants.*

- plans to reduce acid rain by halving emissions of sulfur dioxide and oxides of nitrogen. Environmental requirements on fossil-fuel power plants strengthened considerably.

- further emission requirements on automobiles and requirements for oil-companies to create cleaner burning fuels.

- increased restriction on "toxic air pollutants." The EPA was given the power to control emissions of over 200 substances from a variety of sources, ranging from coke and steel mills to dry cleaners, and to demand installation of new technologies to limit or eliminate emissions.

Taken from <u>American Public Policy: Promise and Performance</u> by Guy Peters

These regulations take great efforts to make exceptions of allowances for already established industries. New sources of pollution are easier to regulate because they do not yet exist. Older sources are established and employ special interest lobbies and contain voters. For example, the steel workers were able to work the legislation to there advantage. They do not have to eliminate a cancerous emission from their coke ovens until the year 2020. All they have to do is show periodically that they are taking steps to achieve this end (Lemonick, p.33). Industries have been very forgiving of the current regulations because there has been a great distance between rhetoric and reality (Hahn, p.27). Older industries have been the subject of lax supervision by regulators. A older-industry favoring combination of these two aspects of environmental policy has led to current implementation problems.

One section of the Clean Air Act amendments deals directly with the type of gasoline used in automobiles. In an attempt to alleviate the burden of pollution controls on the automobile manufacturers, refineries were commanded to begin production of a "clean" fuel. A "clean" fuel was defined as containing, by weight,

only 2.7% oxygen (Begley, p.68). The more oxygen that is contained in gasoline, the cleaner and more completely the gasoline burns, thereby reducing the amount of noxious emissions by the automobile. This increases the cost of the production process because the gasoline has to contain more ethanol, methanol, or compounds called MTBE or ETBE. Oil refining companies initially objected to this regulation because of the retooling of their refining processes and machinery that would have to take place.

This retooling process required by refineries has led to many dilemmas regarding the purpose of the EPA rules and regulations that must be followed. These rules and regulations have increased twenty fold over the past two decades (Whiteman-Jones, p.42). Many times a company does not know they are violating a specific code or regulation. Because of the proliferation of these rules, incredible growth has occurred in the environmental consulting field over the last few years. When retooling and building new facilities a variety of permits have to be acquired from both federal and states agencies. The EPA has not been hesitant in enforcing the use and need, and lack thereof, of these permits:

- *EPA officials initiated 354 Clean Air Act enforcements in 1992, compared to 86 in 1980.*

- *The EPA levied $78.7 million in civil penalties and $62.9 in criminal penalties in 1992, a single year accounted that accounted for 28% of all fines in EPA history.*

Taken from journal <u>Colorado Business,</u> p. 42 by Michael Whiteman-Jones

Sonya Pennock, a community involvement coordinator for the EPA' Rocky Mountain region demonstrates the attitude of EPA officials with regards to regulation, "We're essentially environmental cops. We're doing better and better-or getting meaner and meaner. And we're going to do better yet. (Whiteman-Jones,

p.42)" This attitude has forced many U.S. corporations to accept the fact that the environmental movement is not about regulation, but strategic planning for the future of the country.

By January 1, 1995, by edict of the Clean Air Act, all gasoline sold in the United States must meet new specifications. These specifications require a reformulation of the gasoline during the refining process. In addition to the regulation, the California Air Regulation Board has set even higher reformulation standards for gasoline used within the state of California. In order to ensure compliance with all environmental regulations, the EPA created regional boards to control the permit and local regulation process. Interpretation of these regulations has led to many disputes between not only the EPA and their enforcement organizations, but also the EPA and corporations. The purpose of the organization often comes into question during these legal and turf disputes.

In October of 1993, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency cited Unocal Corporation for several violations of the Clean Air Act, including construction without proper permits. The EPA stated that Unocal had begun construction efforts to expand their present refineries in the Los Angeles area without the proper environmental permits that must be obtained from the local Air Quality District regulators, or in this case South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The permits could only be obtained after an extensive environmental study as to the effects of the construction had been completed.

