

JOB CORPS AND THE
PUBLIC-PRIVATE DEBATE

by

Donald Duane Berglund

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
Public Administration and Public Affairs

APPROVED:

C. T. Goodsell, Chairman

G. L. Wamsley

K. K. Eschenmann

P. I. Martin

C. A. Houston

March, 1992

Blacksburg, Virginia

JOB CORPS AND THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE DEBATE

BY

Donald Duane Berglund

Committee Chairman: Charles T. Goodsell
Public Administration and Public Affairs

(ABSTRACT)

One of the most controversial questions in public administration today is the question of effectiveness and how well it is achieved by public and private organizations. Some studies hold private enterprise up as more effective; however, some others have argued the case in favor of the public sector. In examining the question, theorists have largely neglected the issue of quality of service. This study generates an effectiveness rating that takes into account quality as a major factor in addition to costs.

This research uses the largest manpower training program in America, Job Corps, as a model for study. Job Corps encompasses both the public and private sectors, with a majority of the 107 Job Corps centers managed by private enterprise under contract to the United States Government.

Two public and two private Job Corps centers were compared. Data were compiled from the following sources: 1) direct personal observation; 2) in-depth interviews; 3) Job Corps financial reports; and 4) student survey results. An effectiveness quotient for each center was

developed from the data. Results show that each of the four centers has its own characteristic strengths and weaknesses. The public centers offered somewhat better quality of services as well as lower costs, and therefore noticeably better effectiveness than did the private centers. The public centers also surpassed the private centers in successfully meeting the job satisfaction needs of their employees. Unexpected findings included the fact that the centers that kept their costs the lowest also had the highest quality, and thus were scored as more effective. We conclude that the differentiating factor between public and private Job Corps centers is not their ownership, public or private, but rather how well-managed a center or class of centers is.

In order to improve Job Corps operations, this study recommends a change in the assessment procedures for Job Corps, emphasizing quality of services and effectiveness of services rather than statistics on cost and average length of stay. It also suggests that continuing attention be paid to program management systems, including elements as diverse as communication among staff and control of students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful for the professional devotion and friendship of those people who have enabled me to complete this dissertation.

I thank the students and staff members at Flatwoods, Harpers Ferry, Old Dominion, and Potomac Job Corps centers, for allowing me to visit their centers and observe them in their daily routines. Also, I thank Job Corps staff members at the National Job Corps office in Washington, D.C. and the regional office in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for their time and expertise. I truly appreciate the time and effort given by Charles Trail, project manager at the Job Corps regional office in Philadelphia. Charles was always direct and honest, and helped me to better understand Job Corps operations, especially the complexities of Job Corps financial reports. His enduring assistance throughout this project has been invaluable and will always be remembered.

My sincere appreciation goes to the members of my doctoral committee: Kurt Eschenmann, Charles Goodsell, Charles Houston, Phil Martin, and Gary Wamsley, for their insightful reactions to the study. I thank Charles Goodsell, my committee chair, for his guidance, encouragement, and friendship over the past five years. His remarkable teaching skills and diligent pursuit of learning have been an inspiration to me. During the

course of this dissertation, his insight, direction, and ability to critique have improved the finished product.

A special thanks goes to Al Vrabel, for his counsel and intellectual discussions. He helped me unite my own beliefs to the practical applicability of my work. Thanks also to Linda Wagner for her perceptiveness and her assistance in translating ideas visually. I thank Darcy Mays who helped me to better understand the procedures used to calculate the costs of operation and the cost per student of each Job Corps center. Also, I am grateful to Kathy Hilton, Lista Egger, and Donna Chambers who served as able typists during the various stages of this dissertation. They were understanding, despite having to tolerate my constant discussion about the dissertation.

Finally, a big "thank you" goes to my parents, Harold and Virginia Berglund, whose trust and assurance have been a big source of encouragement to me. They have never neglected inquiring about my progress. Their pride in my academic accomplishments, like their love, has no barriers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER I—INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
The Study	11
Research Methodology	15
Forthcoming Chapters	22
CHAPTER II—LITERATURE REVIEW	24
Organizational Performance	24
Salaries and Benefits	35
Job Satisfaction	41
CHAPTER III—RESIDENTIAL LIVING	44
Dormitories	44
Recreation Program	52
Counseling Program	61
Cafeteria Services	65
CHAPTER IV—EDUCATION, TRAINING, SUPPORT	79
Basic Education	79
Vocational Training	90
Medical/Dental Services	99
Administration/Management	106
CHAPTER V—HUMAN RESOURCES	119
Salaries	122
Job Related Benefits	124
Job Satisfaction	128
Representative Workforce	134
Summary	139
CHAPTER VI—SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	141
Summary of the Study	141
Final Thoughts	152
Recommendations	154
Areas for Further Research and Discussion	158
Conclusion	159
WORKS REFERENCED	165

APPENDIX A. FINANCIAL REPORT SUMMARIES 175
APPENDIX B. STUDENT SURVEY 178
VITA 180

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
3-1	DORMITORIES	53
3-2	RECREATION	62
3-3	COUNSELING	66
3-4	CAFETERIA	72
3-5	RESIDENTIAL LIVING	73
3-6	STUDENT RATINGS OF RESIDENTIAL LIVING .	76
4-1	BASIC EDUCATION	86
4-2	EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT DATA	88
4-3	VOCATIONAL TRAINING	96
4-4	TRAINING, PLACEMENT AND SALARY DATA . .	97
4-5	STUDENT RATINGS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING	100
4-6	MEDICAL/DENTAL	107
4-7	ADMINISTRATION/MANAGEMENT	114
4-8	ADMINISTRATION/MANAGEMENT	116
4-9	STUDENT RATINGS OF SUPPORT	117
5-1	JOB CORPS SALARIES	123
5-2	STUDENT-STAFF RATIO	133
5-3	RACIAL COMPOSITION	137
6-1	SUMMARY TABLE	143

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEM

Which is the more efficient provider of services, government or the private sector? For decades this question has wrinkled many a respectable brow. Much of the dilemma stems from the fact that efficiency means different things to different people. To one taxpayer, efficiency might mean the lowest cost for services rendered, which, in turn, may mean lower taxes. To another taxpayer, efficiency may mean a high quality service at a fair price. The private sector normally emphasizes cost control when speaking of efficiency. To government however, efficiency suggests satisfactorily serving the public interest. The problem is that people bring their own biases to the question. Even theorists approach it from a subjective point of view, favoring one agency of service over the other.

Since the argument has focused on who is providing the service, the more important issue has been ignored -ie., whether or not the public interest is being served and society, as a whole, is being improved. I am not a proponent of either the private or the public sector, but rather a citizen-scholar interested in serious inquiry regarding an important issue. My concern is how to best serve the interest

of the people. Let us begin by considering values that lay near the heart of this concept.

Cost

Private enterprise enthusiasts emphasize that cost consciousness is built into the marketplace. That is, the customer will not buy a product from one producer if he or she can get that identical product from a competitor for less money. Currently, there is an emphasis on applying the value of cost control to government by seeking such alternative service delivery approaches as contracting public services to private sector organizations. However, private sector techniques may not necessarily be more economical when it comes to meeting the unique demands of government. Furthermore, when private organizations do provide public services, the costs related to the public are difficult to assess, since simple cost efficiency measures may not be applicable to complex human issues.

Quality

When serving the public, the quality of services must be considered, as well as the dollar costs. Private enterprise philosophy has built into it the idea that those firms which deliver a quality product that satisfies the customer will survive in the marketplace, whereas those which do not will

be weeded out. Thus, quality service, being an essential public demand, should also more or less naturally be provided by market forces. Government is, of course, also concerned with quality; not simply to satisfy its clients, but because it is seen as the mission of good government to provide good service to its people. Public service occupations are steeped in a sense of mission and therefore emphasize the quality of services provided as a matter of course.

When considering quality, we cannot restrict our concern to economics, nor can we divorce ourselves from the topic of cost. What we are really interested in is whether public organizations or private enterprises more effectively provide suitable levels of services. The answer to this question must consider both cost and quality.

I seek to determine and identify the different means by which both public and private organizations effectively provide services. Then I pose this question: Is the private enterprise approach to providing reasonable quality at a manageable price more effective, or does the government approach of providing a target level of quality at whatever its cost yield a better solution?

Equity

When serving the public interest, there are issues other than cost and quality which must be addressed. Equity is a prominent one.

Salary is an example where the issue of equity arises. Salaries in private firms are set by the natural forces of supply and demand, by and large. Government salaries are set by legislation, not driven by supply and demand dynamics. At first glance this implies that government cannot keep salary costs down because it lacks a competitive dynamic. This way of looking at it, however, fails to account for the possibility that government may have a legitimate interest in paying more than what the market typically allows. If, for example, the government pays minorities more than they could receive in the private sector, then it is consciously deciding to empower these people. Equity is thereby pursued.

Legality

Legal concerns are also to be considered. Government has a unique responsibility to live up to the intent of the Constitution. In the interest of good government, the Constitution, as well as the body of law and political structures which have developed to support the Constitution, is designed with a distinct separation in mind between the public and the private sectors. The law of the land permits private and state organizations to work together, but it also clearly establishes the sovereignty of the state to which private sector concerns must remain subordinate.

This means in effect, that at the national level the federal government alone is guaranteed the rights and

privileges of the sovereign, with indivisible power. No such rights or privileges can be granted to private organizations, even those under contract to the government. These legal issues must be considered when the possibility arises of assigning public service responsibilities to the private sector.

Implications

A thorough examination of all of these issues is important to the United States of America, as well as to the field of Public Administration. It is critical for the United States to determine if effectiveness of service to the public is unique to either the private sector or the public sector. If effectiveness proves to be a unique characteristic of one sector or the other, further study should be undertaken to understand how such effective service is achieved, so that it might be reproduced in the other sector.

Full comprehension of effectiveness mechanisms and their implementation is what we are after, within the limited realm of one program. This type of study is needed to evaluate what some see as the panacea, "privatization." If privatization is not sound and fails effectively to serve the public interest, the academic discipline of Public Administration should be made aware of this. Conversely, if privatization "works," the field should accept this finding.

This research seeks to shed light on these questions.

Also it attempts to broaden perspectives within the field of Public Administration by establishing quality as a factor to be considered in determining the relative effectiveness of service programs, while also considering key mitigating factors such as equity and legality.

The Argument

A perusal of the literature confirms the depth and breadth of the public-private argument. Supporters of private enterprise focus on costs (Savas 1982, 1987; Spann 1983, Butler, 1985, Tullock, 1965). Theirs is a position which insists that the market is self-disciplining, rewarding efficiency and penalizing ineffective methods, thereby producing sound, effective organizations. These authors also maintain that, since public organizations are financed through an appropriations process resulting from political action, there is no pressure or incentive to cut costs. The outcome of this, they say, is escalating government expenditures.

Many books reflecting this stream of thought have been published, including: Better Government at Half the Price, (Bennett and Johnson, 1981); Cutting Back City Hall, (Poole, 1981); and Privatizing Government: Shrinking Government Costs, (Savas, 1982). These books encourage government at all levels to hire private firms to perform public services, citing fiscal advantages. One observer, Ruth Dehoog, describes this cost cutting movement as advocating "less is

best" (Dehoog, 1984).

Conversely, other writings caution against privatization, claiming that private industry is not necessarily more efficient (Starr 1987; Goodsell 1985; Adams 1981). This caution is underlined by a long history of overcharging by private enterprises for such items as national defense equipment (Adams, 1981). Dehoog (1984) has noted that, especially in the human services, when government contracts private industry to perform public services, the administrative costs of contracting can be high. These costs, which include negotiating, writing, and monitoring contracts, are difficult to measure accurately and are usually not included in contract cost accounts. They are rarely considered by writers who favor contracting out public services to private industry.

Other theorists argue that looking at efficiency in terms of costs may be reasonable for such practices as collecting trash or paving streets, but when dealing with complex human problems, an emphasis on quality of services rendered is necessary (Donahue 1989; Waldo 1947).

Frederick Mosher (1968) states that the nature of public employment elicits both a unique loyalty to duty and a sense of servitude from individual employees. These attitudes, he maintains, stem from the authority of the state, which represents sovereign power. He also maintains that the power entrusted to public employees is wielded with benevolent sensitivity to public interest, suggesting that a strong

commitment to public service is a characterization of government bureaucrats.

Others have noted this same characteristic. C. William Verity, an executive in the steel industry who served as President Reagan's Commerce Secretary, made the following noteworthy comment:

I had always felt that maybe government people didn't work so hard because they weren't so highly motivated. Well, I was dead wrong. In this department there is a tremendous cadre of professionals highly motivated not by financial incentives but to serve their country. It's as simple as that.
(New York Times, 29 Nov. 1988)

By comparison, a major advantage of private industry is that it offers a monetary incentive for quality performance. If the quality of service declines, or is determined to be unsatisfactory, then customers are liable to choose another firm from which to purchase the product or service. In theory, at least, when public services are contracted to private firms, if the quality of the product or the service provided isn't good, the contract can be canceled and awarded to another contractor (Bennett and Johnson 1981; Spann 1971; Hirshman 1970).

Some contend that issues besides cost and quality of services should be considered in determining which sector should provide the service. Ronald Moe (1987) states that the distinctions between the public and private sectors are important and cannot be taken lightly. The basis for

assigning functions between the public and private sectors, Moe stresses, should not rest principally upon which sector performs more efficiently and economically. Instead, public law emphasizes the distinctive character of the public and private sectors. Citing case law, especially *McCullough v. Maryland* (1819), Moe states that the single most important characteristic separating the public and private sectors, particularly at the federal level, involves the concept of sovereignty. Moe contends that any serious consideration about assigning the performance of a function to the public or the private sector must ask the question: Does the performance of this function necessarily involve the powers properly reserved of the sovereign power? Or is the function largely private in character, requiring none of the coercive powers of the sovereign? Economic costs of providing a given service are secondary to the fundamental legal issue, Moe believes. To him, distinctions between the public and private sectors are being blurred as public purposes increasingly reflect a blend of public and private characteristics. Moe urges public administrators to return to public law in the debate over the future of the public sector.

In contrast to Moe, Barry Bozeman (1987) claims that "sector blurring" is the desired way to proceed in the future. Bozeman argues that political constraints affect virtually every organization. As an example, Bozeman points out that a high percentage of research and development organizations, due to management by corporate and university contractors,

cannot be strictly classified as either public or private. Due to recent policy changes focusing on the establishment of national research centers, this sector blurring will likely continue in research and development. It is the province of public policy, according to Bozeman, to provide the right mix of sectors. In some cases, policy objectives will be met by the market; in others, direct government provision will be required; and in still others, new organizational forms may be required. Bozeman (1988) sees no danger to the republic in this sector blurring:

Sector blurring does not mean that public law is any less important or that the Constitution is any less the centerpiece of American government. Nor does it mean that everything is up for grabs in some kind of "crypto-quasi-pseudo" organization anarchy. The concept of sovereignty does no more for us in determining allocations of goods and services between sectors than does the only slightly more ambiguous concept of public interest (673).

Other writers bring up additional points. Paul Starr (1987), for example, argues that privatizing public services can undermine government's legitimate role, suggesting that genuine service to the public as a whole is the proper realm of public administration. Says Starr:

Privatization calls upon motives of private gain, weakening the grounds of authority and the capacity to assert collective interests over narrow ones. It is particularly dangerous for the state to put coercive power over persons in the hands of employees accountable, in the first instance, to a private firm (12).

In conclusion, the problem is a complex one, with

valid arguments on both sides. There are many factors to consider, and, indeed, many facets to examine. The debate as to which is the more effective service provider, the public or the private sector, continues. Experts remain divided, with evidence to support each of the two opposing beliefs. Given this diversity of thought, it must be concluded that the matter is as of now unsettled, making it ripe for further research.

THE STUDY

With this research context in mind, Job Corps provides an ideal opportunity to study the relative merits of private and public provision of services. Because it exemplifies both private and public provision of services, studying Job Corps may help resolve the dilemma as to which of the two is more effective.

Job Corps, America's largest manpower training program for disadvantaged youth, has public centers (those operated directly by the federal government and also called agency centers) as well as private centers (those operated by contracted private industry and also called contract centers). Currently, of the 107 Job Corps centers across the nation, 30 are operated by the federal government, specifically by the United States Department of Agriculture and the United States Department of Interior. The remaining 77 centers are operated by private industry under contract to the United States

Department of Labor.

In pursuing my research on Job Corps, I decided to compare public and private centers in terms of costs of operation, perceived quality of service to the public, and overall effectiveness of services (determined by considering cost of service in relation to quality of service). In addition, I determined to evaluate how the management of human resources (employees) of the public and private centers affected cost and quality, and if it facilitated the cause of societal equity, one noticeably more or less than the other. The results of this evaluation could mitigate the impact of any cost, quality, and effectiveness measurements regardless of whether they proved to support continued privatization or renewed commitment to provision of public services.

In terms of cost, I decided to compare public and private centers based on the following recognized budget categories: 1. Residential Living; 2. Educational and Vocational Training; and 3. Support Services, which include medical and dental services and management and administration. The costs in these categories include - salaries (professional, support and administrative) and - operating costs (supplies, food, clothing, maintenance, insurance, travel, utilities, and communications).

In terms of quality, I decided to focus on subjective assessments (my own and students') of the quality perceived in the programs above analyzed for cost.

Effectiveness of service would derive from considering

comparative cost results in relation to my quality determinations.

Based on the literature, we might expect that private Job Corps centers would be less costly than public Job Corps centers; we might also expect that more costly public Job Corps centers would provide a better quality of services. Relative effectiveness, as a measure of quality of service in relation to the cost of that service, would most likely be predicted based on one's bias in favor of public or private provision of service. Finally, we might expect equity mechanisms to be more active in the public centers, operating as they are under legality constraints, not strictly subject to market forces.

This study is a critical one because it makes the contribution of studying comparative effectiveness in human services organizations, which most past studies have not done. Most past studies have avoided the human services, since they are so difficult to measure. Instead, most previous studies have focused on municipal services, especially the most visible of all municipal services, garbage collection (Savas, 1985; Bennett and Johnson, 1979, Pier, et al, 1974). Other studies include fire fighting services (Ahlbrandt, 1973); transit systems (Perry and Babitsky, 1986); office cleaning (GAO, 1981); electric utilities (Trapani, et al, 1985, Atkinson and Halvorson, 1986, Fisher, 1972); water utilities (Teeples and Glycer, 1987; Bruggink, 1982); airlines in Australia (Davies, 1971) and railroads (Covert and

Christensen, 1980). This study makes the contribution of studying comparative effectiveness in public and private Job Corps centers, which are human service organizations.

This work is important, also, simply because it offers research on Job Corps. Job Corps is not just another government program. It is America's largest manpower training effort. Originally, Job Corps was a part of the Economic Opportunity Act passed by Congress on October 3, 1964, and signed by President Johnson on October 7, 1964. Up to 100,000 students are served by the program in a given year, with the average yearly cost per student at about \$15,000. Current appropriations, for fiscal year 1991-1992, are \$867,500,000, a major investment for the nation's future.

Job Corps is a full-service operation providing housing, clothing, health care, and recreational facilities, in addition to remedial education, vocational skills training and work experience. The extensive reach of the program, as well as the burden it places on taxpayers, warrants careful study.

Finally, this work is unique since it focuses not just on cost but also considers quality of service, and goes further to postulate that program effectiveness can be determined by considering quality of service achieved in relation to the cost of that level of quality. Most former studies comparing public and private organizations examine merely the costs without consideration for service quality, assuming this to be more or less constant, when nothing suggests this is so, particularly in the area of human

services. Furthermore, most studies have been completed in an effort to promote either the public or private point of view. This study attempts not to prejudge its conclusions and holds as its goal the collection of facts for analysis and interpretation, not buttressing of one school of thought or another.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Two public and two private Job Corps centers were compared for research purposes. Those four centers within the same general geographic area having the greatest number of attributes in common were designated for study. For research convenience, all four are within a day's travel of each other. Each supports an enrollment of under 500, and provides similar curriculum.

