

We tried to survey all of these as objectively and definitively as our research would allow.

As objective, professional social scientists, we have avoided sweeping generalizations, such as that the Job Corps is "good" or "bad." Others might draw judgments from our data, and I gather by the committee hearings some have already. We avoid such generalities, however, because our task is to report, not to sit in judgment. That is the task of those vested with the responsibility of running the Job Corps, the OEO, and the Congress itself.

In the course of our studies, our primary purpose was to turn up areas of both strengths and weaknesses in the Job Corps program and to report them factually and without reservations or qualifications other than those inherent in the results themselves. For the only way in which the Job Corps can be made more effective—at least in my view—is to look at the facts without sugarcoating, to capitalize on its strengths, and to find amelioratives for its weaknesses.

Our reports are an accurate reflection of the Job Corps as it existed in 1966, not necessarily as it is today. In fact, if the Job Corps were the same today as in 1966, we would find this condition discouraging for it would mean that our studies had not been used to their full potential. The basic purpose of any applied research is that the results be applied into action.

It is our understanding that changes have been made as a result of these research efforts. Among them are these: Job Corps screeners have been instructed to give recruits a much clearer picture of the Job Corps on initial contact; the orientation program has been changed to try to make it more effective; the Job Corps behavior code has been tightened; discharge authority at the centers has been facilitated to move faster to enforce discipline; efforts have been instituted to obtain greater minority representation on center staffs to alleviate problems of racial tension; an effort is being made to improve the feedback to corpsmen on how they are doing while at the centers; the time between the initial screening and assignment has been shortened; and new corpsmen have been assigned to centers nearer their homes.

All of these stemmed directly or indirectly, as I understand it, from the results of our reports.

Having said this, however, I want to emphasize that we cannot today document that solid progress has been made in any or all of these areas. We hope that future research of a practical and operational nature will measure rather precisely just what progress has been made in what has been called, the new Job Corps.

The point is that such research can uncover problem areas, point to potential courses of action, and then establish the effect of such action when taken. I might add that this kind of social inventorying is sorely needed for the efforts of governmental and private sectors on many levels.

Our job has been to find out what has happened to these young people out of their total experience with the Job Corps. We have tried to seek out a true cross-section of them, find the level of gravity on which they can communicate to us, and then systematically probe them on their past, present, and hope for their future.

They are our only source of basic information. We are reflecting what comes out the other end. Obviously, their answers in some cases will be impressionistic and not necessarily entirely accurate.