Unocal responded to this violation citation by continuing its present work. A spokesperson for Unocal states that "construction" had not yet begun. Site preparations were beginning with the pouring and grating of concrete, but no new source of pollution had yet been created; "We have not yet begun to fabricate or install equipment." states the spokesperson. In addition to this confusion, Unocal states that it already alerted SCAQMD officials. These officials gave Unocal the "go

ahead" with the current endeavors. The permit application process was underway and a permit was to be obtained before any new construction was going to take place.

This was not just a case of an oil company wanting to expand its operations. Unocal was in the process of retooling its facilities to produce gasoline that would be in compliance with the new Clean Air Act regulation that would go into effect in 1995. This $500 million project planned to ad a hydrotreater to Unocal's capabilities. The new machinery at the refinery would produce the gasoline that would not only meet the EPA's requirements but also those of California. The oil company Chevron had faced the same violations a month earlier while trying to construct a new facility to meet the federal regulations.

In response to the EPA's orders to cease and desist construction, Unocal , like Chevron, sought the help of the courts to continue the construction. Citing unclear rules and the permission Unocal received from SCAQMD, a San Francisco court blocked the EPA from shutting down the construction of the new facilities. Chevron had set the precedent earlier in the month by obtaining the same ruling. After the ruling was handed down both sides issued statements regarding the decision:

> "Now we can keep moving ahead so we are ready to begin construction once we have received the permit to construct from the South Coast Air Quality Management District."   Roger C. Beach, Unocal president and chief operating officer.
> (Kovski, p.2)

> "U.S. EPA intends to actively pursue its case against Unocal Corp. for the company's violation of federal law and disregard for the rights of local citizens by expanding its Carson and Wilmington refineries without an air quality permit. Under the federal Clean Air Act, no construction of any kind may take place until an environmentally protective permit is granted. The court's decision late yesterday has no impact on U.S. EPA's ability or

intention to pursue civil penalties for Unocal's violations of the Clean Air Act. While the decision affected the Agency's ability to carry out an order to halt construction, it is not a judgment on the legality of Unocal's action."

The Court injunction prevented the EPA from shutting down the pre-construction work in Los Angeles on November 4. The EPA, however, will seek to extend the case through other legal means, such as civil and criminal suits.

Previous to the drastic court action taken by Unocal, the company sought the sanctity of the bargaining table to settle their dispute. Unocal did not want to pay the $25,000 per day fine that the EPA was going to enforce because of lack of compliance by the November 4 deadline. Unocal spokesman, Barry Lane, was not pleased with the progress of these meetings; "Instead of issuing stop orders, [the EPA] should be giving full support to help us meet the clean air standards on time. (Sandell, p.B4)" Unocal's position remained that it had SCAQMD's approval because permits were not necessary at the time. Upon questioning SCAQMD agreed with Unocal's position stating that they wanted the work on the new refining plant to go as quickly as possible so the end result, cleaner burning fuel, could be achieved earlier (Kovski, p.2); Bill Kelley, spokesperson for the district ststed, "Our position is, the sooner they get these facilities operating, the sooner we'll be breathing cleaner air. Since the environmental impact is a lengthy one, we have said: 'Go ahead and do some site work as long as you don't hook anything up or take anyhting to the point where it can be operational.'(Clifford, p. B3)." EPA spokesperson Bill Glenn responded to this assertion by stating that, "We can't accept the argument that violating one part of the Clean Air Act is justified by trying to comply with another part of it. (Sandell, p.B4)"

Mr. Glenn's quote is at the center of the controversy that occurred in this case. Who is responsible for deciding what is best for the environment? SCAQMD allowed Unocal to proceed with what they saw as pre-construction in order to hasten the final results of the project. Many people, including Unocal president Roger Beach, have seen the EPA's actions as contrary to the final purpose of the legislation; Beach said, "Congress has mandated reformulated fuels. It is ironic that the EPA seems to want to stop us from complying with that mandate (Oil & Gas Journal, Nov. 1, 1993, p.32).