Of the four centers, two are located in southwest Virginia, one in West Virginia, and one in Washington, D.C. They are: 1) Flatwoods Job Corps center, located in Coeburn, Virginia, and managed by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture; 2) Old Dominion Job Corps center, located in Monroe, Virginia, and managed by International Telephone and Telegraph (ITT); 3) Harpers Ferry Job Corps center, located in Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, and managed by the National Park Service of the United States Department of Interior; and 4) Potomac Job Corps center, located in Washington, D.C., and managed by the General Electric Corporation (GE).

Flatwoods and Harpers Ferry are public centers, and Old Dominion and Potomac are private. The Flatwoods center had an average student population of 220 during the program year (July 1989 - June 1990) of this study, and 57 employees. In the same year, Old Dominion had 346 students and 131 employees, Harpers Ferry 168 students and 53 employees, and Potomac 412 students and 168 employees. Of the 412 students at Potomac, 35 were non-residential, but they used the normal Job Corps services. The two public centers have male residents only while the two private centers are coeducational.

Effectiveness of Services

In order to determine the effectiveness of services delivered by each center, I attempted to break down Job Corps services into recognizable, measurable categories common to each center. To this end I used categories of services which correspond to categories in the financial reports of each center (see Appendix A for a digest of these reports), and are also described in the Job Corps Policy Handbook (U.S. Department of Labor, 1990). These categories are: 1) Residential Living; 2) Educational Training; 3) Vocational Training; 4) Medical and Dental Services; and 5) Administration and Management.

In evaluating the quality in each category of services, I decided to look at several substantive criteria whose nature

is spelled out below. In this analysis, the category Residential Living was broken down into four sub-categories, each of which was also considered equally important: dormitory life, recreation, counseling services, and cafeteria services. Chapters III and IV include a discussion of the findings of quality of service and effectiveness for each of the five categories listed above.

Field visits were undertaken in order to rate the quality of services in each criteria. In order to quantify the results of my field visits for each category, one of four possible responses to each criteria was selected. The range of possible responses were poor, fair, good, and excellent. A "Poor" ranking received a rating of 1 to 2.0; a "Fair" ranking, 2.1 to 3; a "Good" ranking, 3.1 to 3.9; and an "Excellent" ranking, 4.0. The criteria ratings were then totaled for an overall field visit rating for that category. These ratings were then added together and divided by the number of criteria, producing an average quality rating for that category.

To measure costs, data were obtained from Job Corps that permitted calculations of costs per student. The individual Job Corps financial reports were examined. These reports covered the time period July 1, 1989 to June 31, 1990. The Potomac center's fiscal year is different, so the Potomac financial report covers the time period October 1, 1989 to September 30, 1990. Additionally, Job Corps documentary sources, which included information on student educational

progress, vocational placement, student and staff education levels and race, were examined for the time period 1989 - 1990. The quality rating was divided by the cost per student in each category to determine an effectiveness quotient, which represents the quality of services per dollar spent.

Finally, that figure was multiplied by 1,000 to produce an effectiveness quotient per \$1,000 spent. A higher effectiveness quotient indicates better quality of service per thousand dollars spent. The same process was applied across the board for each category at each Job Corps center.

Since the category Residential Living has four sub-categories (dormitories, recreation, counseling, and cafeteria), but only one budget category (residential living), the effectiveness quotient for Residential Living was established only after the quality ratings were determined and averaged for each of the sub-categories.

A number of other data sources were also used, qualitative as well as quantitative in nature. These were: 1) direct personal observation, 2) in-depth interviews, 3) documentary sources, and 4) student survey results.

Direct Observation Eight field visits were undertaken, two at each center, totalling twenty-four days of on-site research. The first visit was a one-day visit to familiarize myself with the center. This was followed by a more comprehensive one-week visit to each center.

I learned the daily routine of each center. In the

dormitories, the furnishings, size, and maintenance of the rooms were observed. Bathrooms were checked to determine if the faucets, showers, and commodes were working. I also attended dormitory meetings between staff and students, and sat in on education classes. Student-teacher interchanges were noted, educational supplies and equipment examined, classroom characteristics studied, and the condition of the desks and tables checked. I observed the students in their vocational training classes, and examined the vocational facilities and equipment. I performed a walk-through tour of each medical building, and available services provided by the nurses, doctors and dentists were noted. Dining in the cafeteria, I noted the nutritional value of the food, the service provided by cafeteria workers, the eating environment, and the condition of the dining facility. Checking the condition of the billiard tables, ping-pong tables, weightlifting equipment, and gymnasium was another avenue of research. The schedule of recreation activities was also examined. In addition, I participated in recreational activities, such as billiards and horseshoe throwing, so as to acquaint myself with the recreation program.

Interviews To obtain a more global picture of the operations of each center, a total of ninety-six interviews were conducted, twenty-three of which were follow up interviews, designed to clarify information. The first interview was with the center director, followed by interviews with the education

department director, teachers, guidance counselors, vocational instructors, personnel directors, dormitory personnel, and recreation personnel, and cafeteria personnel.

The interviews usually lasted from thirty minutes to an hour, and were loosely structured to promote an open-ended discussion of the issues. Each interview began by focusing on the major duties of that individual and their concerns. It then moved on to cover the obstacles faced by that particular Job Corps center.

Interviews were also conducted with personnel in the Job Corps national office in Washington, D.C., and the Job Corps regional office in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Job Corps personnel at the national level have an overall policy viewpoint, and this provided a contrast to what was heard in the interviews at the centers, where personnel are, of course, primarily concerned with immediate problems in that center.

Another component of the study was to interview as many Job Corps students as possible to get their impressions of the quality of services. A total of eighty-five interviews were conducted, ten of which were follow up interviews. Some of these interviews were relatively short, lasting five or ten minutes, while others were longer, lasting thirty minutes to an hour. These interviews, like the interviews with staff, were loosely structured to promote open-ended discussion. Some of the students interviewed used the interview as an opportunity to complain about Job Corps, especially problems they were having relating with other students. Other

students, however, spoke positively of the opportunities available to them at Job Corps.

Documentary Sources Data pertaining to student training at each center, including the length of training, the percentage of students who completed their training, the total percent placed in jobs, and the average wage per hour for placements were compared across the four centers.

Additionally, data pertaining to student educational progress were compared across the four centers, including GED achievement, reading achievement, and mathematical achievement,

Finally, data comparing salaries for the directors, counselors, nurses, teachers, and dormitory staff were compared at each center. These are contained in summary reports published by Job Corps.

Student Survey A short student questionnaire was drawn up, which contained ten questions, and was designed to provide information concerning the students' feelings about Job Corps services (see Appendix B). I consulted with management staff at each Job Corps center in order to draw up appropriate questions. The content of the ten questions focused on Job Corps activities, including the quality of education classes, vocational training, recreation, counseling, dormitory life, cafeteria services, and management.

The questionnaire was administered during the second

field visit to each center. The instruments were administered to the students at the dormitories. The students were assured of complete confidentiality for their responses, with the only identifying information being the name of the particular Job Corps center. I explained the questionnaire to each dormitory manager, who then explained it to the students. The dormitory managers then passed out the questionnaires to each student to complete. The questionnaires were returned to me either at the next dormitory meeting that I attended, or by mail.

When the surveys were completed and returned, the responses were coded as follows: a "Poor" ranking received a rate of 1; a "Fair" ranking received a rate of 2; a "Good" ranking received a rate of 3; and "Excellent" received a rate of 4. The frequency and percentages falling into each category for each of the ten questions were then determined. Two runs were made of this procedure, one by individual center and one by type of center, public or private. The survey results appear in chapters III and IV. The results were tabulated from 119 responses from Flatwoods, 98 responses from Harpers Ferry, 216 responses from Old Dominion, and 189 responses from Potomac.

FORTHCOMING CHAPTERS

The organization of the rest of this dissertation is as follows. Chapter II will review the literature, with an emphasis on the nature of the differences in public and

private organizations.

Chapters III and IV compare costs, quality of services and effectiveness of services in the areas of Residential Living, Educational and Vocational Training, and Support.

Chapter V focuses on the human resources of each Job Corps Center. The chapter examines how the human resources at each center affect cost and quality of services.

Chapter VI will present a summary of the overall findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, and recommendations for future Job Corps policy and future Job Corps and vocational training research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the literature comparing public and private performance on organizational performance, salaries and benefits, and job satisfaction, as these areas hold particular import.

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Numerous studies contend that private industry is more efficient than government. Savas (1982) insists that some government functions could be performed more economically by private industry contracted to do the work. Savas studied 315 American cities for refuse collection arrangements, and found that municipal garbage collection was 65% more expensive than garbage collected by private contractors. The cause, said Savas, was that city agencies: 1) used larger crews, 2) experienced higher absenteeism, 3) served fewer households per hour, 4) were less likely to utilize incentive systems, and 5) were less likely to use vehicles in which the driver could also work as a loader. Savas concluded that private contract collection is the most cost-effective method of collecting residential refuse.

Bennett and Johnson (1980) argue that much of the work now done by government should be contracted out to private firms, because government bureaucrats, they claim, have

managed, through their political activities, to raise wage rates well above the competitive labor markets. Bennett and Johnson investigated the salary structure in the federal government and claimed that individuals with comparable skills were paid as much as 20 percent more than their counterparts in the private sector. They concluded that government employees were grossly overpaid, not that private sector workers were underpaid. The taxpayers, they concluded, were hurt the most, since they paid the bill. In answer to those critics who say that the private contractor keeps wages as low as possible, Bennett and Johnson reply:

Firms in the private sector cannot 'keep wages low.' No worker can be forced to work on any job. If a worker can obtain better pay in another job, he is free to quit and take it. Private firms must pay going wage rates to attract and retain employees (93).

Bennett and Dilorenzo (1983) reported a cost reduction of 35 percent in facilities maintenance costs at selected military sites, after those functions were transferred to private contractors. There was also a savings, ranging from 5 to 25 percent, when custodial services were contracted to private firms.

Spann (1977) reports on a study by R. S. Ahlbrandt, comparing the costs of public and private contract provision for fire protection and garbage collection. The city of Scottsdale, Arizona elected to contract with the rural-metropolitan fire protection company for the provision

of fire services. Ahlbrandt conducted an econometric analysis of the cost relationship for 44 publicly owned fire departments in the state of Washington. Armed with this data, Ahlbrandt then accurately predicted costs for some Arizona cities that already used public fire departments. He then predicted the costs for Scottsdale, Arizona. He determined that the costs per capita for a public fire department in Scottsdale was \$7.10, whereas the cost of having fire protection services provided by the contracted Rural-Metro company turned out to cost \$3.78, suggesting a major savings.

Spann (1977) also cited other cost studies for garbage collection in New Jersey and in St. Louis, Missouri, and found those costs somewhat lower in communities using private contractors, though not greatly so. Spann concluded that since garbage and fire services may be provided more cheaply by contracting with private firms rather than by using city-run refuse and fire services, there was no reason why similar results would not be true of other government functions.

These writers have advanced the position that public bureaucracies are more costly than privatizing. But other writers have dissented from this position. Paul Starr (1987) challenges the specific claims made for privatization and challenges the accuracy of the political and economic world presented by its advocates. In so doing, he discusses many issues, including program costs, economic growth, housing, social security, and education.

Among the points made by Starr are that privatization proponents generalize about the virtue of privatization, and virtually ignore any of the benefits of public spending. For example, Starr says that while the advocates of privatization see it as a means of reducing government activity, this neglects the fact that when government increased the scale of taxation and spending, this contributed to economic stabilization. The result is that over the past 50 years, the once severe business cycle has been diminished.

Starr further charges that while privatization proponents talk of how much the American people are dissatisfied with too much government spending, the truth is that the American public has overwhelmingly supported increased spending for government programs and services.

Furthermore, privatization, says Starr, has symbolic consequences. Administering justice, for example, is a communicative act, with a public character. Public servants, he says, not private contractors attempting to maximize benefits, should administer justice. The same holds true for other public functions, like national parks and wilderness. Starr goes on to say that President Reagan's open encouragement of using private agents to illegally supply the Contras in Nicaragua angered the American people precisely because the private agents were not lawfully authorized government agents carrying out United States policy.

Starr does not deny that privatization may be the best policy in certain circumstances, but argues that any appraisal

of alternative solutions to any problem must weigh concerns of justice, security, and citizenship.

A common example is defense. Privately produced defense equipment has not reduced the pressure on the defense budget.

Defense contractors have proven to be very capable in profiting from high military expenditures. Furthermore, throughout the 1980s many of the Pentagon's major contractors were under investigation for corrupt contracting practices, including charges of excessive prices and poor quality (Holloran 1986; Carrington 1986).

Adams (1981) reports that the decision to contract defense manufacturing to private industry has fueled contractors' expectations that federal expenditures will maintain their productive capacity, and that profit margins will be ensured by the federal government. Furthermore, there is evidence that profits for defense firms have run higher than the general manufacturing average, when income as a proportion of capital investment is measured, rather than sales.

Perry and Babitsky (1986) did a comparative study which assessed the costs and benefits of particular privatization strategies of urban mass transit systems across the United States. They found that publicly owned mass transit systems managed by private contractors performed no better than purely publicly managed systems.

The power industry has been studied to determine cost differences between public and private management. Donahue

(1989) reports on the findings of six major studies, all of which used Federal Power Commission data for various years, and all of which attempted to explain the costs of electricity generation or distribution, or both, by numerous variables, including organizational form. Four of the six studies showed slightly lower costs for public utilities-the other two studies showed significantly higher costs for the private utilities.

This brings up a point that is often overlooked by many theorists: the private sector is not always disciplined by the market. Private sector advocates typically assume that the self-regulatory features of the market will solve any problems plaguing publicly administered programs. Goodsell (1985) has addressed this point:

Profit competition among firms is explained elegantly in economics texts but is not necessarily discovered in the real business world. I am referring not merely to oligopolies or ineffective competition but to that sector of private enterprise disciplined by the enemy, government regulatory bureaucracies (50).

Those who favor contracting frequently contend that privatization unleashes competitive forces, bringing pressures of the marketplace to bear on inefficient producers, suggesting that a private supply is less costly than public supply. However, it is not uncommon to find an insufficient number of potential suppliers to reach a desired level of competition (Dehoog 1984, 55).

Donahue (1989) compared data on prisons which employed

their own personnel to those which contracted out prison personnel to private prison operators. Private security guards, he determined, receive about 15 percent less pay than do public correctional workers. Donahue concluded that \$9 billion could be saved if all American prison systems used private contract personnel. But Donahue also noted that the characteristics of the prison workforce would be different. Public prison guards are much more likely to be high school graduates, work full-time and year-round on their jobs, and be of prime working age. Employers using a private labor pool might pay less, but they would get less. In other words, lower labor costs signal a lower quality workforce, and the likelihood of worsened prison conditions. Furthermore, private sector employees, unlike civil servants, cannot be denied the right to strike. A potentially disruptive and serious situation would exist if the private prison personnel went on strike, shutting down the prison (152-178).

Critics of government bureaucracy complain that the quality of service suffers because public bureaucracies are "top heavy" with "support" personnel, leaving too few people to perform the actual delivery of service. However, Goodsell (1985) reports on several studies which, contrary to expectations, indicates that government bureaucracies are not top heavy with support personnel. One study compared 30 businesses: financial, manufacturing, governmental, political, educational, and other organizations. In reanalyzing the data, Goodsell discovered that only 12 percent

of the staff of the government bureaucracies were in supportive activities, compared to 27-28 percent for private organizations (52).

Dehoog (1984) examined privately operated programs in two departments in the Michigan state government--the Department of Social Services and the Department of Labor. She discovered many problems with contracting to private industry, among them that private contractors had their own bureaucracies. There was just as much red tape and rule following. Similarly, communications had to be filtered through two bureaucratic systems, that of the contractor and that of the Michigan state government. Lines of accountability were less clear. As a result, Dehoog found that the participants focused even more on process, rather than on the quality of services provided (119).

The evidence is not clear-cut. Some studies indicate that public provision of services is less costly. Furthermore, it is difficult to measure all of the activities associated with contracting to private industry, including writing, negotiation, and coordinating the contract.

Other scholars have noted that government has more important values than costs and efficiency, and that these must be considered in any comparison of the public and private sector.

Waldo (1948) pointed out that matters of efficiency should receive a low level of priority in matters of government. He said efficiency can be measured only in terms

of purpose. Introducing a "pyramid of values," Waldo says that at lower levels of purpose, efficiency can be measured. However, at higher levels of human purpose, efficiency is relegated to less importance, and judgments of efficiency are less accurate (195-196).

Paul Appleby, in Big Democracy (1945), flatly rejects the politics/administration dichotomy, claiming that "government is politics," and government decisions are value laden. Those values promoted most often, says Appleby, are those of representativeness, political responsiveness, and political accountability through elected officials.

Rosenbloom (1986) describes some of the governmental reforms arrived at by maximizing these values, including the Federal Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, which provides for a more diversified workforce, and the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, which, through the use of advisory committees, attempts to enhance responsiveness. These values, say Rosenbloom, are frequently at odds with concerns with efficiency.

Managerial effectiveness is difficult to gauge, of course, but federal managers have long complained that their effectiveness is hampered by the large congressional role in public administration and the need to consult continually with a variety of parties having a legitimate concern with their agencies' operations (20).

A group of public administration scholars associated with the "Blacksburg Manifesto" provide a comprehensive image of

American governance that encompasses values beyond the concepts of efficiency and quality of service. To them, public administration has a profound moral responsibility to the Constitution. Calling for an "agency perspective," these authors maintain bureaucracies are "repositories," and their staffs are "trustees of specialized knowledge, historical experience, time-tested wisdom, and most importantly, some degree of consensus as to the public interest relevant to a particular function." They advocate a strong and vigorous public administration with an emphasis on higher values (Wamsley et al. 1985, 301).

Another point of interest is Sullivan's (1987) discussion of constitutional protection. Sullivan describes various forms of privatization, including contracting, as a threat to the constitutional rights of the American people. Sullivan refers to the "State Action Doctrine," which declares that when a private utility performs a public function, it is restrained by the Constitution in the same way as the state. Sullivan points out that the Supreme Court in recent years has severely restricted the reach of the State Action Doctrine, and therefore has severely restricted the potential reach of constitutional protection to privatized governmental functions.

There is also literature to support the idea that privatization leads to more, not less discrimination. Mahaffy (1983) considers the drive toward privatization as an attempt to remove the constitutional guarantee that government will

promote the general welfare of all the people, as stated in the Preamble and in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. Mahaffy maintains that a major function of government is to retain the sense of community for all the people. In order to do this, government has to determine the needs of the American people in a fair and equitable way. The public sector alone, she maintains, has the ability to develop and analyze data on a national scale. Contracting public functions to the private sector asserts the priority of businesses over individuals and results in efforts to destroy progress that has been made, especially the equal rights movement, affirmative action, public education, and public sector jobs.

McGee and Pastor (1988) contend contracting to private industry is a discrimination device used against minorities. They point out that Black and Latino workers have traditionally found an avenue of escape from economic deprivation through government employment. Using Los Angeles County as an example, the authors point out that the Board of Supervisors, in a privatization move, contracted out 4,000 jobs, with thousands scheduled in the future. They were replaced by temporary contract workers earning as much as \$700 a month less than the county paid their employees, and receiving no benefits. These people then turn to public agencies and private charities for health services and food stamps. The cost of contracting out government services, they claim, is often the relative impoverishment of minority workers in the community.

