

We are sure we have talked with representative cross-sections of each group surveyed. We are sure our questioning was penetrating and in depth. We are sure we obtained a full reading on their impressions of what the Job Corps did or did not do to or for them.

Obviously, more precise figures on their hourly wages could have come from their employers, as could the length of their job tenure, their hours of work, and the precise definition of the job they are engaged in, or the degree to which they are demonstrating skills learned in the Job Corps.

Yet a major part of the purpose of the Job Corps, as we understand it, is to help shape these young people as total human beings who can function positively and contribute usefully to society.

Much of whether or not this function is fulfilled depends on what has and is going on inside them as people. Here, by use of this method of survey research, we can obtain as insightful and as sound a reading as by any method now available. In fact, what happened to those young people as human beings may in the long run go much further toward determining the real long-term effectiveness of the Job Corps than whether immediately their hourly wages are going up 20, 40, or 80 cents an hour or whether they are among the upper third or second third as engine mechanics today.

Within these limits, there are some findings which ought to be restated from our reports:

Among those who were accepted in the Job Corps, those who never showed up at a center, are the ones called the "no shows." The key reasons were that they found a job, they lost interest in the rather long period between acceptance and assignment, they were needed at home, they didn't want to go so far away from home, and they had heard bad things about the Job Corps.

Among the so-called dropouts, the main reasons for their not completing their tour in the Job Corps were too many fights, lack of proper training, homesickness, and racial friction, especially whites with Negroes.

Among the August and November 1966 terminees, we found that the longer a corpsman stayed in, the more positive his experience, the higher he became, in his own estimate, in the Job Corps.

The longer he stayed in, the more useful he felt his training was, but even those who were in less than 90 days had a more positive experience than those who never showed up for the Job Corps in the first place. A majority of those who went through the centers thought the training helpful. Perhaps more important, a majority of those who went through the centers felt better off as people now than they did before they arrived. Currently, increases in rates of pay are higher for graduates than for dropouts, higher for dropouts than for discharges, and even higher for discharges than those who never went to the Job Corps at all.

Having said and reported all of this positive news, it would be the height of folly and plain nonsense to conclude therefore that all was great in the Job Corps and that the millenium had been reached in finding the perfect way to rescue, refurbish, and regenerate these most deprived young people.

Clearly, all that has been made is a beginning—and all we have measured is the 1966 beginning in what has been called the old Job