There are many dilemmas that arise for new EPA administrator Carol M. Browner. Browner took over the helm of the EPA from William Reilly, the first professional conservationist to hold the position. The Clean Air Act amendments occurred under the reign of Reilly and were considered his "baby". Browner is in a situation that demands the most out of the leadership of the EPA. The country is in a recession and jobs are at a premium. Unfortunately for the proponents of strong environmental laws, the political culture is now one of saving jobs, not trees.

The EPA has set down a long list of guidelines necessary for everyone to follow. The environmental movement can be easily sabotaged due to "free-riders". "Free-riders" believe that everyone else is going to clean up the environment so they sit back and enjoy the effects of greater ecological awareness, while doing little to promote consciousness among themselves. If one considers Unocal in this scenario, can they validly use the defense of SCAQMD permission to excuse this action. EPA chief Browner believed that the company willing worked around the necessary permits for this construction. She has shown no hesitancy in penalizing violators, even after the fact. Chevron incurred the same problem earlier in the month and may be subject to retroactive fines as a result of the days they did construction work before the court injunction.

As a leader should Browner excuse a case where the participant did not seem to be knowingly violating the rules, but was working toward the common good of the people anyway? In any group participants will perform actions that may be detrimental to the group in the short run but prove to be advantageous in the long run. Should a business that is incurring large expenses to promote environmental friendliness be subject to greater penalty for misinterpretation; or is ruling against them setting a precedent of strict environmental law that should not be breached? Finally if permission was given to an organization like the South Coast Air Quality Management District to issue such permits and regulate the air in their jurisdiction, does the EPA have a clear right to contradict what SCAQMD decided? What kind of power will district air quality organizations have in the future? What does the EPA want to ultimately acheive.?

Discussion Questions

1. The EPA superseded the ruling of the local governing body. What do you think would be the future ramifications of that action? What else could have the EPA done to get the same results?

2. What were the motives behind the EPA's orders to stop construction? As a leader, is it necessary to always cede to precedence? What is a situation where one shouldn't?

3. Should the EPA pursue its plans to file civil or criminal charges against Unocal? If not, what should be their next move?

4. If you were the president of Unocal, what approach would you have taken to rectify the dilemma? Was court action necessary?

References

Begley, Sharon. "Keep Holding Your Breath", <u>Newsweek</u>. June 4,1990, p.68.

Clifford, Farnk. "Preliminary Work on Unocal Plants is Unauthorized,", <u>Los Angeles Times</u>. Oct. 27,1993, p.B3.

Hahn, Robert W. "The Politics and Religion of Clean Air", <u>Regulation</u>. Winter 1990, p.21-30.

Kovski, Alan. "Federal court blocks EPA attempt to stop construction site work at Unocal refinery", <u>The Oil Daily</u>. Nov. 4, 1993, p.2.

Lemonick, Michael D. "Forecast: Clearer Skies;", <u>Time</u>. Nov. 5, 1990, p. 33.

Linden, Eugene. "Endangered Earth Update; Is the Planet on the Back Burner", <u>Time</u>. Dec. 24, 1990, p.48.

Peters, Guy. (1993) <u>American Public Policy: Promise and Peformance</u>. Chathan House Publishers, Inc. Chatham, New Jersey.

Sandell, Scott. "Unocal Given Deadline to Halt Refinery Work", <u>Los Angeles Times</u>. Oct. 29, 1993, p.B4.

staff. "Unocal, EPA at odds over clean fuel permit", <u>Oil and Gas Journal</u>. Nov. 1, 1993, p. 32.

staff. "Court Blocks EPA Effort to Halt Unocal Construction", <u>Platt's Oilgram News</u>. Nov. 4, 1993, p.3.

Whiteman-Jones, Michael. "With enforcement of environmental laws skyrocketing, going green isn't just for the environmentally correct business anymore.", <u>Colorado Business</u>. January 1994, p. 42.