SALARIES AND BENEFITS

Salaries and benefits are important because they are reflected in the costs, and because they are an integral part of job satisfaction and contribute to a more equitable organization in society. They also reflect on the quality of services. To undertake a wage comparison of public and private institutions would be a sufficient enough task. To include a comparison of benefits, both tangible and intangible, multiplies the difficulty.

One resounding criticism of most empirical studies comparing wage scales of public and private institutions is that non-wage forms of employee compensation have been ignored (Bellante and Long, 1981). We shall seek to incorporate wages and non-wage compensation in the comparison of public and private employment compensation.

We must first identify the elements of compensation for each sector, public and private. Wages are easily compared, since employees of both factions are compensated in identical units--dollars. Non-wage compensatory factors differ, however. Things such as motivational interest, job security, opportunity for advancement, work environment, job prestige and escape from negative factors cannot be measured in dollars. Even material fringe benefits are hard to measure; Havemann and Lanouette (1978) say that it is very difficult to assign a dollar value to fringe benefits, especially pensions.

First we shall look at wages. The literature overwhelmingly supports the belief that public workers are paid as well as, or better than, their privately employed counterparts (Smith, 1981, Krashinsky, 1978, Fogel and Lewin, 1974, Long, 1982). In a wages-only comparison by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, comparing federal and private compensation of workers, researchers concluded that the average federal wage was consistently higher than the average private-sector wage (Federal Reserve Bank of New York Quarterly Review, 1978).

In spite of such evidence, Long (1982) cites three studies contending that, while federal and municipal government overpay for low skill, clerical and craft employees, their high level employees are actually underpaid, when wages are compared to those of private employees on the same level. The same report states that the question is not whether government workers are overpaid for the work they are doing, but whether they are overpaid for the human capital they lend to the position. The argument seeks to prove that government employees are underemployed, rather than overpaid, and that misallocation of labor resources is the culprit.

In their research focusing on the comparability of federal employees' pay to that of the private sector, Havemann and Lanouette (1978) quote Smith's estimation that the federal wage advantage was 13 to 20 percent. However, they qualify this information with evidence that it is not the white male who enjoys the advantage, but rather Blacks and women.

Population surveys show that both men and women employed by the federal government are better paid than private sector employees with similar human capital characteristics (Bellante and Long, quoting Smith, 1981). In a study published in the Industrial and Labor Relations Review, examining pay differentials between federal government and private sector workers, research concluded that the estimated mean earnings and pay rates of federal employees exceeded those of private employees (Smith, 1976). Focusing on the salaries of daycare workers in Ontario in 1974, one study revealed that workers at private centers received considerably lower wages than did their counter-parts in public centers (Krashinsky, 1978). Specifically, municipal workers received an average of 42% more in wages than the private employees, not counting an additional nine percent in fringe benefits for these workers.

One reason for the discrepancy was attributed to the fact that municipal centers can pay more because they are publicly supported, and need not be concerned with pricing themselves out of the market. It should be noted that this is a reflection of the theory mentioned in the first chapter, that with the absence of market demands, efficiency (in this case dollar efficiency) is not a factor to be dealt with for public agencies. Since the government need not be concerned with putting itself at a competitive disadvantage if it pays excessive wages, the only restriction on the wages paid is "taxpayer revolt" (Smith, 1976).

Considering a field of eleven large urban areas, a U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics survey concluded that clerical, data processing, and manual workers under municipal employ were paid significantly higher wages than workers in the same occupations in private industry (Fogel and Lewin, 1974). The same survey also provided evidence that, in most cases, federal employees in the same cities were also paid more than their private sector counterparts.

In reviewing wages for any one period, we must keep in mind the dynamic nature of the private wage. If a private sector wage is depressed due to changes in the market, the comparable public sector wage will be perceived as excessive. Then again, an American trade union, which has a 7 to 15 percent impact on the wages of those whom they represent, may exercise its power over the private market to achieve large gains (Fogel and Lewin, 1974). This, then, would make public salaries appear to be deficient by comparison. This is only a potential impact, since most sectors are not effectively unionized today. Even so, when necessary, these factors should be taken into consideration and compensation made, in order to compare public and private wages. This can be done by either extending the period of time covered in the data, or adding an allowance margin to both the upper and lower ends of the public wage.

The normative question then arises. Should governments match wage rates that have been achieved through the exercise of private market power and, by doing so,

support and expand that power? If the answer to this question is "yes," the implication would be an upward spiraling wage for the public sector, followed by the same in the private sector.

Therefore, when public salaries are lower than private salaries, much consideration should be given to matching them. However, when government salaries are higher than private salaries, I do not think we should lower public salaries in consideration of the unique role of the public sector in trying to bring about equitability.

Although we see some evidence to the contrary, it is generally true that public employees' wages are comparable to, or better than, their privately employed counterparts. With this established, we shall endeavor to compare non-wage compensation, or benefits.

In reviewing evidence concerning fringe benefits, the data suggest that fringe benefits in the public sector are equal to, or better than, those in the private realm (Fogel and Lewin, 1974). In fact, in the case of federal workers, these so-called "fringe" benefits are so substantial that they are more than just ornamental to the compensation package, as the term "fringe" implies. All federal workers receive such benefits as annual leave, sick leave, holidays, health benefits, life insurance, injury compensation and severance pay, which are often not considered in determining comparability with the private sector (Smith, 1976). Other factors that usually are not considered in comparability

studies include hours worked, stability of employment, and intensity of work effort, according to Smith. The most significant of factors not considered are paid leave and retirement. Combined, they account for 11.6 percent of the federal employment package, and only 8.8 percent of the private employee's compensation.

Hiring practices and job tenure policies in the public sector add a considerable dose of security to the package, according to the data. Fogel and Lewin report that in 1971, only 57 percent of nonfarm, private employees worked a full year, while the public sector figure was 77 percent. The same research showed job turnover also was lower for public employees, with a turnover of 19 to 22 percent in the public sector in 1970, and a full 58 percent in the private sector.

Concurring with that, Long (1982) concluded that quit rates will be lower in government. The publication attributed this to the fact that government employees receive more in the form of higher wages, or greater fringe benefits, than workers in the private sector. Baldwin (1987) noted the relative job security in government for tenured employees.

In short, all data leads to the conclusion that, on the whole, public workers are better compensated than their private sector counterparts, except for high level employees, where the pay is less in the public sector than in the private sector. The evidence in dollars certainly supports this, but what really pushes the support for the public sector in this area is Smith's revelation that many of the so-called fringe

benefits are not factored into comparability.

JOB SATISFACTION

Numerous studies suggest that public and private organizations are more different than similar; and that private organizations offer greater first-year job challenge, more of a chance for marked success, and more competent supervisors (Brown and Eric 1981; Long 1975; Buchanan 1974; Kilpatrick et al. 1964).

Many of the findings relate to some of the most commonly cited differences between the two sectors. In considering four public and four private organizations, Buchanan (1975) found that private organizations suffer from more red tape. Rainey concluded his 1977 study with findings to the contrary, determining that government agencies were more formalized and less flexible where personnel procedures were concerned. In the same study, he compared clarity of goals and found no significant differences between the public and private sectors. However, Baldwin (1987) demonstrated that public agencies trailed private organizations in goal clarity.

Executive turnover was examined by De Allesi (1974). His research encompassed 200 private and publicly owned electric utilities, and concluded that the private enterprises suffered more executive turnover. On the other hand, Baldwin's findings (1987) showed more executive turnover in the public concerns. This must be qualified, though, since Baldwin's

study included 50 public and only 12 private organizations.

Baldwin (1987) reports that the sometimes suggested notion that public sector workers are less concerned about having higher-order needs met was undermined by Newstrom et al. (1976). Findings showed public workers put no more emphasis on job security, and no less on self-actualization, than their private counterparts. They do, however, act with greater caution and rigidity, and less innovation than private employees, Baldwin concludes, citing Rainey's 1976 study.

Most needs satisfaction studies suggest that private employees are more satisfied with their jobs than are public employees. These studies are based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs as related to employment, and include the work of Paine et al., 1966; Porter and Mitchell, 1967; Rhinehart et al., 1969; and Newstrom et al., 1976. Balancing these findings are two studies (Kilpatrick et al. 1964; NCPQ 1978) accounting for large employee and organizational samples, which disclosed that public and private workers are equally satisfied with their jobs. Yet another such endeavor (Grupp and Richards, 1975) indicates that state-appointed officials show higher rates of job satisfaction than privately employed executives.

The literature suggests that private employees are usually more satisfied with their jobs, but the evidence is not clear cut. There are mixed results from studies showing the amount of red tape and formalization. There are also mixed results on employee turnover, with the private sector

suffering more turnover in one study, and the public sector more turnover in another study.

In conclusion, the literature on organizational performance is inconsistent, but seems to favor the private sector over the public. The literature also suggests that public sector employees are better compensated (especially when fringe benefits are considered). The only exception to this is that privately employed executives are better paid than upper management in the public sector. Also, research indicates a better representation of minorities in the public organizations.

The literature reaffirms the critical need for research in several areas. The inconsistency in findings on organizational performance indicates that further study is required. Since many of the studies focus solely on cost, and overlook the important factor of effectiveness, research on quality is mandated. Quality should then be examined relative to cost and stated objectives, to determine overall effectiveness.

Salaries, and especially benefits, should be examined as a major component when looking again at cost. Research also indicates further study is needed on minority employment representation in human service organizations.

CHAPTER III RESIDENTIAL LIVING

To study Residential Living, this chapter examines four facets, as follows: 1) Dormitories; 2) Recreation Program; 3) Counseling Program; and 4) Cafeteria Services. For each of these four, criteria are established and justified. My personal observations are then presented, followed by my reactions to the same. To conclude, a rating is assigned and justified.

To distinguish the public from the private centers, the center name will be followed by (public) for public centers and (private) for private centers.

DORMITORIES

Dormitories: Criteria and Justification

The quality of the dormitories was rated on the following criteria: 1) Orderly Environment; 2) Facilities Maintenance; and 3) Furnishings.

Orderly Environment was chosen as a criterion since a good, orderly environment contributes to a relaxed atmosphere, which in turn provides for more retention of learned material. Facilities Maintenance, if well done, provides for the safety and hygiene of the residents, and sufficient furnishings are conducive to good sleeping habits and good study patterns. The

effects of these criteria leave an impression as to the overall quality of the Job Corps program.

Dormitories: Observations, Reactions and Rating

1) Orderly Environment:

The overall atmosphere in the dormitories at Potomac (private) and Flatwoods (public) was one of relative calm. The dormitory personnel in both centers did a good job of maintaining order, and the students showed a genuine respect for the staff and dormitory rules. Dormitory rules at all four centers prohibited activities such as fighting, rough behavior and loud, abusive language.

I was impressed with the orderliness of these two dormitories, and especially with the way the staff and students worked together to maintain a calm environment. I rated both a 4.0 for Orderly Environment.

In contrast, the environment in the dormitories at Old Dominion (private) was tense, especially in the men's dorms. Lack of student discipline was a serious problem. Several members of the dormitory staff told me that they go to work each evening afraid for their safety. In my dormitory visits I observed that students frequently showed a lack of respect for one another and for dormitory staff. Loud cursing was a common means of venting frustration. It was not uncommon either to see students angrily knocking over furniture. One

student kicked over a large table in the lounge area when he learned that he could not get a weekend pass.

When I inquired of the dormitory personnel about taking disciplinary action against the troublemaking students, the response was that it did no good. The staff explained that when they do fill out incident reports for student misbehavior, disciplinary action is rarely taken.

The general feeling among the dormitory workers and students at Old Dominion was that management allowed the troublemakers to remain at the center in order to keep the student population up. This was done in spite of the fact that the troublemakers were responsible for driving away many good students who choose to drop out rather than put up with the tense conditions in the dormitories.

A factor in discipline is that Job Corps center director and managers, including those at Old Dominion, are handcuffed by national Job Corps policy which expects each individual Job Corps center to keep a high Average Length of Stay per student (ALOS) and a low Average Weekly Termination Rate (AWTR). Unfortunately, this policy means that each Job Corps center must keep disruptive students that would otherwise be terminated.

I was appalled at the tense environment in the dormitories at Old Dominion. I kept thinking it would take an extremely strong personality to stay in those dormitories and complete training. Yet, I know that many youths between the ages of 16-21 are not that strong. This situation is very

disappointing for some of the new enrollees, many of whom come to Job Corps looking forward to a new start in life. In my interviews with students at Old Dominion, the disorderly dormitory atmosphere was a frequent complaint.

Old Dominion also provides two smaller "honors" dormitories for students. These are well kept, with two beds per room, designed to accommodate approximately thirty students. Students who are toward the end of their training and demonstrate good behavior are candidates for these "honors" dorms. The atmosphere in these special dormitories was comfortable and calm. In fact, there was such a contrast between the "honors" dormitories and the other dorms that the students referred to the "honors" dorms as "condos" (i.e., condominium), and the regular dorms as "the projects" (i.e., project housing). Unfortunately, the "honors" dorms accommodate less than 20 percent of the students at Old Dominion. Students beginning their training are forced to stay in the regular, disorderly dormitories. I gave Old Dominion a rating of 1.0, which is "Poor," because of the tense and disorderly environment in the dormitories.

At Harpers Ferry (public), dormitory personnel and students maintain orderly dormitories during the weekdays only. Students and staff work together on weekdays to create a calm and orderly environment. Unfortunately, order is not as likely to be maintained on weekends. It is not uncommon on weekends for only one dormitory staff member to be on duty for all three of the dorms. Due to weekend staff shortages,

there have been several serious weekend incidents in the Harpers Ferry dormitories. In addition, I observed an increase in arguing among students on weekends. On one occasion prior to my visit, some students set fire to one of the dormitories, making it necessary for the dormitory to be closed for repair.

I was perplexed by this situation in the dormitories at Harpers Ferry. On the one hand, the dormitories were well staffed and orderly during the week, but understaffed and disorderly on weekends. It seemed as if much of the progress that was made toward orderliness during the week was quickly undone on weekends. When I examined the situation further, I discovered that the staff shortage on weekends was the result of dormitory staff resentment against the center's director. The dormitory staff felt that the director did not support them strongly enough. They felt that the director was too concerned about ALOS and AWTR rates. They were especially upset that the director would overrule them when they recommend disciplinary action against a student. Their resentment was expressed by collectively calling in sick on weekends. I felt a sense of disappointment that dormitory staff members would allow such disagreements to take precedence over their concern for the students.

Because maintaining order in the dormitories was so inconsistent, I gave Harpers Ferry a rating of 1.4 for Orderly Environment.

2) Facilities Maintenance:

The Potomac (private) staff and students make a major effort to keep the dormitory floors exceedingly clean. I frequently saw one or more students mopping the floor. Dormitory floors here were spotless, almost to the point of excess.

In contrast to the clean floors, the rest of Potomac's dormitories are in need of general repair. I found that many of the interior air-conditioning units in the dormitory rooms were not working, were dirty, and did not have covers. Some had openings that allowed cold air inside during the winter season. In the bathrooms, some of the commodes did not work, and there was no hand soap in the dispensers. The paint on the walls was peeling in many places.

I was impressed with the students' efforts to keep the building floors clean, but discouraged to see so many areas in need of repair. I gave Potomac a rating of 2.2, slightly better than "Fair."

At Old Dominion (private) and Harpers Ferry (public) maintenance in the dormitories seemed abysmally bad. At Old Dominion, at least every other shower does not work. Most of the bathrooms have mildew on the ceilings, and shower curtains substituted for doors on the commodes in two of the dorms. In addition, many of the commodes were stopped up and unusable.

At Harpers Ferry (public), toilet stalls had no doors or

curtains. The shower areas were slippery, and in one case a pool of water stood several inches deep, promoting the growth of bacteria.

When I noticed that the standing water problem in the shower area was not promptly corrected, I inquired about the work order system for facilities maintenance. It turns out that Harpers Ferry has no system to ensure that work orders are filled. Also, neither the maintenance supervisor, nor the dormitory personnel, keep a maintenance log. Work orders are stored in a file, but there is no follow-up system. Thus the facilities maintenance program functioned poorly at best, and inconsistently.

The poor maintenance at both Old Dominion and Harpers Ferry is an extra burden on the students who live in the dormitories. I gave both a rating of 1.0, or "Poor."

In contrast, at Flatwoods (public) the bathrooms are clean and the showers and commodes work. The floors throughout the dormitory are clean and general maintenance seems very good. The only thing noted as broken or in need of repair were several of the bathroom mirrors, which were cracked. I was impressed with the maintenance and cleanliness of the dormitories here and gave Flatwoods a rating of 3.5.

3) Furnishings:

The furnishings in the residential areas of all four centers seemed inadequate. At Potomac (private), most of the

sleeping rooms contained six beds, but only one desk and chair. Some sleeping quarters did not even have that. The lounge areas contained couches and a television set. In addition, the sleeping rooms are air-conditioned, though students complained that the air conditioners didn't work.

At Old Dominion (private), seven or eight beds filled each room. Many of the rooms, however, have no desks or chairs. Additionally, there is no air conditioning anywhere in the dormitories. The lounge areas have new, comfortable couches, but I found that the television sets in most of the lounges were in need of repair. They produced a blurred picture, causing eye strain and frustration.

Harpers Ferry (public) also has problems with inadequate furnishings. Each sleeping room contains four beds, but no desks or night stands. Additionally, there are no drapes on most of the windows. The sleeping rooms do not have air-conditioning, though the lounge areas do. The couches in the lounge areas are new and comfortable. The bathrooms, however, do not have a hand dryer or paper towels. Each student is expected to bring a towel on trips to the bathroom. Most do not, and just do not bother to dry their hands.

At Flatwoods (public), most of the sleeping bays have eight beds and are comfortably air-conditioned. There are, however, few other furnishings in the rooms. Most rooms contain just one desk and one table. Some do not even have that. The lounge areas in each Flatwoods dormitory do have fairly new furnishings, including chairs and couches. In

addition, each lounge has two working television sets.

I concluded that room furnishings in all centers' dormitories are inadequate. In some of the dormitories, at all four centers, it would have been difficult for a student to find a desk to write a letter. The lounge areas are better furnished. Even so, I rated the centers quite low for Furnishings. Flatwoods received a 2.0, "Fair," because the furnishings, though limited, are not as sparse as at the other centers. I rated Potomac and Harpers Ferry 1.8 each, and gave Old Dominion a 1.5 rating, where the furnishings are not only sparse but television sets do not work and air-conditioning is absent.

Table 3-1 shows the cumulative quality ratings for the dormitories. The ratings for each of the three criteria have been combined for an overall dormitory quality rating. Flatwoods, a public center, has the highest rating, a 9.5; Potomac, a private center, has the second highest rating, an 8.0; Harpers Ferry, a public center, is next at 4.2; and Old Dominion, a private center, was lowest at 3.5.

RECREATION PROGRAM

Recreation Program: Criteria and Justification

The Recreation Program at each center was rated according to the following criteria: 1) Staff Supervision; 2) Variety of Recreational Offerings; and 3) Condition of Recreation

TABLE 3-1
DORMITORIES

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Orderly Environment	4.0	1.0	1.4	4.0
Facilities Maintenance	2.2	1.0	1.0	3.5
Furnishings	<u>1.8</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>2.0</u>
TOTALS	8.0	3.5	4.2	9.5
Mean Rating	2.67	1.17	1.40	3.17

Equipment and Facilities.

The quality of staff supervision is very critical, since it provides for orderly, safe recreation. It also sets overall attitudes for the recreation program. The variety of offerings is important so that all students can find some outlet for stress and a vehicle for social interaction. If offerings are too limited, students not interested in the few choices available are discouraged from participating. Good equipment and facilities encourages good recreation, which gives a student one more reason to continue his pursuit of education by staying in the Job Corps program. Since good recreation often offsets the negative factors of Job Corps residential living, it can be a big contributor to a student's satisfaction with the program.