Head Start to a Tough Race

Aaron J. Heffron

Abstract:

This case study addresses the issues of long term leadership of a project. The Head Start program experienced great success early but is now experiencing difficulties. Tight funding has led to tough choices. Sargent Shriver, the founder of the project, no longer leads the charge.

The leadership questions that arise are; how does one create enthusiasm for a project during different political times. Also, how can a leader show short term successes to please the followers while pursuing long term goals. Finally, If a leader can not help everyone fully, does he or she help few completely, or everybody a little. This case traces Head Start from the inception to the present status.

"This is a very proud occasion for him (Sargent Shriver) and for us today, because it was less than three months ago that we opened a new war front on poverty. We set out to make certain that poverty's children would not be forevermore poverty's captives. We called our program Project Head Start"

In 1965, Lyndon Johnson made the preceding announcement in the Rose Garden at the White House. These remarks kicked of what many consider the greatest success of the War on Poverty, Project Head Start. Others consider this program a failure that keeps persisting and eating up the resources of the federal government. Because of these divergent viewpoints, and questionable follow up studies on the first classes of this program, Head Start has experienced much scrutiny from its inception leading to sporadic funding from different administrations. While there has been a resurgence of support over the last few years for this program, the enthusiasm by the American public has dwindled. The sixties were a time of great optimism and hope, will the nineties, a decade of cynicism and distrust be able to continue such a project?

Project Head Start was the brainchild of a charismatic official in government, Sargent Shriver. Linked to the Kennedy family through marriage Shriver sought to help the disadvantaged not only in the United States, but abroad. Considered the father of such programs as Job Corps, the Peace Corps, and Vista, Shriver was appointed head of the War on Poverty during the Johnson Administration. A budget surplus led Shriver to design a program to help the disadvantaged children of poverty.

Project Head Start was an amalgamation of ideas not from public school officials and educators, but from a gamut of other fields. Shriver assembled a board to work on the idea of the program. The board consisted a person, or people, from the following fields: two specialists in early childhood education, four physicians, a professor of nursing, an associate dean of social work, a nun- who happened to be a college president, a dean of a college of education, a clinical psychologist, and two research psychologists (Zigler & Muenchow, p.8). This board with diverse backgrounds set the framework for the project.

One popular opinion in the field of child psychology at the time was the ability to influence a child's IQ through intense intellectual stimulation at an early age. Shriver, along with the rest of the American public, became fascinated with the idea that this country could have a generation of higher IQ people if a program was developed to stimulate these children. Magazines such as Reader's Digest, Harper's, and Life, fed the frenzy by publishing the hypothesis as fact (Zigler & Muenchow, p.11). Soon everyone was on the bandwagon, and public support for such a program was at a peak. Anything short of a widespread government program would be seen as a feeble attempt to appease the people. It would also demonstrate a lack of commitment among the federal government in helping the disadvantaged, poverty- stricken children of our country.

Project Head Start began to develop as more than an intellectual stimulation exercise. The main problems of the children of poverty were identified as health related. If a child could not see, how were they to learn. The projects aimed "to prepare disadvantaged children for school by teaching them basic concepts that most kids have absorbed by the first grade. It gets them accustomed to a social environment and persuades them to look at learning as something fun- and in the process checks their teeth and eyes, inoculates and feeds them. (Mundy, p.26)" Even Sargent Shriver admitted that the program was experimental , because little was

known about the causes and cures for poverty. Shriver stated, "There was very little known about [stopping] poverty. [Developing this program] was just like gambling in Las Vegas. (Waldman, p.78)"

This program came under scrutiny right away from other actors in government and the community. Shriver had initially hoped to gain immediate support and build large coalitions of long term support by showing immediate results and short term "victories" (Lemann, p.37). Unfortunately when dealing with a social program short term benefits are rarely visible. Project Head Start would be successful if, at the age of 25, the first class achieved equal if not greater levels of success than their non- Head Start counterparts. There was one measure that Shriver could point to for easily understood results, IQ scores. Unfortunately results from initial IQ testing showed marginal results and fed the critics of the program. Shriver needed victories.