Recreation Program: Observations, Reactions and Ratings

1) Staff Supervision:

At Old Dominion (private) I observed two recreation specialists working each evening, which constitutes adequate recreation staff to supervise and organize recreational activities. I rated Old Dominion 3.5, between "Good" and "Excellent."

Flatwoods (public) has an aggressive and energetic recreation director who is actively involved with the students and their recreation activities. He has, however, only one

other staff person helping him. This means that in order to cover day, evening, and weekend schedules, only one staff member works at a time. With an active recreation schedule and off-campus trips, this center is stretching its capabilities very thin. Games are often left unsupervised risking injuries to students. For example, during my field visits, the recreation director, who is also the football coach, spent part of the evening hours on the football field coaching the team. Meanwhile, back in the gymnasium (nearly one block away) other students were weightlifting and playing basketball, unsupervised. If a weightlifter or basketball player injured himself, there would have been no staff available to offer help.

When asked about the problem, the recreation director acknowledged the problem. "I worry that something will happen while I'm away from the gym," he told me. With such a good recreation program, and such a talented director, it is unfortunate that Flatwoods has not been able to hire a few more recreation staff members to provide adequate supervision. I gave this center a rating of 2.4, between "Fair" and "Good."

In contrast, Potomac (private) and Harpers Ferry (public) had more serious problems with staff supervision. Potomac has only one recreation employee, and no recreation director (at the time it was in the process of advertising for one.) At Harpers Ferry, the recreation specialist is on extended sick leave, and the replacement staff person is not trained to execute and supervise an effective recreation program. There

is a real dearth of leadership in the program. Because of the lack of staff supervision students do not receive the attention they should receive. I gave each center a 1.3 in Staff Supervision, between "Poor" and "Fair."

2) Variety of Recreation Offerings:

Old Dominion (private) and Flatwoods (public) both have active and structured recreation programs that offer a variety of recreational activities. Both maintain an ambitious schedule of off-campus recreation trips.

Old Dominion sponsors intramural softball and basketball games, and offers varsity softball and basketball competition for the better athletes. The recreational facilities, including the gymnasium, pool tables, and weightlifting rooms, were heavily used by the students during the evening hours. Old Dominion also does a good job of scheduling off-campus trips for students, including, for example, trips to minor league baseball games, roller skating, movies, and rock concerts. Additionally, this private center also has a female enhancement staff person (beautician) who runs a beauty shop on campus. I gave Old Dominion a 4.0 rating because of its variety of recreational experiences, which the students actively use.

Flatwoods also runs an active and structured recreation program. There is an ambitious schedule of evening and weekend recreational activities. The center also provides a

full schedule of off-campus trips for students, including trips to stock car races, movies, and horseback riding expeditions. Team sports include a varsity tackle football team, varsity and junior-varsity softball teams, and a varsity track team. An active intramural schedule of volleyball and basketball games fills out the recreation program. Basketball includes one league for students under five-feet-eight-inches tall, and another league for those at that height and taller.

I observed students taking advantage of recreational opportunities during their evening hours at Flatwoods. At the time basketball games were taking place in the gymnasium and on the outdoor courts, several horseshoe games were being played, and the ping-pong and pool tables were being used by students. I attended several football practices, and was impressed with the enthusiasm of the student players and the coach. It looked just like an early season football practice for any high school or small college football team, with the players clapping their hands and yelling encouragement to each other. I gave this center a 4.0 for its outstanding recreational offerings.

By contrast, Harpers Ferry (public) and Potomac (private) had little in the way of recreational programming. At Harpers Ferry I did observe students playing pool, ping-pong, and pickup basketball games, but there were no structured activities. The most popular recreation seemed to be watching movies on the VCR in the dormitory.

In addition to the lack of supervised activities, there were few off-campus trips available, and those that were available gave priority to students without disciplinary write-ups. In interviews students complained about the lack of off-campus visits. When a rare off-site activity is scheduled, the same students end up going again and again. I gave Harpers Ferry a rating of 1.8 on this criterion.

Potomac does not have an organized recreation program. I observed few students using the recreational facilities, which include a gymnasium, softball fields, recreation hall, and outdoor swimming pool. Instead, during the evening hours most students stand outside their dormitories in long lines talking with one another.

Potomac does sponsor off-campus trips on weekends, including trips to rock music concerts, museums, and bowling. However, many students complained to me that only twenty-five persons were permitted to go on these trips, and many more than that wanted to go. I rated Potomac 1.6.

3) Condition of Recreation Equipment and Facilities:

I found some equipment problems to be the same at all the centers. An example is the lack of tips on pool cues. The students played with cues that had wooden stubs attached on the end of them. Likewise, none of the ping-pong players that I watched used a ping-pong ball; instead, they used a golf whiffle ball.

Upon inquiry about the matter, the recreation staff at each center told me that the tips and ping-pong balls easily break. Rather than keep trying to keep ahead of the situation, each center makes do without them. The students didn't seem to mind.

The recreation facilities at Potomac (Private) included: a video room; pool tables; a weight room; a basketball court; stationary riding bikes; an outdoor swimming pool; a football field; and a baseball diamond. Some of these facilities are housed in the recreation hall, and some in the gym.

The condition of these facilities is not very good. The recreation building is not air-conditioned, and is stiflingly hot. The video machines are broken. I saw only a few students use the recreation building equipment. The weight room in the gymnasium needs more weights, as there are only enough to accommodate one or two students. Also, both stationary riding bikes are inoperable and in need of repair. Additionally, the swimming pool is shut down for repair. I gave Potomac a 1.0 rating (Poor) for serious maintenance problems with recreational equipment.

The condition of the recreation facilities at Old Dominion (private) was only slightly better. Recreational facilities included: a gymnasium with a basketball court; three pool tables; and a ping-pong table. The gymnasium also has a weightlifting room with Nautilus equipment. Adjacent to the gymnasium is an indoor swimming pool. There are two tennis courts on the grounds, a softball field, and a

quarter-mile track.

The weightlifting room has very good, modern Nautilus equipment. Otherwise, much of the recreation equipment is in need of repair. For example, the tennis courts and running track are not kept up and have weeds growing in them. The indoor swimming pool is closed for repairs. Old Dominion was rated 1.8.

The recreation facilities at Flatwoods (public) includes a gymnasium with a basketball court and weightlifting equipment; three pool tables; two ping-pong tables; a football field; a softball field; outdoor basketball courts; and several horseshoe pitching areas. Though the gymnasium is old, the facilities are well maintained.

The outdoor recreation fields are especially well manicured, and the grass precisely mowed. Despite the older condition of the gymnasium, I was impressed with the condition and maintenance of the facilities and equipment and gave Flatwoods a 3.0 (Good).

The recreation facilities at Harpers Ferry (public) includes a new, modern, air-conditioned recreation hall. This houses pinball machines, video games, three pool tables, and two ping-pong tables. There is also a gymnasium with a basketball court and weight room. Surrounding the gymnasium is a tennis court, an outdoor basketball court, a softball field, and a football field.

The recreation hall is well kept and clean, and the video games and pinball machines are working. The students take

advantage of the hall, in fact it is usually filled with students during the evening hours. In contrast to the recreation building, the tennis courts and outdoor basketball courts are overgrown with weeds.

I was especially impressed with the recreation hall at Harpers Ferry. I was less impressed with the other recreation facilities, but I did not observe any serious maintenance problems. A rating of 3.3 was given.

Table 3-2 shows the cumulative quality ratings for Recreation. Flatwoods, a public center, had the highest rating, a 9.4. Old Dominion, a private center, finished next at 9.3. Harpers Ferry, a public center, totaled 6.4. and Potomac, a private center, had the lowest rating, 3.9.

COUNSELING PROGRAM

Counseling Program: Criteria and Justification

Every Job Corps center has guidance counselors to serve the students. The nature of Job Corps counseling is such that much of the work is done in private consultation with students; therefore, I was not able to observe these counseling interchanges. I did attend group counseling sessions when it was possible to do so. My qualitative ratings of counseling services are based on impressions of the overall guidance services offered at each center.

TABLE 3-2
RECREATION

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Staff Supervision	1.3	3.5	1.3	2.4
Variety of Recreational Offerings	1.6	4.0	1.8	4.0
Condition of Equipment & Facilities	<u>1.0</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>3.0</u>
TOTALS	3.9	9.3	6.4	9.4
Mean Rating	1.30	3.10	2.13	3.13

Counseling Program: Observations, Reactions and Rating

1) Services Offered:

Counselors at Potomac (private), Old Dominion (private), and Flatwoods (public) hold regular group counseling sessions for all students every week in the evening hours. These are held in the dormitories.

Each counselor must work one evening per week in order to conduct the evening group therapy session at all three centers. The counseling staff and students complained to me about these weekly group counseling sessions. They feel that once a week group sessions are not necessary. That is too often. My observations indicated that the sessions were not a meaningful experience for the students, or for the counselors.

In the sessions that I attended, the students seemed disinterested and the counselors had difficulty getting the students to talk about anything. These sessions took place in the evening hours when the students would rather be doing something else, such as watching television, playing video games, or talking with friends.

In addition to the weekly evening group sessions, the counselors carried a normal counseling schedule of individual appointments during the day. In my discussions with the counselors of these three centers, it became obvious that these sessions amounted to what one counselor called "putting

out fires." They are reactive in nature.

When a student wants to move to another dormitory, transfer to another Job Corps center, or obtain a weekend pass, he or she schedules an appointment with the counselor to discuss the issue. There is very little "deeper" counseling where a student and counselor try to work on behavior or emotional problems.

Potomac counselors are the only ones that use specific behavior modification techniques. They do "contract" counseling, i.e. the counselor and student agree to a written contract for behavior change, and then the contract is monitored by both counselor and student.

In contrast to the other three centers, at Harpers Ferry (public) there is no scheduled individual counseling or group counseling for students. Instead, formal counseling takes place only when students requested to talk to a counselor, usually about such items as a transfer request or dormitory discipline problems.

Additionally, the counseling offices at each center offer drug and alcohol programs for those students with drug and alcohol problems. However, only Potomac requires student drug testing prior to commencement of training. If a student tests positive, he or she must immediately begin drug counseling. At the other three centers, drug or alcohol counseling begins only when a staff member or student initiates it by contacting the counselor, and treatment is recommended.

Counselors at Potomac, Old Dominion, and Flatwoods make a good effort to reach out to students. However, I felt a sense of frustration among the counselors, since so much of their work is "reactive" in nature, forcing them to deal with one small crisis after another. I also sensed the frustration of these counselors as they conducted group therapy sessions, knowing most of the students would rather be doing something else. Efforts on the part of the counseling supervisor and staff at Potomac to use "contract" counseling and to counsel drug users at the outset of training, was, however, commendable.

As Table 3-3 shows, Potomac was rated 4.0 for Counseling because of its sincere and thorough efforts to reach out to help the students at Potomac. Old Dominion and Flatwoods were rated 3.3 because, although both also make a strong effort to help students, they do not use more advanced counseling techniques (i.e., "contract" counseling), and do not screen for alcohol and drug users. Harpers Ferry was rated 2.0, only "Fair," since it did not offer group therapy or on-going, individualized counseling.

CAFETERIA SERVICES

Cafeteria Services: Criteria and Justification

Each center has a cafeteria on campus serving three meals a day to students. The criteria for measuring Cafeteria

TABLE 3-3
COUNSELING

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Services Offered	4.0	3.3	2.0	3.3

Services are as follows: 1) Nutritional Content of Food; 2) Quality of Service; and 3) Eating Environment.

Nutritional Content of Food is important, since nutrition contributes to a sound mind and body, which are essential for the success of the Job Corps program. Taste of the food was considered a component of this criterion. Good Quality of Service insures against health dangers, such as food poisoning and diseases that spread through handling of food. The Eating Environment should be relaxed and orderly to insure proper digestion and maximum absorption of vitamins and minerals.

Cafeteria Services: Observations, Reactions and Rating

1) Nutritional Content of Food:

One of the biggest complaints I heard from students at all four centers related to the food in the cafeteria. "Worst food I ever ate," is the way one student put it.

The menu at each center included the four basic food groups established by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). They are: milk and dairy products; vegetables and fruits; and breads and cereals. Desserts were presented at the noon and evening meals.

In addition, Old Dominion (private) offers a service that is not available at the other centers. Working in conjunction with the nurse in health services, Old Dominion offers a special low-calorie tray to any overweight student who so

desires. The diet consists of more vegetables and fruits, and less starchy foods.

Eating several meals at each of the four centers, I discerned no difference in the quality or taste of the food between centers. Although the food is nothing to rave about, it is palatable. It tastes much like the food at any hospital cafeteria.

My general, overall reaction to the Nutritional Content of the Food was favorable. Because the Nutritional Content of the Food was basically sound, I gave each center a rating of 3.0, with the exception of Old Dominion, which I rated 3.3 because of the low-calorie tray.

2) Quality of Service:

At Potomac (private), the food selection area is clean and the food well presented. The cafeteria serving line staff is friendly and helpful. However, Potomac does have one flaw in its service: The self-serve cola and juice machines were broken, leaving students with only milk or chocolate milk to drink. These machines were fixed later in the week, but the juice machine quickly broke down again.

In contrast to the friendly, helpful cafeteria staff at Potomac, the staff at Old Dominion (private) said nothing to students passing through the serving line. Instead, its members gathered around in small cliques talking with one another. There is no active interchange between cafeteria

staff and students as at Potomac. Additionally, the Old Dominion staff wore dirty uniforms, badly stained with food.

Old Dominion has other Quality of Service problems as well. There are no sugar or bread dispensers, and all self-serve cola machines were broken. Also, the condiments (i.e., ketchup and mustard) are served in unsightly bulk containers, rather than being individually packaged. Also, the dishwasher does not function well, occasionally leaving hardened food residue on eating utensils.

At Flatwoods (public) and Harpers Ferry (public), the cafeteria staff are professional, but not as friendly and outgoing as at Potomac. In addition, the Flatwoods cafeteria is very undersized with no room for students to line up except outside the building. This is a problem, especially in the cold winter months.

Potomac was rated 3.0 because of the friendly, helpful cafeteria staff, and the appetizing way the food is presented. Flatwoods and Harpers Ferry received a 2.5, since their service is professional, but not as friendly and outgoing as at Potomac. Old Dominion earned 1.0 because of the unfriendly and unprofessional cafeteria staff and broken equipment.

3) Eating Environment:

At Potomac (private), the eating environment includes nicely finished wooden tables, seating up to six diners at a

time. Each table is charmingly set with a red napkin at each place and a colorful flower arrangement in the center. It presents the atmosphere of a good restaurant.

Unfortunately, the warmth generated by this clean, appetizing dining experience is quickly replaced by repulsion as the diner clears his plate. In the food disposal area, mounds and mounds of discarded food rise several feet high. Here, the diner is expected to place the contents of his dirty plate atop the garbage. I found this absolutely revolting.

Old Dominion (private) has some problems as well. For one thing, the noise level in the cafeteria is very high. Students at one end carry on conversations with students at the other end, yelling over the heads of those in between. Additionally, food scraps are scattered on the floor throughout the cafeteria. It was not a pleasant place to eat. On the positive side, the dish washing area where students place their trays at the end of the meal is not as unappetizing as at Potomac; a staff member quickly took the trays so that food did not pile up.

At Harpers Ferry (public), the eating environment is calm and orderly, but flies abound. At Flatwoods (public), the atmosphere is also calm and orderly, but unsightly food scraps cover the floor. This is mostly evidenced near the front of the dining area near the salad bar.

In rating for eating environment I gave Potomac a 2.0 because, even though the table arrangements were superior to the other centers, the sight of food piled up next to the

dishwasher spoiled the "restaurant" setting. Old Dominion earned a 1.5 due to the high noise level and dirty conditions. Harpers Ferry received 2.2, which would have been higher except for the problem with flies. Flatwoods, which has a comfortable and orderly cafeteria environment, got no more than a 2.4 because of food scraps on the floor.

Table 3-4 shows the cumulative quality ratings for Cafeteria. Potomac, a private center, had the highest rating, an 8.0, followed closely by Flatwoods (public) at 7.9, and Harpers Ferry (public) at 7.7. Old Dominion (private) had the lowest rating, 5.8.

Residential Living: Quality Rating & Effectiveness Quotient

Table 3-5 shows the determination of an overall Quality Rating and Effectiveness Quotient for each center for the category Residential Living. Mean quality ratings from each sub-category (Dormitories, Recreation, Counseling, and Cafeteria) have been added together and divided by the number of categories (four), which produces the absolute Quality Rating for Residential Living for each center. That figure is then divided by Residential Living costs for each center and multiplied by 1,000. The result is the Residential Living Effectiveness Quotient, which embraces both costs and quality of services rendered.

Flatwoods (public) finished with the highest absolute Quality Rating, a 3.06; followed by Potomac (private), 2.66;

TABLE 3-4
CAFETERIA

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Nutritional Content of Food	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.0
Quality of Service	3.0	1.0	2.5	2.5
Eating Environment	<u>2.0</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.4</u>
TOTALS	8.0	5.8	7.7	7.9
Mean Rating	2.67	1.93	2.57	2.63

TABLE 3-5
RESIDENTIAL LIVING
Quality Rating and Effectiveness Quotient

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Dormitories	2.67	1.17	1.40	3.17
Recreation	1.30	3.10	2.13	3.13
Counseling	4.00	3.30	2.00	3.30
Cafeteria	<u>2.67</u>	<u>1.93</u>	<u>2.57</u>	<u>2.63</u>
TOTALS	10.64	9.50	8.10	12.23
Quality Rating (total ÷ 4)	2.66	2.38	2.03	3.06
Cost Per Student	\$5,922	\$4,547	\$6,141	\$5,444
Effectiveness Quotient (quality ÷ X K*)	.45	.52	.32	.56
		<u>Private Sector</u>		<u>Public Sector</u>
Quality Rating		2.52		2.55
Costs		\$5,235		\$5,929
Effectiveness Quotient		.48		.43

*(K = one thousand)

Old Dominion (private), 2.38; and Harpers Ferry (public), 2.03. Note the substantial difference in overall quality in residential living between Flatwoods and the other three centers. This was the only one to make it into the "Good" category.

When costs are considered, Flatwoods finished with the highest Effectiveness Quotient, .56. Old Dominion was next with .52, followed by Potomac at .45, and Harpers Ferry at .32.

Note that Flatwoods had the highest Effectiveness Quotient because its Quality of Service was the highest and expenses intermediate. Old Dominion, by contrast, finished with the second highest Effectiveness Quotient, primarily because its costs were low despite finishing third in overall Quality. This difference highlights the conceptual issue of this dissertation. If Old Dominion had been evaluated strictly in terms of costs, it would have received the highest rating; when quality too is considered, however, it does not fare as well.

For its part, Potomac finished with the second best Quality Rating, but had expenditures of nearly \$500 greater per student than Flatwoods, resulting in the third highest Effectiveness Quotient. Harpers Ferry clearly spent the most money, yet finished with the lowest absolute quality rating, yielding the "least bang for the most bucks" and the lowest Effectiveness Quotient.

When we make gross sector comparisons the differences are

not great. The Quality Ratings are almost identical. Costs are lower in the private centers collectively, causing Effectiveness to be slightly superior there. In all these indicators individual center differences were greater than sector differences, a point to which we will return later.

Student Survey - Residential Living

The results of the student survey are shown in Table 3-6. These indicate that in the sub-category of quality of dormitories, Potomac (private) students rated their center the highest. This is followed by Flatwoods (public) Harpers Ferry (public) and then Old Dominion (private).