Head Start supporters felt forced to retreat to more defensible and perhaps more hopeful goals- "improving the child's physical health, ", "establishing patterns and expectations of success for the child, " involving parents and families in each child's education and development." Some how these worthy goals lacked the political punch of raising IQs, which ties neatly into all the received wisdom about poor people
<div align="right">The Nation, February 1, 1993, p.133</div>

Regardless of the criticism that had occurred Head Start enjoyed, "a honeymoon period rare among poverty programs", and also helped in the civil rights movement by displaying the thought that every children, regardless of color, was entitled to adequate education (Mundy, p26+). This honeymoon period was a result of the political and social atmosphere of the times. The sixties were a times of ideological faith in programs and a sense of hope for every human being. The

optimism of the Kennedy campaign at the beginning of the decade, including the theme song *High Hopes*, dictated the feeling that citizens of this country could possibly create an environment that would make people smarter (Zigler & Muenchow, p.11). Even the faint hope that Head Start could make children stricken by poverty more intelligent gave the American public a fervent enthusiasm for the project. Johnson echoed this feeling in the statement, "This country is rich enough to do anything it has the guts to do and the vision to do and the will to do. (Wicker, p.A15)"

The response to the program at its inception was tremendous. What started as a smaller summer program with limited scope was in great demand and was expected to help thousands of children. The incredible build up of public support led to the Johnson command to the director of the project to "go spend" (Mundy, p.26+). This order was to expand the project. Suddenly Johnson saw the opportunity to institute a highly popular program that could reach thousands of children. It was time to think big. Unfortunately for the program's scope was bigger than it was capable of being. Shriver's initial public relations coup, stating that the cost of the summer program, $18 million was equivalent to the cost of two fighter bombers (Zigler & Muenchow, p.23), soon rang false. The program did not have full funding.

John Califano, one of Lyndon Johnson's lieutenants during the project, talked of the frustration and failures of some aspects of the project. The mistakes "were fueled by the frustration of seeing so much poverty, ignorance, and illness amidst such wealth." He later quoted President Johnson, "...not how much, but how good; not only how to create wealth, but how to use it. (Wicker, p.A15)" One of the lessons of any social program that was instituted during this time was that inflation of promises occurs (Furstenburg, p.C1). Sargent Shriver during speeches during his tenure as "general" in the War on Poverty, said that the war could end poverty in

ten years. He, like his counterparts of the time, were extreme optimists. It is relatively obvious to the outside observer to know that poverty could not be eradicated in that short of a time. There were too many variable with which to deal. These people just typified the general feeling of America at the time- if we set our mind to it, we can solve it. Head Start was the product of the "high hopes and widespread activism" of the mid-1960s (Ayers, p.133+).

"Project Head Start was designed to be something more than a preschool readiness program. It was planned as a comprehensive intervention into many aspects of early childhood development. The basic objectives were the improvement of the child's physical and mental health, emotional and social development, conceptual and verbal skills, self confidence and motivation, family relations and attitudes toward society and its institutions. The program was directed primarily at the child as an individual, but was intended as well to influence the family and community to which the child belonged."

Excerpt from piece written by planning member George B. Brain
(Zigler & Valentine, p.72)

While the program established by Sargent Shriver was not perfect in its approach to addressing the complete present needs or future needs of children, what he did accomplish was the establishment of a program that survived for twenty five years despite recessions, oil shocks, and conservative spending executives. There are a couple of reasons for the longevity of the program, but first the program will be traced out of the Johnson presidency up through the Clinton administration.

During the years after the Johnson administration Head Start was the subject of many reviews that produced conflicting results. Initial studies under the Nixon administration produced findings that did not support the idea that the IQ of a child was raised through this program. Since it was the easiest method of evaluation, IQ testing became the method of determining the success or failure of the program.