These results seem to confirm my impressions of the dormitories. The students and I gave Flatwoods and Potomac the highest ratings, and Harpers Ferry and Old Dominion the lowest. The difference is that I rated Flatwoods somewhat higher than Potomac in dormitory quality, while the students rated Potomac slightly higher. I speculate that this difference may be attributed to the higher value that I placed on dormitory maintenance, as compared to the students. Maintenance was better at Flatwoods. However, when I asked Flatwoods students what they liked about the dormitories, they usually made a comment such as "the staff treat me okay," or "I can sleep okay here," rather than commenting on the showers that worked or the overall maintenance of the dormitories. They may have been taking for

TABLE 3-6
STUDENT RATINGS OF RESIDENTIAL LIVING

	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Quality of Dormitory Conditions ¹	2.54	2.01	2.19	2.39
Likelihood of Help With Problems ²	2.34	2.14	1.97	2.18
Quality of Cafeteria Food ³	1.44	1.33	1.63	1.65
Quality of Recreation Opportunities ⁴	<u>2.56</u>	<u>2.33</u>	<u>1.93</u>	<u>2.26</u>
Mean Rating	2.22	1.95	1.93	2.12
		<u>Private Sector</u>		<u>Public Sector</u>
Quality of Dormitory Conditions ¹		2.28		2.29
Likelihood of Help With Problems ²		2.24		2.08
Quality of Cafeteria Food ³		1.39		1.64
Quality of Recreation Opportunities ⁴		<u>2.45</u>		<u>2.10</u>
Mean Rating		2.09		2.03

1. "How would you describe living conditions in your dormitory?"
2. "If you needed help with a problem of any kind, what is the likelihood that you would get the help you need at this center?"
3. "How would you rate the food in the cafeteria?"
4. "How would you rate the recreational opportunities that are available to you at this center?"

granted the excellent dormitory maintenance. Likewise, at Potomac, the students I interviewed rarely complained about the poor maintenance with the one exception being the nonfunctioning air conditioning.

Potomac students also rated their counseling program the highest, as I did in my field visits. The students at all four centers rated their centers' cafeterias poorly, with no cafeteria receiving a rating as high as 2.0 (fair). My quality ratings for cafeteria, though not high, were higher for all of the centers than were the student ratings. I speculate that the difference between us has to do with the fact that many Job Corps students are not used to a diet that contains the basic food groups, as served at each Job Corps center. Some of them told me they were used to a diet of french fries, and cola drinks. The other possibility is that were I to have eaten each meal at Job Corps, for up to one year, as the students do, I may have rated the food quality lower than I did. Variety, or the lack of it, in the eating environment, can bring with it a new perspective on the quality of the food.

The recreation program at Harpers Ferry had the lowest student rating, which I expected, but the students at Potomac rated their recreation program the highest of the four, which I did not expect since Potomac had very little in the way of a recreation program. I believe the Potomac students were responding partially to the freedom they have to do what they want. Without a recreation director or recreation program,

they were free from any direction in the matter of recreation. They were pleased with not having to exercise, and to be able to spend their evenings outside the dorms talking with other students.

When we compare the two sectors, in Table 3-6, we find that the private centers are rated the highest by the students in counseling and recreation, whereas the public centers are rated highest in the quality of cafeteria food, with the two sectors almost equal in dormitories.

CHAPTER IV
EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND SUPPORT

This chapter will examine basic education, vocational training, and the support services at each center. Basic education and vocational training are the core of the Job Corps program. Job Corps is set up so that students spend half of their time in basic education classes, and half in vocational training. The support services include medical and dental services and management and administration.

BASIC EDUCATION

Basic Education: Criteria and Justification

The quality of the basic education program at each center was determined by rating the following criteria: 1) Orderly Classroom Environment, 2) Student Attention from teachers, and 3) Facilities and Equipment.

An orderly classroom is conducive to learning, since it allows for easier communication between student and teacher and keeps distractions at a minimum. The more attention the student receives, the better he or she will learn. This is also a factor that contributes to higher self-esteem, which further advances the learning process. Poor facilities and equipment detract from the learning process. If students are forced to share equipment, those students awaiting their turn

quickly lose interest and become distracted. If an education building is not adequately heated, students and teachers will become uncomfortable and lose concentration.

Basic Education: Observations, Reactions and Rating

1) Orderly Classroom Environment:

Basic Education classes at all four centers consists of usually eight to fifteen students. The educational program at Flatwoods (public) is well organized and the students well behaved. If a student becomes disruptive or tries to sleep in class, he is corrected. I found classes orderly, with a relaxed atmosphere. Also I was impressed with how well the teachers at Flatwoods work together and consistently maintain order in the classrooms. A 4.0 rating was granted.

At Harpers Ferry (public) classes were also orderly, and the teachers stress discipline. Attentiveness in class is expected. Teachers are sometimes required to attend student progress meetings during classroom teaching hours, however; on these occasions, the students must do without a teacher for anywhere from five to thirty minutes. While the teacher is absent, many of the students sleep at their desks.

Although I was generally impressed with the way the teachers and students promoted order, I was mystified on those occasions when the class, myself included, was forced to wait for the teacher to arrive after being detained by another

meeting. I felt, as did the students I talked to, that it was the teacher's responsibility to be there on time. I gave Harpers Ferry a rating of 2.8, which reflects this problem.

In contrast to Flatwoods and Harpers Ferry, teachers at Old Dominion (private) often seem overwhelmed by discipline problems. Some students are rude and hold little respect for the teachers. For example, a few students walk in and out of the classroom at their own discretion during class. In some classrooms, the student desks are arranged in no particular order. Some students sat facing the back of the room, some faced the window, and still others faced the back wall.

Student sleeping in class is also a problem. In some classes, only a few students slept, but in others, as much as half the class slept. Some teachers make an effort to wake up the sleepers, but others do not, directing their attention to the rest of the class. This sometimes results in humorous incidents. In one class that I observed about ten students were sleeping. The conscientious teacher walked around the room tapping the head of each sleeper, saying, "Wake up." Each sat up for a moment and then drifted back to sleep. By the time the teacher finished one pass of the room, the first student was settling back into slumber. Seeing this, he started around the room again, tapping heads in succession.

Overall, I felt that the teachers at Old Dominion are committed to their work, but are overwhelmed by student discipline problems. One student told me that he came to class intending to stay awake, but when he saw so many others

sleeping, he was inclined to sleep as well. I gave Old Dominion a 1.0 rating in this category.

At Potomac (private), the classroom atmosphere is not as undisciplined as at Old Dominion. Students are not verbally rude to the teachers. There is a general sense of order; however, a few students do wander in and out of class at their own discretion, usually to take a "cigarette break." Potomac received a 2.0 rating.

2) Student Attention from Teachers:

In Job Corps classes students advance from one short, competency-based lesson to the next. As a result, learning is a solitary experience. Students sit at their desks and complete an assignment, then take it up to the teacher. They proceed at their own pace, and are assisted by the teacher only when they solicit help.

At both Flatwoods (public) and Harpers Ferry (public), teachers follow this practice of sitting at their desks while the students work in workbooks. They give attention to students primarily when they come up to ask a question, or to have their work checked for accuracy, or if behavior problems occur. While this method of teaching allows for "programmed" learning, it does not allow the students to learn from one another; nor is there an opportunity for the teacher and class to interact. Both centers received a 1.0 rating.

In contrast, many of the teachers at Potomac (private)

do not employ this normal Job Corps teaching method. Several of them teach in the traditional way, standing in front of the class and interacting with students.

Most of the teachers at Potomac are planning to move on to other jobs and, in many cases, establish careers. They see their work at Job Corps as a short-term project. Their salary, \$21,000, is low, especially considering the high cost of living in Washington, D.C. Most are looking for other work while they teach, and are thereby distracted. For example, one teacher wanted to be a film director and was putting together a documentary film in her off-work hours. Another was a professional singer and was in the process of setting up a performance in a downtown night club. Yet another wanted to continue teaching and was trying to secure a position in the District school system.

All of these teachers were well educated. Despite the fact that they saw their Job Corps position as temporary, they were enthusiastic about their work and committed to helping the students. I rated Potomac 3.4.

At Old Dominion (private), some of the teachers also give much attention to students and teach by interacting with the class from the front of the room. Others stick to the standard Job Corps method, monitoring student progress. In addition, the education director keeps the students informed of their progress by posting the quarterly test results in the education hallway. Teaching quality was not uniformly good, however, and I rated Old Dominion 2.7.

In the process of examining Student Attention from Teachers, I feel it is necessary to make the following observation. Both private centers have provisions for substitute teachers, if it becomes necessary. That is, money is available to cover costs. The public centers have no such provisions. If a public center teacher is out sick, attending a conference, or on vacation, the class is suspended until the teacher returns. My research disclosed there are no provisions in the Job Corps civil service practices for hiring substitute teachers.

3) Facilities and Equipment:

The facilities at Flatwoods (public) and Harpers Ferry (public) are spacious, new, and clean. Rooms are large, with new and sturdy desks and tables. I was highly impressed with the modern educational buildings I found at both centers.

In contrast, at Old Dominion (private) the classrooms are small. Even with only eight to fifteen students in a class, the classrooms seem crowded. In addition, hallways leading to the classrooms in the education department are dirty and littered with cigarette butts. At Potomac (private), the classrooms are also small, the desks old and unsteady. However, the hallways and classrooms are clean and well kept.

Each of the four centers has a good amount of equipment and supplies. In talking with teachers, I verified this. Televisions, VCRs, films, and audio-visual equipment are

available for use. There is an ample supply of workbooks, pens, paper, rulers, and other necessary items.

I rated Flatwoods and Harpers Ferry 4.0 for Facilities and Equipment. I was impressed with the clean and modern educational facilities. Potomac received a 2.8 because, although the classrooms are small and the desks old, the education building and classrooms are clean and well kept. Old Dominion was rated 2.0; although enough supplies and equipment are available, the classrooms are small and the educational building dirty.

Basic Education: Quality Rating and Effectiveness Quotient

The ratings for Basic Education are restated for each center in Table 4-1. Flatwoods had the highest mean Quality Rating, 3.00, followed by Potomac, 2.73, Harpers Ferry, 2.60, and Old Dominion, 1.90. As for costs per student, Harpers Ferry was highest at \$1,837, followed by Flatwoods at \$1,365, Potomac at \$1,213, and Old Dominion lowest at \$982.

Effectiveness Quotients show that Potomac finished in first place, with a 2.25; followed closely by Flatwoods at 2.20. Old Dominion's quotient was 1.93 with Harpers Ferry coming in with the lowest figure, 1.42. It can be maintained that Potomac appears best because quality was relatively high, but expenses per student were relatively low. In other words, it was quite good on both counts. In comparison to Potomac, Flatwoods' high Quality Rating of 3.0 was not enough

TABLE 4-1
 BASIC EDUCATION
 Quality Rating and Effectiveness Quotient

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Orderly Classroom	2.0	1.0	2.8	4.0
Attention from Teachers	3.4	2.7	1.0	1.0
Facilities & Equipment	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>
TOTALS	8.2	5.7	7.8	9.0
Mean Quality Rating	2.73	1.90	2.60	3.00
Cost Per Student	\$1,213	\$982	\$1,837	\$1,365
Effectiveness Quotient) (quality + cost X K*)	2.25	1.93	1.42	2.20
	<u>Private Sector</u>		<u>Public Sector</u>	
Quality Rating	2.31		2.80	
Costs	\$1,097		\$1,600	
Effectiveness Quotient	2.11		1.75	

*(K = one thousand)

to offset greater costs there. At Old Dominion, low costs and low quality occur together, while in Harpers Ferry both measures are high together—causing the quotient for each to be mediocre.

In contrast to residential living, where the sectors differed little, we see substantial contrast. The public centers, collectively, showed considerably more quality than the private, but also, considerably more costs. Thus, the private centers finished with a higher Effectiveness Quotient. This conclusion will make those who value service over costs ponder.

Educational Achievement Results

Let us digress for a moment and look at student achievement. This is another way to measure the quality of basic education received. Job Corps keeps data on the educational achievement of students in each center. Each center has a standard percentage of students who are expected to receive their GED (General Education Diploma) and to improve their reading and mathematical skills. This standard is different for each center. It is based on a formula which takes into consideration the age and race of students who enter each Job Corps center, and grade level previously completed. The results of the educational achievement data of students in the four centers are shown in Table 4-2.

Examining the tables, GED Standard achievement represents

TABLE 4-2
EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT DATA

	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
<u>GED Completion</u> (per cent)				
Standard	13.4	20.8	24.4	24.0
Actual	<u>13.3</u>	<u>15.6</u>	<u>31.2</u>	<u>34.7</u>
Difference	-.1	-5.2	6.8	10.7
<u>Reading Achievement</u> (Grade Level)				
Standard	1.8	2.0	2.1	1.8
Actual	<u>1.3</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>
Difference	-.5	-.2	-.2	.2
<u>Mathematical Achievement</u> (Grade Level)				
Standard	2.0	1.8	2.1	1.9
Actual	<u>1.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>2.1</u>
Difference	-0.9	0.2	-0.5	0.2

Source: U. S. Department of Labor Education Summary Report, 1990.

the percentage of students entering without a high school diploma that the Job Corps expects to pass their GED test while at that center. This calculation is based on experiences with a number of factors. The GED Actual achievement indicates the percentage of students who enter that center who actually do pass the GED test. A positive difference between the two figures indicates that the center had more students pass the GED test than the standard called for. A negative difference indicates that the center had fewer students pass the GED test than the standard called for. Standard and actual data are also available for reading achievement and mathematics achievement. These figures, however, represent grade-level gain rather than passage of a test.

The results indicate that both private centers had a negative difference between actual achievement and the standard on GED completion and reading achievement. Potomac also had a negative difference on mathematics achievement, whereas Old Dominion had a positive difference in that category. Of the public centers, Harpers Ferry met the standard for GED completion but not reading, or mathematics. Flatwoods, however, met the standard on all three education achievement categories.

On the basis of my own ratings and these achievement data, then, Flatwoods did the best job of the four centers in educating its students. Collectively, the two public centers did a better job of educating its students than did the

private centers in both forms of evaluation as well. Yet this quality differential was costly, taking us once again to the central issue of this dissertation.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Vocational Training: Criteria and Justification

The criteria for measuring the quality of Vocational Training are the following: 1) Quality of Supervision, 2) Equipment and Supplies, and 3) Variety of Training Experience.

Quality of supervision is important since Vocational Training opens students up to many physical dangers. Good supervision is required to insure proper use of tools and thorough implementation of safety procedures.

Equipment and supplies are critical in Vocational Training, since much of the training time is spent learning how to use tools and handle supplies. Much of the training focuses on the students' familiarity with tools used in the elected trade. Therefore, modern, well maintained equipment must be available for student use.

Those centers offering the greatest variety of training experiences have a better chance of meeting the various talents, and aptitudes of the student population. A variety of training opportunities should be available.

Vocational Training: Observations, Reactions and Rating

1) Quality of Supervision:

At Harpers Ferry (public) and Old Dominion (private) quality of supervision is outstanding. Both of these institutions are actively involved with the students and do indeed supervise their vocational training activities. During my field visits, most of the students were actually working in their respective trades and the instructor was close by to observe, direct and encourage them. I was impressed with the work of the vocational instructors at both centers and gave each of them a 4.0 rating.

In contrast, at Potomac (private) vocational instructors had a very negative attitude toward Job Corps. They complained that equipment repairs took too long, placing the blame on the national Job Corps office. During my field visit to Potomac, I observed that the instructors usually sent the students to another part of the campus to practice their vocational skills. For example, the carpentry instructor sent the students to a building on campus that needed carpentry work. The painting instructor sent students to a building that needed painting. The students left to go to work and the instructors stayed behind in their offices.

When I visited the buildings where the students were supposed to be practicing their vocation, I often found them sleeping on tables, or in some cases on the floor. Those

students who were not sleeping were usually sitting on tables and talking to one another. One student was sleeping inside a wheelbarrow, with his feet hanging out.

I felt as though the students were being shortchanged. They were left unsupervised and were not developing the kind of work habits they would need when they left Job Corps and went out to the job market. I gave Potomac a 1.0 rating for this reason.

At Flatwoods (public), most of the students seemed to receive supervised instruction, although the situation was mixed. Some students milled about for hours talking with one another and doing anything but work. Because of this unevenness I gave Flatwoods a 2.5 rating.

2) Equipment and Supplies:

I found the vocational Equipment and Supplies to be of similar quality at each of the centers. For example, in the carpenter's helpers classes, the students at all four centers are taught use of the basic hand tools, including: a square; a hand saw; a pocket tape; an electric skill saw; an electric drill; and an angle saw. In the bricklaying classes, the students at each center are instructed on how to "lay to the line" and how to use basic hand tools of the trade. Tools included a brick saw and mortar mixers.

Although the quality of the equipment is the same at each center, Potomac (private), exhibited some deficiencies.

Unlike the other centers, Potomac does not have a support vehicle, which is critically important for the purpose of transporting equipment. Consequently, Potomac students must transport equipment by hand. Sometimes this involves moving heavy equipment across the campus to the work project. This process is very time consuming.

Additionally, at Potomac much of the equipment seemed to be in need of repair. Instructors showed me various pieces of equipment (including a compressor, a welding machine, and threading equipment) that had been in need of service for months. I gave Potomac a 1.7 because of these problems and 3.5 to the other three centers.

3) Variety of Training Experience:

Students at all four centers have ample opportunity for hands-on work experience. All of the centers are periodically involved in community projects, and also do work on their own campus. The hands-on work experience ranges from restoring old homes in the community to building foot bridges at the Virginia Creeper Trail. During my field visits, some students at all four centers left the center to receive outside experience. As far as the formal training program is concerned, vocational training opportunities in the public centers are somewhat less than in the private centers. Flatwoods (public) and Harpers Ferry (public) offer training primarily in the traditional trades, i.e., carpenter's helpers and

electrician's helpers. The private centers offer training in the traditional trades, but also in other areas. Old Dominion (private) offers training in nursing, retail sales, and bookkeeping, as well as in the traditional trades. Potomac (private) covers transportation communication, business and clerical skills, and nursing assistance, as well as the traditional trades.

Missing from all of the centers are training programs in occupations that use computers. For example, there are no training programs for computer programming, even though the more advanced Job Corps students could benefit from this type of training. Old Dominion does offer training in bookkeeping, but even the teachers do not know how to use computers. Consequently, the bookkeeping students are taught bookkeeping by placing debits and credits in a written ledger, even though most organizations are now doing it on computer. Training the teachers to use computers is, however, one of the goals of each of the centers. Flatwoods already has some computer training for students, but that is only in one class. It does not provide training for a "computer" occupation.

I gave the private centers a 3.2 rating for added Variety of Training Experience, since they have opportunities for formal training beyond the traditional trades. Harpers Ferry earned a 2.5 rating, somewhat lower than Flatwoods which was rated 2.8 because it does offer some computer training.

Vocational Training: Quality Rating & Effectiveness Quotient

We see in Table 4-3 that the Mean Quality Rating for vocational training is highest for Old Dominion 3.57, followed by Harpers Ferry at 3.33, Flatwoods at 2.93 and Potomac at 1.97. Costs at Old Dominion were lower than at the other centers, which in combination with its high quality causes its Effectiveness Quotient to be significantly higher than the other centers. Harpers Ferry fares relatively well because, although its costs are high, so is its quality. Potomac came out as the least effective, since its expenditures were the highest and its Quality Rating lowest.

The data reveal that the public centers, when figures are averaged together, show a substantially higher Quality Rating than the private centers. Their greater costs largely absorb this advantage, however, yielding only a slightly higher Effectiveness Quotient.

Once again, differences in effectiveness are greater between the centers from each sector than between the sectors themselves. This reaffirms prior findings which indicate that the sector variable may be quite insignificant.

Training, Placement, and Salary

Again, let us digress, and this time look at aggregate data supplied by Job Corps concerning student training, placement and salary at the four centers (Table 4-4).

TABLE 4-3
VOCATIONAL TRAINING
Quality Rating and Effectiveness Quotient

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Quality of Supervision	1.0	4.0	4.0	2.5
Equipment and Supplies	1.7	3.5	3.5	3.5
Variety of Training Experience	<u>3.2</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.8</u>
Totals	5.9	10.7	10.0	8.8
Mean Quality Rating (total + 3)	1.97	3.57	3.33	2.93
Cost Per Student	\$2,668	\$1,778	\$2,663	\$2,095
Effectiveness Quotient (quality + cost X K*)	.74	2.01	1.25	1.40

Private Sector

Public Sector

Quality Rating	2.77	3.13
Costs	\$2,223	\$2,378
Effectiveness Quotient \$2,223	1.25	1.32

*(K = one thousand)

TABLE 4-4
TRAINING, PLACEMENT AND SALARY DATA

	<u>Potomac (private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (public)</u>
Training Duration (months)	7.8	7.2	7.6	7.4
Training Completed (percent)	62.7	37.0	40.3	52.7
Placement- Any Job (percent)	67.6	63.2	56.3	68.8
Placement- Training Related (percent)	34.2	38.0	32.7	46.9
Average Wage in Placement (dollars)	5.03	4.63	4.96	5.48

Private Sector

Public Sector

Training Duration (months)	7.1	7.5
Training Completed (percent)	49.9	46.5
Placement-Any Job (percent)	65.4	62.6
Placement- Training Related (percent)	36.1	39.8
Average Wage in Placement (dollars)	4.83	5.22

Source: Job Corps vocational outcome summary report, 1990.

The results indicate that both public centers have a slightly longer training duration, which means the average length of time students are trained in a vocational skill. Potomac (private) has the highest percentage of training completion, and Old Dominion (private) the lowest. Flatwoods (public), however, has the highest percentage of students placed in jobs, though this means any job, not necessarily a job related to their Job Corps training. Harpers Ferry (public) has the lowest percentage of students placed in any job.

The next category, Placement-Training Related, is more critical. It shows the Job-training match. This is the percentage of students trained in a trade at Job Corps who were actively placed in a job in that trade. Here, again, Flatwoods has the highest percentage of students placed, and Harpers Ferry, the lowest. Flatwoods students also received the highest wage once they were placed in a job, and Old Dominion students, the lowest.

Looking at the table as a whole, it shows that there are differences between the public and private centers in each area. However, in all areas, the differences are not very large, and actually, are quite similar.

When we examine the sectors, we see that the public centers finished higher in training duration, training related placement, and average wage for students placed in jobs, and the private centers finished higher in training completed, and placement on any job.

Student Survey - Education and Training

The results of the student survey for questions dealing with educational and vocational training are shown in Table 4-5. In Vocational Training, the centers were rated in the same order as I rated them in my field visits, with Old Dominion ranked the highest, followed by Harpers Ferry, Flatwoods and Potomac. However, whereas I had larger differences between centers from top to bottom, the student differences between centers were not as great.

In Basic Education, the students in the two private centers rated their GED, Math, and English classes equal to or slightly higher than the students did in the two public centers. This did not confirm my impression from the field visits. I believe the students at both private centers were responding in part to the freedom and lack of discipline that they found in the classrooms.

When we review the student ratings for the sectors, we find that the public centers rate slightly higher in vocational training, but lower in the area of basic education.

SUPPORT

Medical/Dental

All students are given a medical and dental exam upon entering Job Corps. The medical exam includes testing for the

TABLE 4-5
STUDENT RATINGS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Quality of Job Training Classes ¹	2.75	2.91	2.90	2.77
Quality of GED classes ²	2.63	3.08	2.68	2.51
Quality of Math and English Classes ³	2.64	2.70	2.55	2.44
Total	8.02	8.69	8.13	7.72
Mean Rating	2.67	2.90	2.71	2.57

	<u>Private Sector</u>	<u>Public Sector</u>
Quality of Job Training Classes ¹	2.83	2.84
Quality of GED Classes ²	2.86	2.60
Quality of Math and English Classes ³	2.67	2.50
Mean Rating	2.79	2.64

1. "How would you rate the job training classes that you are taking?"
2. "How would you rate the GED classes that you are taking?"
3. "How would you rate the math and English classes that you are taking?"

AIDS virus. The nature of these services is such that students are cared for in private consultation sessions. For this reason I was not able to observe these medical interchanges. My qualitative rating of Medical/Dental services is based on impressions of the overall program encountered at each center.

Potomac (private)

The Medical/Dental building at Potomac houses a dental office, a seven-bed sick room, two restrooms, an examination room, a supply room and a laboratory. This center is equipped to do minor lab work, including urinalysis and blood testing.

Full-time employees include: a nurse/manager; an RN; and an LPN. The following part-time employees complete the staff: a dental receptionist; a dental hygienist; a physician; a dentist; and a mental health consultant. Workers at the center feel comfortable with the workload and agree that staffing is sufficient.

Potomac is open for "sick call" from 7:15 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. every morning and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. every evening. At these times, walk-in medical consultations are available to students.

The program includes pregnancy and family planning services for female students, and a weight-control clinic for overweight students. The weight-control service allows the student to work out a low-calorie diet with the help of a

nurse. There are no special low-calorie trays served in the cafeteria; rather, the student is trained to choose low-calorie items from the selection offered.

In addition, at Potomac, unlike at the other centers, it is mandatory that all students be tested for drug use at the beginning of training. If results are positive, the student must undergo further testing to determine that drugs are no longer being used. At the other centers, drug testing is done only when staff determines that a student exhibits "suspicious" behavior.

At all of the centers, illegal drugs are accessible to those students who want them, from other students. Some students return from weekends away with an ample supply of illegal drugs which they are prepared to sell. The most common drugs at the centers are alcohol and marijuana. The drug PCP had also been popular, but it fell out of favor over a year ago.

Old Dominion (private)

Old Dominion has a new, modern medical building, with a very competent nurse/director. The medical building includes two exam rooms, a five-bed sick room, two restrooms, a kitchen, a dental office, and a laboratory for minor blood work and urinalysis.

Full-time employees include the managing nurse, two LPNs, a dental assistant, and a lab technician. The center also

employs a dentist, a physician, and a mental health consultant on a part-time basis. The managing nurse feels the staff is sufficient to handle the workload. Dental care is provided, as well as a pregnancy program for female students, and a weight control program for overweight students. The cafeteria, in conjunction with the medical department, offers a special low-calorie food tray at each meal for those students dieting. "Sick call" is available one hour each morning and afternoon.

Harpers Ferry (public)

At Harpers Ferry, the medical facility is quite small, with no capacity for lab work. The facility houses a two-bed sick room, a supply room, and an examination room. All dental and lab work is done off campus. Transportation is available for students for off campus lab and dental work. The only full-time employee is the health services manager, a nurse. This center also employs a part-time dentist, physician, and mental health consultant.

A serious shortage of help plagues the medical center at Harpers Ferry. The health services manager has no LPN or assistant. Besides her managerial duties, she is the substance abuse coordinator for the center. Due to the workload and lack of staff, she rarely has time to devote to the substance abuse program.

"Sick call" is one hour each morning. Overweight

students may consult with the nurse, but no special diet tray is offered by the cafeteria.

Flatwoods (public)

Flatwoods has a small medical building, which includes a three-bed sick room, an examination room, a restroom, and a supply room. All dental work and lab work is done off campus, and transportation for this is available to students. The center employs a full-time nurse/director. An LPN, a physician, a dentist, and a mental health consultant work on a part-time basis.

"Sick call" is from 7:00 a.m. to 7:30 a.m. each morning. Weight control counseling is available. Overweight students are encouraged to select low-calorie foods at the cafeteria, since a special tray is not provided. The medical staff complained of feeling overwhelmed with the workload at times.

Observations, Reactions and Ratings

During the weeks of my field visits I sought opportunities to spend time in the waiting rooms of each of the medical buildings of the four centers. My goal was to observe the interchange between students waiting for medical services and the medical staff. At all four centers, the staff member greeting the student was usually a nurse or nurse's assistant. At three of the centers, including

Flatwoods (public) Harpers Ferry (public) and Old Dominion (private) the welcome tended to be warm and friendly. The nurse usually said, "Hi," and inquired about the student's progress in the program. This inquiry was followed by a sincere, "How can I help you today?" If it happened to be a follow-up visit, the nurse would ask, "Are you feeling better?" or, "Did the medication help?"

In contrast, at Potomac greetings from the nursing staff were cool and impersonal. The staff member often asked, "What do you need?" or even worse, "Did you need something?"

The physical facilities and services offered at the two private centers were impressive. Facilities included the on-campus dental service and blood work lab. The public centers did not have these. I was also pleased to see the friendly and helpful attitude of the medical staff at Old Dominion. The demeanor of the medical staff at Potomac, however, left something to be desired. For these reasons, I gave Old Dominion a 4.0 rating and Potomac a 2.8.

I was impressed with the friendly and helpful attitude of the medical staff at both public centers, but less satisfied with the range of services offered, and the small, cramped quarters. Inadequate staffing at both centers was very much a concern of mine. Harpers Ferry, especially, was short staffed with only one nurse, who, though very competent, should have had at least one assistant. For these reasons, I gave Flatwoods a 2.6 rating and Harpers Ferry a 2.4.

Medical/Dental: Quality Rating and Effectiveness Quotient

The Quality Ratings and Effectiveness Quotients are shown in Table 4-6. Old Dominion was the most effective, with a 5.52 rating; followed by Flatwoods, 3.58; and Harpers Ferry, 2.56; and Potomac, 1.88.

Note that the private centers' lie at both extremes. Old Dominion was the most effective due to very high quality and the lowest expenses. Potomac by contrast, earned the lowest Effectiveness Quotient, a 1.88, because of its mediocre quality and enormously high expenses.

Effectiveness Quotients for the public centers fell between these extremes. Of the two public centers, Flatwoods, at 3.58, was more effective than Harpers Ferry, at 2.56, primarily because of lower costs.

When the sectors are compared, the private centers show higher quality but also higher costs, causing the two sectors' Effectiveness Quotients to be almost identical. Because of the great differences between centers in each sector (particularly the private sector), however, we must be cautious in drawing general conclusions.

ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

Managing a Job Corps center, which admits a new busload of students every week, is an extremely complex and difficult task. I did not have access to executive meetings. However,

TABLE 4-6
MEDICAL/DENTAL
Quality Rating and Effectiveness Quotient

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Overall Service Quality	2.80	4.00	2.40	2.60
Cost Per Student	\$1,492	\$724	\$940	\$727
Effectiveness Quotient (quality + cost x K)	1.88	5.52	2.56	3.58

	<u>Private Centers</u>	<u>Public Centers</u>
Quality Rating	3.40	2.50
Costs	\$1,108	\$834
Effectiveness Quotient	3.07	3.00

*(K = one thousand)

during my field visits I was able to gain a sense of how well each center operated. My quality ratings for Management/Administration were directed toward a determination of the general progress and direction of each center. I also tried to determine if the operation of each center ran smoothly, with coordination, or in a haphazard way. Finally, I tried to pay attention to, and report on, the level of staff satisfaction at each center.

Flatwoods (public)

I was impressed with how well members of the staff at Flatwoods work with one another. The work seems well coordinated. Most employees have worked with one another for years, and they respect each other.

The program seems to run smoothly. Communication with staff and students is through meetings. Likewise, managers communicate with the students, either through the dormitory personnel, or by holding a big meeting in the gymnasium.

The overall appearance of the center reflects well on management and the maintenance staff. The campus is well landscaped, the buildings are clean and the center has an effective system for reporting maintenance needs.

Additionally, center management looks for ways to stimulate and improve the program. For example, in education, introduction to drafting is now offered as an enhancement to the math program.

I gave Flatwoods a 3.5 rating for Management because activities are well coordinated and the overall appearance of the campus is excellent.

Harpers Ferry (public)

In contrast, Harpers Ferry has serious problems with coordination of activities and staff morale. As mentioned, too often the dormitory staff calls in sick on weekends due to poor morale, leaving the dormitories understaffed. Various members of the staff across the center do not communicate with one another due to differences and animosities.

There is also a general feeling of lack of respect for the director. (In defense of the director, it appeared that he was in a situation where some members of the staff placed their personal vendettas against him ahead of serving the students.) The result is a center with many communication and coordination problems.

The Center management disciplinary system seems to lack respect. As stated earlier, there is a feeling that disciplinary actions are not upheld at the top. The staff feel they do not get support from management in their efforts to discipline students.

There have been other problems. On one occasion, several students allegedly assaulted another student with a broomstick in his dormitory room. This occurred on a weekend when the dormitories were short staffed. That alleged incident was

reported in the Washington Post and prompted a national Job Corps office investigation. On another occasion, students caused a fire to start in one of the dormitories, causing such extensive damage that the building had to be closed for renovation.

Additionally, there appear to be problems with overseeing the student scheduling efforts. During the day, students can be observed around the campus without any apparent assignment.

In order to deal with these problems, it appears that management has tried to make decisions that would satisfy everyone, including students and staff, rather than take the decisive, authoritative approach that is sometimes necessary when difficult problems present themselves. In the process, management has satisfied no one.

Harpers Ferry received a 1.5 rating for Management because so many problems, especially in the dormitories and with staff morale, have gone unsolved.

Old Dominion (private)

Management at Old Dominion has done a good job of keeping an open system of communication with students and with staff, which includes meetings and memos. The leadership has also done a good job of personnel management, especially in selecting staff positions. Many of those in responsible positions, including the administrative services manager, the

education and training director, the nurse/manager, and some of the teachers, have excellent qualifications and work hard to help the overall center's operations.

Management should also take credit for public relations efforts with the townspeople of Monroe, Virginia, where Old Dominion is located. In 1984, an Old Dominion Job Corps student murdered a staff member as she was jogging on the Old Dominion outdoor track. After that incident relations between the center and the town of Monroe were very fragile for several years. The director of Old Dominion has worked very hard over the past six years to re-establish more stable relationships with the townspeople, and has largely succeeded.

Old Dominion has one serious problem, however, that undermines the other positive aspects of management's efforts-that being lack of discipline among the students. Students are rude and boisterous, and get away with it, frustrating the other students who are serious about the program. Somehow, the need for discipline has not been communicated from top management down throughout the staff.

I gave Old Dominion a 2.2 rating for Management, primarily because of my concern for the lack of discipline and its effect on the program.

Potomac (private)

Potomac's formal system of communication uses meetings and memos. I found, however, that staff morale is low. The staff turnover rate of approximately 100 percent is a reflection of that low morale.

The complaint that I heard most often from the staff was that, though concerned with helping the students, management ignores staff problems. As a result, staff cliques have formed throughout the center, each trying to belittle the other in order to advance themselves.

Another complaint I often heard from the staff was that the director listens to a few friends among the staff, but the information these friends give him about other staff may not be accurate.

Lack of adequate training is another problem for Potomac management. The center hires management personnel, such as personnel managers and finance managers, who have no Job Corps experience, and then places them on the job without providing any training whatsoever. They are expected to immediately perform well on the job. The result, predictably, is that too often they don't, are fired, and replaced by someone else.

For example, Potomac had four different personnel managers in program year 1989. During 1990, Potomac fired its personnel manager again, and immediately after firing him, escorted him off the Potomac campus, making it all the more humiliating for the dismissed employee. Because of the

problems just discussed, I gave Potomac a 2.0 rating.

Quality Ratings and Effectiveness Quotients

In examining the data for Management/Administration in Table 4-7, the results show quite a large difference between Flatwoods and the other centers in quality of service and effectiveness. At Flatwoods, the quality of service rating of 3.5 is much higher than for Potomac at 2.0, Old Dominion with 2.2, and Harpers Ferry at 1.5.

At Flatwoods, the Effectiveness Quotient was 1.01, compared to .53 for Old Dominion, .38 for Harpers Ferry, and .31 for Potomac. The much higher quotient at Flatwoods is because it had the least cost for Administration/Management per student, and by far the highest Quality Rating.

The other centers suffer by comparison. Costs were much higher, especially for the private centers, and their quality ratings were generally lower.

The public centers' combined average Quality Rating of 2.50 was somewhat higher than the combined rating for the private centers, 2.10. The excellent showing of Flatwoods was more than undercut by the poor performance at Harpers Ferry. When the Effectiveness Quotients are combined and averaged, the public centers finish higher at .67, to .39 for the private centers.

Notably, the costs for Administration and Management in the private centers average \$5,323 per student, but only

TABLE 4-7
ADMINISTRATION/MANAGEMENT
Quality Rating and Effectiveness Quotient

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Management Quality Rating	2.0	2.2	1.5	3.5
Cost Per Student	\$6,511	\$4,136	\$3,964	\$3,461
Effectiveness Quotient (quality ÷ cost X K*)	.31	.53	.38	1.01

Private Sector

Public Sector

Quality Rating
Costs
Effectiveness
Quotient

2.1

\$5,324

.39

2.5

\$3,713

.67

*(K = one thousand)

\$3,712 for the public centers. Table 4-8 further breaks down the costs for Management and Administration. Here we see that the reason for the higher costs in Administration is the greater cost for salaries and benefits paid at the private centers which, of course, increases the overall costs.

The higher costs in this area of management/Administration were not expected. In this study, if any sector is top heavy with management and administrative salaries, it is the private sector, not the public sector.

Student Survey - Support

The student survey data for "Support" is shown in Table 4-9. On the question about the quality of medical services, the student ratings are lower for each center than were my field visit ratings. Harpers Ferry had the highest student rating, at 2.01 which is not that good. In my interviews with students at each of the centers, they frequently complained about the fact that they could not see a Doctor or Nurse whenever they wanted to, rather than during specific sick-call hours, as required by each center. I speculate that this accounts for the lower student ratings. As I observed the overall operation of each medical center, I could see their numerous responsibilities, and could therefore understand why they had specific sick-call hours.

In the questions about management, the students at

TABLE 4-8
ADMINISTRATION/MANAGEMENT
Cost Per Student

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Potomac</u> <u>(Private)</u>	<u>Old</u> <u>Dominion</u> <u>Private)</u>	<u>Harpers</u> <u>Ferry</u> <u>(Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods</u> <u>(Public)</u>
<u>Management</u>				
Operating Expenses	\$232	\$208	\$132	\$132
Salaries, Wages & Benefits	360	290	341	476
<u>Administration</u>				
Operating Expenses	\$2,619	\$1,337	\$2,215	\$1,785
Salaries, Wages & Benefits	3,300	2,300	1,276	1,068
Administration/ Management Total Costs	\$6,511	\$4,135	\$3,964	\$3,461
	<u>Private Sector</u>		<u>Public Sector</u>	
<u>Management</u>				
Operating Expenses		\$220		\$132
Salaries		\$325		\$409
<u>Administration</u>				
Operating Expenses		\$1,978		\$2,000
Salaries, Wages & Benefits		\$2,800		\$1,172
Administration/ Management Total Costs		\$5,323		\$3,713

TABLE 4-9
STUDENT RATINGS OF SUPPORT

	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Quality of Medical Services ¹	1.88	1.79	2.01	1.89
Quality of Management ²	2.30	1.96	1.93	2.15
Meet Personal Expectations ³	2.30	2.02	1.98	2.26
Mean Rating	2.16	1.92	1.97	2.10

	<u>Private Sector</u>	<u>Public Sector</u>
Quality of Medical Services ¹	1.84	1.95
Quality of Management ²	2.13	2.04
Meet Personal Expectations ³	2.16	2.12
Mean Rating	2.04	2.04

1. "How would you rate the services provided by the nurses and doctors?"
2. "The people who are running this Job Corps center -- What kind of job do you think they are doing?"
3. "How would you rate this center at meeting your expectations?"