Many policy makers began to fight over the future of the program. Should a program that hasn't yet proven long-term benefits be allowed to continue? Sargent Shriver, himself, responded to this criticism by the Nixon administration:

"I know that there has been much criticism of these programs on the part of people attempting to evaluate their effectiveness.... It is ludicrous to suppose that if children participate in a program like Head Start for only one or two years, one can subsequently find IQ changes in them which can be proved, on a cost-effective basis, to have been worth the expenditure. That is nonsense. If one plants a tree , for example, and gives it lots of nourishment in the beginning and then goes away and leaves it for the next five years, the tree will not grow as well as if the nourishment is continued. Similarly, Head Start could not achieve permanents effects when all its "nourishment" was stopped after two years."

Excerpt from remarks by Sargent Shriver, (Zigler & Valentine, p.65)

Luckily for the Head Start program an ally was found within the Nixon Administration. Casper Weinburger, at the time secretary of Health Education and Welfare, had visited some of the centers and become a fan of the effort stating that the program was a "substitute for what many homes lacked. (Waldman, p.78+)" Weinburger would prove to be a good friend to the program for years to come.

The oil shocks of the early and mid-1970's proved to limit the amount of funding that went to these programs. While inflation was at high rates, funding for the program increased from slightly over $300 million in 1969 to just $350 million in 1975 (Zigler & Valentine, p.142). People began to question the effectiveness of a program that could not fully fund all of its ambitions. Carter, upon his election in 1976, brought Head Start back to the public realm with increased funding. Carter increased the budget by seventy-five percent, and enrolled over 54,000 more children in the program. Unfortunately, even with the increased funding- the largest hike in its history- Head Start was still only reaching fewer than one third of

the kids eligible for the program. The program was still working, but the initial vision of the project was being lost. Project Head Start was supposed to reach millions of children and free them from the endless cycle of poverty. How could this happen if funding was not sufficient?

Ronald Reagan entered the White House on the agenda of "getting government off your back." This type of laissez faire attitude toward government intervention in social programs did not seem conducive to giant increases in funding of a government funded, poverty program. This hypothesis proved to ring true throughout the Reagan years. During one year, instead of maintaining the status quo, funding for Head Start actually decreased (Waldman, p.78). Head Start's friend Casper Weinburger, now a member of the Reagan cabinet, actually saved Head Start from deeper cuts in funding. People were still fighting for Head Start despite the politics of the time.

George Bush in 1988 promised to be the "education president". The frenzy over the possibility of increased support from the executive branch raised the hopes of many Head Start proponents. In 1990 Bush proposed a $500 million increase in the budget of Head Start. This would increase the percentage of eligible children able to received at least one year of Head Start to 67% (Waldman, p.78). The excitement over the program reached fever pitch in 1990, with the Democrats stating that they would like to increase Head Start funding to reach $7.6 billion by 1994. Head Start was beginning to recover, but the myth of full funding was running amuck. Every person wanted "full-funding" but a economic slowdown, and an ever increasing federal deficit prevented governmental decision makers from achieving this end.

While funding continues to be the main focus of Head Start proponents, people have begun to raise warning flags about the effectiveness of increased

funding. Many say that the money is increasing the quantity of Head Start centers but not the quality. A study performed in 1993 had some rather disturbing results:

- Only about half of all Head Start children received the proper and required health care screenings.

- Less than half of all children were fully immunized by the end of the 1991-1992 school year.

- Head Start staff member could only meet with half of the parent of children in the program.

<div align="right">Results from Dept. of Health and Human Services office survey
(Sheridan, p.A1)</div>

Of the thousands of children receiving help from the Head Start program, few are receiving the service promised under the initial goals of the program.

The growth has been reported to have hurt the staffing of the program centers. The more children included in the program, the more staffing that is needed. With tight budgets the extra teacher that is needed to provided a fuller education is not able to be employed. Facilities that have been used since the inception of the program are now in disrepair and need renovation. Forty percent of the programs have had trouble finding sufficient staffing, while one third of the schooling facilities have been labeled inadequate (Sheridan, p.A1).