Potomac and Flatwoods rated their centers the highest, followed by Old Dominion and Harpers Ferry. The differences, however, were not large. I rated Flatwoods management the highest, so I wasn't surprised that the students also rated it high. However, I rated Potomac management lower than did the Potomac students. I speculate that the freedom and lack of direction that Potomac students were accustomed to in recreation and vocational training may be the reason for their higher rating for administration/management. When we examine the sector differences for the student responses, we see that the public sector ranked somewhat higher in the quality of Medical/Dental services and the private sector slightly higher in Administration/Management.

CHAPTER V
HUMAN RESOURCES

So far we have examined and quantified characteristics of residential living, education, training, and support to see how it affects cost and quality of both publicly and privately operated Job Corps centers. To restate in somewhat different terms, we have explored whether one way of measuring the various categories of services that make up the Job Corps program is clearly more effective than the other way, (i.e., the public sector approach vs. the private sector approach) in an attempt to inform the ongoing public/private debate.

We should not be too surprised that our results are indicative rather than conclusive. We have considered some factors influencing cost, and we have dealt with the complex issues of quality in the realm of human services, a very difficult measure to quantify. Even so, we feel strongly that to analyze for cost alone when evaluating the adequacy of a human services program (as opposed, let us say, to a per-transaction arrangement such as a trash disposal service, for example) makes little sense. Any method of managing a human services program that displays a considerable cost savings but shows poor quality of service sacrifices its basis for selecting it as more effective than another program that costs more but produces significantly more appreciable quality.

For either the public or private sector methodology to be

considered as more effective, it must be demonstrably not only less costly but also show quality of service results that are at least as good as the other sector. Or, it must demonstrate significantly better quality of service results for a similar expense. Ideally, a human service program could be devised that both cuts costs and enhances quality. The results of this study on Job Corps, unfortunately, do not affirm definitely that either the publicly managed centers or the privately managed centers are with any certainty moving toward this ideal. This brings us to the concerns of our present chapter on human resources.

Our goal within this chapter is to bring human resources into the scope of our study and see how it affects cost and quality of services in both publicly and privately operated Job Corps centers. By human resources we mean the employees.

The same system that manages residential living, education, training, and support is also responsible for administering the program's human resources. It is not at all unreasonable to assume that anything we learn about a management system by studying how it deals with its personnel will reflect upon its quality of services and its costs.

Our study begins by comparing the salaries of a representative group of employees at each center. By doing this we can learn what value, in terms of dollars, each center places on each type of employee. If, for example, either the public or private centers show that, as a group, they are invoking a policy of thrift, this may reveal something about

the management philosophy of that sector. However, if comparisons show that either the public or the private centers pay top-dollar for employees we will have gained substantial insight suggesting quality as a priority. Since employee salaries account for a sizable slice of the bottom-line costs, salary comparisons are a very valid unit of measurement. Employee benefits are examined in the same manner to counterbalance our salary findings. We seek to determine if those employees collecting higher salaries are, perhaps, receiving lesser benefits; or, if higher salaries and better benefits go hand in hand. Also, since greater benefits suggest a concern for the well-being of the employee, we might also assume this concern would filter down to the students. A dynamic of this sort would be a positive indicator of a quality program.

Before we finish surveying benefits, we will check to see if better benefits are reflected in a lower employee turnover rate. Furthermore, we will extend our scope to the student arena to find out if better employee benefits translates into a higher student completion rate.

We will also look at the size of the workforce at each center. By examining the staff-student ratios, we should receive some clue into the availability of staff to carry out the services offered by Job Corps.

The comparison of salary, benefits, and size of workforce will be followed up by a third critical point, maintenance of a representative workforce. This is not a money issue, but a

strong measure of quality in the different centers. Since the majority of the student population is Black, we shall investigate staffing to see if that same majority is represented there.

Of course, more important than the percentage of Blacks on staff, is the amount of power and authority they wield. I believe this information can be boiled down to one indicator which will reveal the power and authority of Blacks in that workforce. It is represented by an "influence quotient," the determination of which is explained later in this chapter.

SALARIES

We begin by comparing the salaries of a representative group of employees at each center, as shown in Table 5-1.

The salaries of one group of employees, the teachers, are shown from the starting salary to the third year of service, because their salaries change noticeably in the public sector in that time frame. The other occupational salaries represent starting salaries only, and do not include second and third year salaries, because the yearly increases for these salaries, in both sectors, are minor and are also similar to one another.

As the table indicates, the private centers start their teachers at \$21,000, but, then, depending upon economic conditions, offer a yearly raise which is usually 3% to 7% of their salary. Two years after starting, the public center

TABLE 5-1
JOB CORPS SALARIES

	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Teachers:				
Starting	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$16,500	\$16,500
2nd Year	\$22,470	\$22,470	\$21,000	\$21,000
3rd Year	\$23,900	\$23,900	\$25,000	\$25,000
Counselors:				
Starting:	\$23,000	\$20,000	\$25,700	\$25,700
Average:	\$21,500		\$25,700	
Dormitory Personnel:				
Starting:	\$15,000	\$13,800	\$16,500	\$16,500
Average:	\$14,400		\$16,500	
Education Supervisor:				
Starting:	\$30,000	\$26,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
Average:	\$28,000		\$30,000	
Nurse Manager:				
Starting:	\$35,500	\$25,500	\$28,000	\$24,800
Average:	\$30,500		\$26,400	
Director:	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000

teachers will be making \$25,000, whereas the private center teachers will be making, at most, \$23,900. Despite the fact that private center teachers start out with a salary that is \$4,500 higher than the public center teachers, that salary advantage is lost within two years. The average salary for counselors, dormitory workers, and education supervisor is higher in the public centers, but the average salary for the managing nurse is higher in the private center. The director salary is the same at each center.

All of the centers, in dollar terms, place the least value on the people who work in the dormitories. This may not be surprising, but it is unfortunate, since the dormitory workers spend the most time with the students, and do a lot of informal counseling.

JOB RELATED BENEFITS

We carry our analysis on from the topic of salaries to a comparison of benefits packages at the two types of Job Corps centers. We want to determine whether centers that pay higher salaries also provide better benefits which shows a genuine concern for the well-being of their employees which could point to a pervading philosophy centered on welfare and equity that is passed on to Job Corps students as well. We also want to determine whether centers that offer limited (or no) benefits offer relatively higher salaries and in this way control their human resource cost but still remain competitive

in the workforce marketplace.

Finally, we want to look at whether or not employees receiving benefits are more likely to remain in their positions, serving the needs of the Job Corps students.

Health Insurance and Retirement Pensions All four centers provide health insurance for their full time employees. However, only the public centers offer a retirement pension plan for their employees to draw upon at retirement. Employees at Potomac and Old Dominion are offered no retirement plan.*

Vacation time and holiday leave The public centers offer employees with up to 3 years service 4 hours vacation time for each two week pay period, which comes to 104 hours yearly, or 13 days. Those with 3-15 years experience get 6 hours vacation each pay period, which comes to 156 hours per year, or 19 1/2 days each year. Employees with over 15 years service get 8 hours vacation per pay period, or 208 hours, which is 26 days. They receive 10 paid holidays each year.

One of the private centers, Potomac, offers employees who have up to 5 years experience 10 days vacation each year. Those who have 6 or 7 years experience receive 11 days vacation annually, and those with 7-15 years experience receive 15 days a year. With 16-25 years experience, Potomac

*Potomac was rumored to be considering offering a retirement pension plan to their employees by early 1991.

employees receive 20 days vacation each year, and with over 25 years experience, they get 25 days vacation annually. They receive 10 paid holidays each year.

Old Dominion, the other private center, offers a vacation plan that is somewhat different than Potomac's. Old Dominion employees with up to 10 years experience receive 10 days per year vacation time. Those with 11 to 20 years experience receive 15 days vacation annually, and those with over 20 years receive 20 days vacation a year. Old Dominion employees also receive 10 paid holidays per year. Whereas the holiday leave time is the same at each center, the vacation time is clearly better in the public centers. A public center employee with only 1 year of experience receives more vacation time than an employee at Potomac who has 7 years experience, and more vacation time than an employee at Old Dominion who has 10 years experience. An employee in a public center with only 3 years experience gets more vacation time than an employee at Potomac who has 14 years experience, and more than an employee at Old Dominion with 19 years experience.

Sick Leave Each public center employee receives 4 hours sick leave per 2 week pay period, which translates into 104 hours a year, or 13 days sick leave per year. If the sick leave is not used, it can be accumulated indefinitely from year to year.

At Potomac, employees receive 40 hours, or 5 days sick leave during the first year of service, and 10 days in the

second year of service and beyond. There is no accrual of unused sick leave from year to year.

The other private center, Old Dominion, offers 12 days sick leave per year for employees at all levels of experience. Each employee may carry over from year to year one-half of the unused sick leave, up to a maximum of 35 days.

The sick leave time offered employees also favors the public centers. This is especially true since any unused sick time can be accumulated indefinitely in the public centers, but not at all at Potomac and only up to a maximum of 35 days at Old Dominion.

Flexitime Both public centers offer flexitime work schedules to administrative and counseling personnel. Teachers and dormitory workers, however, cannot use flexitime. Flexitime works in two week cycles, which include working 9 hour days monday through friday and the following monday through wednesday, then working an 8 hour day on thursday, and then receiving friday off, to make a 3 day weekend every other week. Neither of the private centers offer flexitime scheduling to their employees. Private center employees work a straight 8 hour shift each day and a 40 hour work week.

We conclude that those Job Corps centers that pay better salaries, the public centers, also provide better benefits for their employees, suggesting a general concern for their well being.

We can also conclude that the private centers, which

provide less benefits, are not attempting to remain competitive in the workforce marketplace by offering relatively higher salaries. We learned in Table 5-1 that salaries in the private centers are generally lower than those in the public centers.

Given the assumption that the salary and benefits paid by an employer to its employees reflect the employer's interest in the employee, the public centers seem to value their workers more. Public Job Corps centers generally pay a higher salary, though not a lot higher, and have better job related benefits than do the private centers. This last point leads us to investigate whether higher salaries and better benefits are predictive of job satisfaction, and presumably quality job performance. It requires a comparison of employee turnover rates at the four centers.

JOB SATISFACTION

If we present staff turnover rates along with data on how many students complete their Job Corps training, and along with student educational progress, we should get some interesting results. Does the rate of staff turnover correlate with students' failure to complete their studies at Job Corps? (Note that data on student educational and vocational progress was presented in Chapter 4 and will be reintroduced here to make a point.)

Employee Turnover Rate The annual turnover rate for employees at each of the four centers are as follows: Potomac (private) 100 percent (estimate); Old Dominion (private) 23 percent; Flatwoods (public) 12 percent; and Harpers Ferry (public), 5 percent. (Department of Labor, Job Corps Summary Report, 1990), Clearly the private centers have more trouble keeping their employees, especially Potomac. There is much more stability of staff in the public centers. We must infer that one reason for the higher turnover rate in the private centers is the fact that members of private center staff receive generally less pay than members of public center staff, and because job related benefits are not as good, especially the lack of a retirement plan. In my interviews with staff at both private centers, the lack of a retirement plan was a concern to many of them.

We must also consider if employees at the public centers exhibit more dedication to their "vocation" as Job corps employees, or to put it another way, as helpers of the underprivileged, than their counterparts in the private centers. Among the public center employees, is there a more direct alignment with the underlying public policies that give life to Job Corps?

In my field visits to Job Corps centers, I was impressed with the commitment displayed to helping the students, by so many of the staff members at the public centers. But, I was equally impressed with the staff members at the private centers who exhibited that same attitude and drive to help the

students. The higher turnover rates at the private centers are apparently due to the lower salaries and diminished job benefits in the private centers, not due to less dedication to Job Corps ideals on the part of private center staff members. We must also consider other causal factors for leaving the job, such as poor working conditions, or low employee morale. Certainly the morale of staff at Potomac (private) was low, as discussed in Chapter 4. Likewise, the rude behavior of the students at Old Dominion (private) make working conditions difficult there. These factors do, I believe, contribute to the turnover rate at each center. However, we must remember that Harpers Ferry (public) has severe staff morale problems and yet its turnover rate is only 5 percent, the lowest of the four centers. I believe that the good job related benefits, especially the retirement benefits, contribute to the decision by Harpers Ferry staff not to leave their jobs, despite the low morale problem. Meanwhile, at the private centers, the benefits are not as good, and the staff are therefore more likely to leave when working conditions are less than desired, or morale is low, or both.

Let us see if there is any apparent relationship between staff turnover rate and students' failure to complete their program of study. We learned in Chapter 4 that the private center students collectively have a 49.9 percent completion rate in Vocational Training. The public centers collectively have a completion rate of 46.5 percent, slightly less than the private centers. Clearly, the higher turnover rate among the

private center staff has not adversely affected the vocational training completion rate of students.

Now we re-examine the educational achievement data previously reported in Chapter 4, to see if there is an apparent relationship between student educational progress, or lack of it, and staff turnover rate. We learned that Potomac finished with a negative difference between the standard and actual performance on GED completion, reading achievement, and mathematical achievement. Potomac did not meet the standard in any of the educational achievement categories. Old Dominion did not meet the standard in GED completion or reading achievement, but did meet the standard in mathematical achievement. Harpers Ferry met the standard in GED completion, but not in reading achievement and mathematical achievement. Flatwoods met the standard in all three categories. This means that both public centers met the standard for GED completion, but neither private center did. We can possibly speculate that the greater stability among the staff at the public centers may have contributed to the higher GED completion rate at those centers.

Student-Staff Ratio

One other finding that I mentioned previously is important and bears repeating. I found during my field visits that the public centers had some problem with short staffing. With more employees the quality ratings for the public centers

in recreation and counseling would have been better.

Table 5-2 provides a look at the staff-student ratio from the student population figures presented in Chapter I, and reveals that the public centers could use more staff. The students per staff ratio is higher in both public centers than in the private centers.

When these figures are averaged, we find that the private centers have one staff member for each 2.55 students, and the public centers have one staff member per 3.68 students, a notable difference.

In my discussions with Job Corps personnel in the Labor Department, I learned that these ratio patterns are common in Job Corps centers throughout the country. Most private centers have a lower staff to student ratio than do the public centers. The public centers must keep their costs down because of their higher salaries and benefits. This is done by streamlining the number of staff they carry. These figures go against the notion that the public sector is bloated and more likely to be overstaffed.

The philosophy of human resource management in the private centers seems to be that they will employ more staff, but pay them less and offer limited benefits, realizing that this may result in a high turnover rate. They feel, however, that they can replace those who leave with new employees. They are willing to sacrifice stability in the workforce in order to have a larger number of employees to serve the students.

TABLE 5-2
Student-Staff Ratio

	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>	<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>	<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>	<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>
Students	412	346	168	220
Staff	168	131	49	56
Students Per Staff	2.45	2.64	3.43	3.93
	<u>Private Sector</u>		<u>Public Sector</u>	
Average	2.55		3.68	

At the public centers, the philosophy of human resource management seems to be that they will pay their staff better salaries and offer better job related benefits. This will keep their staff from leaving and will provide continuity and stability of operations, benefiting the students. The greater costs for salaries and benefits, however, means that they will have to perform some services with less employees than would be desirable, to keep costs at a reasonable level.

REPRESENTATIVE WORKFORCE

Next we look at hiring practices at the public and private centers, specifically as regards minority hiring. It might be expected that the public centers, as direct agents of public policy, would more nearly reflect in their employee populations the aims of a policy such as Equal Employment Opportunity, or Affirmation Action. That is, since Job Corps has as its reason for being the assistance of disadvantaged youth, and, many of those youth are members of minorities, we might expect greater numbers of minority workers employed at these centers. If not greater in terms of raw percentages, minority staff positions may at least more nearly approximate the number of minority students served by the centers. We might also expect to find more minority persons promoted to positions of influence and responsibility in public centers.

To investigate this possibility, we use the notion of an "influence quotient" to measure how many minority persons are

represented in positions of power and authority as compared with the number of minority employees in general at a particular center. This hypothetical quotient will serve to discover whether centers that have as a social ideal the empowerment of Blacks, for example, are implementing this policy in their own centers. The "influence quotient" is derived from dividing the percent of management staff in a racial category by the percent of all staff in that category. If the influence quotient is below 1.0, it means that the percentage of Blacks on the management staff at that center is less than the percentage of Blacks on the entire staff. If the influence quotient is above 1.0, it means that the percentage of Blacks on the management staff is greater than the percentage of Blacks on the entire staff at that center.

On the other hand, it is not implausible to assume that the private centers, relying on market forces of supply and demand active in the overall workforce from which they draw their employees, would tend to hire whomever among the qualified they could contract at the least expense. This could include, in significant proportion, minority group members, especially those who are young and relatively inexperienced. It could also include many middle-aged or older employees displaced from other jobs who might have difficulty securing a position at higher salary levels in the greater economy. In this part of the chapter, then, we explore the data collected to see, which, if any, of our expectations or assumptions bear out.

An argument can be made that a program such as Job Corps, whose students are largely disadvantaged Black youth, can only be truly effective when its staff service population more or less represents its student body. This practice not only facilitates support and respect among students and staff, it also provides natural role models for the students to emulate.

Racial Composition of the Job Corps Workforce Data measuring racial composition are shown in Table 5-3. Three of the four centers have an overwhelmingly Black population of students; Potomac, Old Dominion and Harpers Ferry. Only Flatwoods comes close to a balanced student population, at 51 percent Black. A somewhat parallel situation exists regarding staff. Blacks make up only 19 percent of the staff at Flatwoods but 59 percent at Harpers Ferry, 62 percent at Old Dominion, and 95 percent at Potomac.

Given the assumption that racial approximation between students and staff is important, the private centers fare better in this regard.

Only at the public centers, especially Flatwoods, are Blacks significantly less represented on the staff than in the student body. This difference was not expected. There is a phenomenon in the public centers which makes it difficult for racial approximation between students and staff to take place.

Re-examining the turnover rate of staff members brings this to light. Recall the annual turnover rates at each of

TABLE 5-3

RACIAL COMPOSITION
 (B = Black W = White O = Other*)

	<u>Potomac (Private)</u>			<u>Old Dominion (Private)</u>			<u>Harpers Ferry (Public)</u>			<u>Flatwoods (Public)</u>		
	B	W	O	B	W	O	B	W	O	B	W	O
(Percent)												
Students	92	7	1	73	19	2	90	9	1	51	46	3
All Staff	95	4	1	62	32	6	59	41	0	19	81	0
Management Staff	73	23	4	35	65	0	66	34	0	25	75	0
Influence Quotient (Management Staff + All Staff)	.77	5.75	4.0	.56	2.03	0	1.12	.83	0	1.32	.93	0

*Asians and Native Americans

the four centers: Potomac (private) 100 percent; Old Dominion (private) 23 percent; Flatwoods (public) 12 percent and Harpers Ferry (public) 5 percent. This higher turnover rate for private centers, as we have explained, seems to be the result of lower salaries and reduced job-related benefits as compared to the public centers which exceed the private centers in these areas. Frequent turnover permits minorities to gain access to these jobs despite their lower compensation and benefits. By contrast, many of the staff at Flatwoods (public) are "locals"-white males who have been living in or around Coeburn, Virginia, for decades. They are satisfied with their jobs, pay, and benefits, and have no plans to leave this center for work elsewhere. Consequently, there is little opportunity to hire new employees, including minority applicants.

The basic assumption, then, is that the workforce in the public centers is skewed toward the white population. However, interestingly enough, a greater percentage of Blacks holds management positions at the public centers, if one considers the percentage in light of the racial composition of all staff of each center. Table 5-3 shows that the influence quotient is substantially higher for Blacks in both public centers compared to the private centers.