While the critics of the programs have increased over the past few years the Head Start program has continued to thrive. This is a result of the firm organizational goals and objectives started with Sargent Shriver in the middle 1960's. Shriver created a program that could not help but gain support from large factions of people. When searching for an anti-poverty program that could be held

up as successful when other efforts had failed, Shriver chose a group to be served that could not be admonished for their relative social position- the children. "Who can object to a program that helps the most innocent (and adorable) of the poor, encourages preventive health care and gets parents more involved in the child's education? (Waldman, p.78)"

Children could not be blamed for being lazy or not getting a job. They were clearly the victims of the system. Unfortunately the system that was devised tried to attack too large of a group too quickly. It created a decentralized approach with many independent schools with some autonomy. While increasing the ownership each person could feel toward the system, the multitude of organizations increased the chance of failure. Each failure was met by a critic of the system. Each critic, however, did not attack the inherent goals of the program, but the implementation of the efforts.

"The program's chief success seems to be in surviving in the absence of any good reason why it should."

Linda Seebach, <u>St. Petersburg Times</u>

Seebach cites many studies that have been performed that have disproved the initial theory behind the Head Start Program. Children's IQs either were not greatly affected by the Head Start training or were retarded once they attended some years in the individual-based, ends oriented public education system. Despite the studies the aura around the Head Start program has kept it intact. What politician would cut benefits to help needy children? This aura was built by Shriver early in the program's formative stages.

The Head Start program has survived throughout the past twenty five years with close to the same goals in mind. However, the program's effectiveness has come into question over the past few years because of the limited amount of

funding and increasing numbers of children being served. The future holds many options for the program. With the economic slowdown that is currently happening in the United States, people have become increasingly wary of spending government money. Yet the same people want the economically disadvantaged to help themselves rise above the throws of poverty. Finally, a growing number of children are being served but in an increasingly limited way. How does one handle the trends in this program?

Discussion Questions

1. The expectancy theory of motivation states that the followers must see positive results from their work for them to work to their capacity all the time. If you were Sergant Shriver, how would you satisfy these needs of the constituents?

2. Head Start funding was tight from the very beginning. As a leader do you feel it is more important to fully help some people or help a great number of people a smaller amount?

3. What methods did Sargent Shriver use to make this project last? What other ways could he have ensured the lasting success of Head Start?

4. One theory of motivation states that the followers will be motivated if the goal is intrinsically uplifting or fulfilling. How could you use this theory to help garner support for Head Start?

5. What would you do *now* if you were named chairperson of this project? What is the most important issue?

References

Ayers, William. "Head Start: The Inside Story of America's Most Successful Educational Experiment (book review)", The Nation. Feb. 1, 1993, p. 133+.

Furstenburg, Mark H. "Lessons of 'Wars' Past", The Washington Post. Dec. 11, 1988, p. C1+

Lemann, Nicholas. "The Unfinished War:", The Atlantic. December, 1988, p. 37+.

Mundy, Liza. "The Success of the War on Poverty; ", Washington Monthly. December, 1989, p.26+.

Seebach, Linda. "Head Start Program Leaves Kids at Starting Gate", St. Petersburg Times. Feb, 28, 1993, p. 8D.

Sheridan, Chris. "Head Start survives, but can it thrive?", The Hartford Courant. Feb. 21, 1994, p. A1.

Waldman, Steven. "The Stingy Politics of Head Start", Newsweek. September, 1990, p. 78+.

Wicker, Tom. "In the Nation: L.B.J.'s Great Society", The New York Times. May 7, 1990, p. A15.

Zigler, Edward and Susan Muenchow. (1992) Head Start: the inside story of America's most successful educational experiment. Harper Collins Publishers, New York.

Zigler, Edward and Jeanette Valentine ed. (1979) Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty. The Free Press, New York.