This is significant because it suggests that, though Black employees may not be as well represented in the public centers in terms of overall percentages, those who do gain employment there are more likely to wield power than are

Blacks employed in the private centers. This validates the perception that many Blacks have, which is that their economic salvation lies in opportunities in the public sector and not in the private sector. It further suggests that the public centers offer Blacks a quicker, easier avenue for power and prestige, and a greater opportunity to perform as a more substantial role model for Black students. Working in the private centers, for Blacks, is not much better than finding employment in a seasonal or temporary job. Recall that private center Job Corps positions offer no retirement benefits. Also, there is little chance for advancement and there is a high employee turnover rate.

SUMMARY

This chapter focuses on human resource tasks at the four subject Job Corps centers, hoping to discover differences between publicly and privately managed human resource programs that shed some light on the management styles, predispositions, and philosophies of the centers in general. We have also searched for evidence that social equity mechanisms are in place and affecting perceptions of Job Corps program effectiveness.

Data comparing the two public and two private Job Corps centers in salary, benefits, staff turnover rates, size of workforce, race, and opportunity for advancement, were presented. Salaries are generally somewhat higher in the

public centers. The job-related benefits are clearly better at the public centers, because they offer both retirement and health insurance to employees and offer better sick leave and vacation plans as well. Public centers also offer flextime work schedules for administrative personnel and counselors, which the private centers do not.

The private centers have more staff per students enrolled, but have a higher turnover rate of that staff. The turnover rate is especially high at the Potomac center in Washington, D.C. It is difficult to tell if the higher turnover rates in the private centers hinders student training. On the one hand, private center students have a vocational training completion rate that is slightly above the public centers, but in education, their GED completion rate is below the standard, while both public centers meet the Standard for GED completion rate.

The racial composition of staff and students more equally approximates one another in the private centers. This is due to high staff turnover rates, however, not enlightened policy. Blacks in the public centers have greater opportunities to wield power and influence by becoming members of the management staff than do Blacks in the private centers, but it is hard to know if this is because of stability in the workforce or policies that allow quicker advancement to Blacks, such as Affirmative Action.

CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to determine if private or public Job Corps centers are more effective providers of services. Effectiveness of services was derived from considering comparative cost results in relation to my quality of service determinations. Specifically, it sought to assess if there were differences in effectiveness of services between two private and two public Job Corps centers, including; 1) The Potomac Job Corps center in Washington, D.C. (private), 2) Old Dominion Job Corps center in Monroe, Virginia (Private), 3) Harpers Ferry Job Corps center in Harpers Ferry, West Virginia (Public), and 4) Flatwoods Job Corps center in Coeburn, Virginia (Public).

The effectiveness of services was determined in five different categories of services, including; 1) Residential Living, 2) Basic Education, 3) Vocational Training, 4) Medical and Dental Services, and 5) Administration and Management. To accomplish this, eight field visits were undertaken, two at each center. Data were compiled from: 1) personal observation, 2) personal interviews with staff and students, and 3) review of Job Corps financial reports.

Criteria were established for each category of services. These criteria were each rated for quality of services. I

made an assessment using the following ranges: 1 to 2.0, "Poor," 2.1 to 3.0, "Fair," 3.1 to 3.9 "Good," and "Excellent," 4.0. One of these four possible responses was selected for each criteria. For example, in the category of services "Dormitories," I established facilities maintenance as one of the criteria. I then rated the facilities maintenance at each center. A 3.7 rating, for example, would fall within the "good rating." The ratings for each criteria were then added together and divided by the number of criterion, producing a quality rating for that category.

To determine the effectiveness of services, that quality rating was divided by the cost per student for each category. The result was an effectiveness quotient, which was then multiplied by 1000 to produce an effectiveness quotient per thousand dollars spent. Table 6-1 recapitulates the results. It is intended to be used for comparative purposes, as a rough indicator of the effectiveness of services. In columns I through III, the Quality Ratings, Costs per student and Effectiveness Quotients respectively are shown by Job Corps center and by category of service measured.

We found that all the centers are good at some things and lacking in others. Potomac (private) is weak in vocational training and recreation, and strong in counseling. Old Dominion (private) is strong in recreation, medical/dental, and vocational training, and weak in dormitories and cafeteria services. Harpers Ferry (public) is lacking in dormitories, recreation, and management, but excels in education and

SUMMARY TABLE

Category	Column I Quality Ratings				Column II Cost Per Student				Column III Effectiveness Quotient				
	Potomac (Private)	Old Dominion Ferry (Private)	Harpers Ferry (Public)	Flatwoods (Public)	Potomac (Private)	Old Dominion (Private)	Harpers Ferry (Public)	Flatwoods (Public)	Potomac (Private)	Old Dominion (Private)	Harpers Ferry (Public)	Flatwoods (Public)	
	<u>Residential Living</u>				<u>Residential Living</u>				<u>Residential Living</u>				
Dormitories	2.67	1.17	1.40	3.17	\$5,922	\$4,547	\$6,414	\$5,444	.45	.52	.32	.56	
Recreation	1.30	3.10	2.13	3.13									
Counseling	4.00	3.30	2.00	3.30									
Cafeteria	2.67	1.93	2.57	2.63									
Average	2.66	2.38	2.03	3.06									
	<u>Education</u>				<u>Education</u>				<u>Education</u>				
	2.73	1.90	2.60	3.00	\$1,213	\$ 982	\$1,837	\$1,365	2.25	1.93	1.42	2.20	
	<u>Vocational Training</u>				<u>Vocational Training</u>				<u>Vocational Training</u>				
	1.97	3.57	3.33	2.93	\$2,668	\$1,778	\$2,663	\$2,095	.74	2.01	1.25	1.40	
	<u>Medical/Dental</u>				<u>Medical/Dental</u>				<u>Medical/Dental</u>				
	2.80	4.0	2.40	2.60	\$1,492	\$ 724	\$ 940	\$ 727	1.88	5.52	2.56	3.58	
	<u>Administration/Management</u>				<u>Administration/Management</u>				<u>Administration/Management</u>				
	2.00	2.20	1.50	3.50	\$6,511	\$4,136	\$3,964	\$3,461	.31	.53	.38	1.01	
	<u>Other Expenses</u>				<u>Other Expenses</u>				<u>Other Expenses</u>				
					\$2,212	\$1,256	\$1,734	\$1,734					
Totals	12.16	14.05	11.86	15.09	\$20,018	\$13,423	\$17,552	\$14,826	Center Effectiveness Quotient	.121	.209	.135	.204
Average	2.43	2.81	2.37	3.02									
	<u>Private Sector</u>		<u>Public Sector</u>		<u>Private Sector</u>		<u>Public Sector</u>		<u>Private Sector</u>		<u>Public Sector</u>		
Private Average/ Public Average	2.62		2.70		\$16,721		\$16,189		Sector Effectiveness Quotient		.157		.167

* The Effectiveness Quotients are for cross comparison. The numbers are only valid within each category.

vocational training. Flatwoods (public) is lacking in medical/dental services but strong in dormitories, recreation, education, and management. Overall, Flatwoods has the best quality, followed by Old Dominion, Potomac and Harpers Ferry. Flatwoods finished with the highest quality of services in four of the eight categories or sub-categories. Old Dominion finished highest in two, Potomac in two, and Harpers Ferry in none.

We conclude, in this limited sample of four, that the strengths and weaknesses of each center do not necessarily correspond to type of organization. The private and public centers are not necessarily strong or weak in the same areas of service. Flatwoods (public) is strong in administration and management, whereas the other public center, Harpers Ferry, is weak. Likewise, dormitory services at Old Dominion (private) fall far below the quality of the dormitories at Potomac (private). The recreation program at Old Dominion is strong, whereas the recreation program at Potomac is lacking.

On the other hand, in one category the strengths and weaknesses of each center do correspond to organization type. Both private centers are strong in their counseling and medical/dental services, while both public centers offer less in those areas.

As for assessment of individual centers, we look at the two public ones first. Obviously something is wrong at Harpers Ferry. Management at Harpers Ferry has not been able to maintain employee respect and has not been able to control

expenses very well. It has the lowest quality rating and the second highest expenses. Meanwhile the other public center, Flatwoods, stands up very well against the private centers. It has the highest Quality Rating and the second highest Effectiveness Quotient. We might draw one of two conclusions: Either Flatwoods is an abnormally good public center, and Harpers Ferry is a typical (poor) public center; or, Harpers Ferry is abnormal (ineffective), and Flatwoods represents the norm for effectiveness in a public center. This differential should not surprise us. Just as there are differences in private agencies—Old Dominion, for example, has higher quality of services than does Potomac, there are also differences in public agencies.

Let us consider the effectiveness of services. In reviewing the total expenses of the four centers, Old Dominion (private) is the least expensive per student, Flatwoods (public) is the second least expensive, followed by Harpers Ferry (public); finally, Potomac (private) has the most expenses per student.

Effectiveness is an interplay between costs and quality. Overall, Old Dominion has the highest Effectiveness Quotient, primarily because of lower expenditures. This center has only the second highest quality of services, but still has the highest effectiveness because of its lower costs. As noted earlier, this point highlights the conceptual issue of this dissertation: Old Dominion is able to provide a service quality that is not as good as Flatwoods, but it is done at

less expense. Old Dominion shows significantly less expenditures in three of the five categories, including Residential Living, Education, and, to a lesser extent, Vocational Training. Of the two centers that finished with the highest effectiveness, namely Old Dominion and Flatwoods, Flatwoods is more expensive, but very highly rated in quality. Old Dominion is less expensive, does not offer as much quality as Flatwoods, and has a higher overall quality than Harpers Ferry or Potomac.

The research suggests, within this very small sample, a positive relationship within sectors and across sectors between expense control and quality. Centers tended to be good in both or bad in both. Among the public centers, the program that costs less money, Flatwoods, has a higher Quality Rating and higher Effectiveness Quotient than does Harpers Ferry. Likewise, among the private centers, the least expensive center, Old Dominion, has a higher Quality Rating and Effectiveness Quotient than does Potomac. Likewise, the public sector shows less cost, but higher quality and higher effectiveness when sectors are compared.

When we examine differences between the centers there are many differences in the quality of specific services offered, but there is little difference in the overall quality of services offered. Aggregations of diverse ratings tend to cancel each other out.

Although overall public and private sector differences were not great, the sample was so small that we must say the

matter is not settled. And we should not forget that there were some important differences between public centers and private centers beyond effectiveness. For example, in chapter V, we found that for most Job Corps positions, the salaries, wages, and benefits for operating staff are better in the public centers. Top managements' compensation, however, is the same. Other differences include the fact that the staff turnover rates are higher in the private centers, and it is especially high at the Potomac center. We found also that the private centers offer a greater opportunity for employment for Blacks than do the public centers, but once Blacks get employed, they were more likely to advance and hold management positions in the public centers.

In light of the need to avoid masking center differences in aggregated statistics, let me conclude this summary by presenting a profile of my evaluative impressions for each locale.

Potomac (private)

At Potomac, I liked the encouraging and helpful attitude of the teachers and counseling staff toward the students. The clean living conditions in the dormitories are also a plus.

I was distressed by the negative attitude of many of the vocational trainers. I was also very disappointed by the overall discontent expressed by the staff, which was reflected in the high (100 percent) annual turnover rate. When I

visited the personnel office at Potomac, 30 vacant positions were being advertised just at that one center. This represents nearly 20 percent of all Potomac staff positions. These positions are not just low level positions but include management.

Even though Washington, D.C. is an expensive place to live, which means that some people will always be looking for new jobs, staff unhappiness is a major contributor to the high turnover rate. This problem makes it difficult to provide continuity of services, since it is necessary consistently to replace exiting staff members. The center faces a continuing burden of hiring new staff members, and must do better at training new staff, especially management staff.

I am not surprised that the overall quality of service rating was only third highest here, and its Effectiveness Quotient the lowest. Potomac would do well to focus on the needs of the staff as a means of improving the overall program. This, in turn, will better serve the students.

Old Dominion (private)

At Old Dominion, I liked the helpful and positive attitude of the vocational training staff, and the strong effort put forth by the education and counseling staff. I appreciate the work done by the dormitory staff under such difficult conditions. I also appreciate the variety of services offered in recreation, education, vocational

training, and counseling.

The turnover rate among staff (23 percent) was not as great as at Potomac, but it was not insignificant either. The serious discipline problems among the students were a big negative factor. The lack of student discipline creates an overall atmosphere that is not conducive to learning. The lack of facilities maintenance contributes to this negative atmosphere. Maintenance problems, especially in the dormitories and the administration building, detract further from the learning environment.

Harpers Ferry (public)

At Harpers Ferry, the competence and camaraderie among teachers in the education department was impressive. I also liked the competence of the vocational training staff.

I was annoyed by the animosities and petty grievances among the staff, however. The staff spoke openly of their dislike of the director, sometimes in front of students, and sometimes within earshot of the director. There is little sense of cooperation of effort across the campus, which interferes with consistency and quality of services for students. This seems to reflect the complacency of security. Federal civil service personnel regulations require a laborious and time consuming series of verbal and written warnings before an employee can be dismissed. Overly secure employees at Harpers Ferry do not have a healthy fear of

losing their jobs when they know they cannot get fired.

Harpers Ferry faces inadequate staffing problems, especially in the medical/dental and recreation areas. These problems hurt the quantity and quality of services offered. I am not surprised that Harpers Ferry had the lowest overall quality of services. This center needs a strong director who will take charge and gain control of the many problem areas. I was disappointed to see so many able and talented staff members who couldn't work in a coordinated and cooperative way with one another at Harpers Ferry. To listen to many of the staff, it might seem that all of the blame for the center's problems can be placed on the director. It is true that the director has not been forceful enough, and a change in directors may be needed, but an effort should be made to dismiss some staff members, despite the time-consuming personnel requirements of doing so.

Harpers Ferry has too many people with ten or twenty, or even twenty-five, years experience in Job Corps. Sometimes, experience is a positive factor, but it can also work against an organization. Too many of Harpers Ferry's experienced staff seem to want Job Corps to remain the way it was ten or twenty years ago, rather than adjust to a new set of circumstances or to new policies.

These disillusioned employees have reverted to undermining the entire center by using such tactics as calling in sick when they are not and blaming others. Management bears responsibility for not being able to deal with the

problems, but Harpers Ferry employs too many people who wouldn't be satisfied with any director or any set of operating circumstances.

Flatwoods (public)

I was impressed with the overall operation at Flatwoods. It is a relaxed and safe learning environment for students. The staff speaks well of one another and works well together. Its members have a genuine concern for the students.

Top management has done a good job of maintaining the respect of the staff. The center has an outstanding education and recreation department, and the facilities are well maintained. This enhances the good learning atmosphere. Flatwood's high quality of service rating is well deserved.

This center does have a problem with inadequate staffing. The recreation department, especially, needs more help. Counseling, education and administration are also lacking in personnel. The short staffing means that staff members are too frequently required to cover for one another, which has the potential to detract from the consistency and quality of services offered. These are hurdles for management. This center had the second lowest expenses. Flatwoods might show considerably higher quality ratings if more were spent on staff.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Those Job Corps students who are willing to stick with an approximate one-year training program do come out of Job Corps with improved educational skills and adequate vocational training. Job Corps students go on to become helpers in a trade, file clerks, or nurse's assistants. In that sense, Job Corps is performing a worthwhile service, especially for the country's underprivileged Blacks.

Furthermore, Job Corps is answering a societal concern. It's preventative. In a tight economy, it is much better to have 75,000 young people in a residential training program than out on the streets.

Given this success, we must then ask the question, "Can we do better?" I believe Job Corps can do better. It should emphasize quality. Most of the field visit Quality Ratings were between "Fair" and "Good," at about "Fair Plus." The student survey ratings were not any higher. The organization can aim higher than "Fair Plus." However, the task of aiming higher is made difficult by Job Corps policy, as we learned in Chapter III. The National Job Corps office rates each Job Corps center, and they emphasize the Average Length of Stay (ALOS) and Average Weekly Termination Rate (AWTR) of students. In order to maintain a good ALOS record, center directors are expected to keep as many students as possible. In other words, those students who don't care, or are behavior problems and may be driving other good students away from Job Corps,

are allowed to stay rather than be terminated. This enhances the center's rating from the national office but is detrimental to the program's quality. Furthermore, it provides a false impression of success.

Likewise, to receive a good AWTR rating from the National Job Corps office, a center must have a low AWTR. Unfortunately, to maintain a low AWTR, a center must keep students who are behavior problems. It is a "Catch 22" for center directors. They are expected to provide a good learning and training environment, but they can't terminate those who are detrimental to that environment. The negative environment too often forces the serious students to drop out rather than continue with their training. Among the four centers studied, an average of 48 percent of students drop out in the first 90 days of their training (Job Corps Termination Report, 1991).

Why does Job Corps have a policy that demands that Job Corps centers admit and keep students who shouldn't be in the program? The answer is resources. In order to receive adequate funding from Congress, Job Corps must prove that its centers are filled to capacity with students. Center enrollment capacity has closely followed the available funding (Levitan and Gallo, 1988). Empty beds in Job Corps dormitories mean that the center is in jeopardy of losing funding. The ALOS and AWTR ratings are a reflection of this policy. Keeping Job Corps centers filled to capacity is important to Congress because full centers seem to indicate

that youth are being helped and that the policy is working. They are thinking quantity, not quality. In a sense, Job Corps is forced to serve its own need for funding as much as to serve the students who need the program. We are equating success with head count. This is a simple way out politically, but it is wrongheaded. Job Corps center directors, managers, and staff members play the benevolent game, but they know it is a silly policy. We can draw an analogy of the Vietnam War. During that war, Americans were reminded daily of the high number of enemy soldiers being killed. But that high head count did not mean the war effort was succeeding. It was not.

It is not just Congress that is pressing for the status quo. There are others who want Job Corps to stay as it is. The small communities in America that surround Job Corps centers have come to expect Job Corps to provide employment for their citizens. Furthermore, these communities depend on Job Corps centers to continue buying food supplies and commodities from their local entrepreneurs. These small communities feel uncomfortable with any change in Job Corps policy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I make the following recommendations:

(1) I recommend that Job Corps adapt my method of evaluation, used in this dissertation, for evaluating all of

its 107 centers across the country. This means focusing primarily on the quality and effectiveness of services provided, concentrating on the overall aspects of the program. This also means moving away from the narrowness of cost and average length of stay statistics, and average weekly termination rate statistics.

When Job Corps adopts my methodology for evaluation, all Job Corps personnel in centers across the country will be able to better use their considerable training and expertise, training and educating students who want job skills and who want a better future for themselves. These Job Corps personnel will no longer need to devote so much time and energy to playing a political numbers game designed to acquire adequate funding.

The real issue, as it turns out, is not whether public or private centers operate Job Corps better. We have learned that the private centers are more effective in some areas of service, and the public centers are more effective in others.

We have also learned that in many areas of service, the differences of service within sectors is greater than the between-sector differences. The real issue is not public versus private, but the assessment procedures. The assessment procedures for Job Corps are too narrow, and should be broadened to include emphasizing the quality and effectiveness of services.

Currently, Job Corps is so concerned with its

termination rates and average length of stay rates that it has lost sight of what is important--training young people in a safe, organized, environment that offers quality training. When the assessment procedures emphasize quality and effectiveness of the overall services, managers at Job Corps centers will no longer be in handcuffs. They will be free to direct their attention to the quality and effectiveness of services, rather than keeping the center filled with students. They will be able to make decisions about who attends Job Corps, based upon the students desire to acquire training, not on length of stay statistics. When that happens, the students who need and want Job Corps services will get the training they need, without the unnecessary burden of being placed in dormitories and training classes with people who are disruptive.

(2) I recommend also a change in the policy for admitting students, to include 22 year olds and to no longer include 16 and 17 year olds. Under current Job Corps policy, Job Corps only accepts students aged 16-21. Many youth aged 16 and 17 don't appreciate the importance of job training until a few years later. At age 16 or 17, job training isn't important to them.

They are often disruptive, and impede the progress of the older students. Meanwhile, there are thousands of underprivileged adults aged 22 who, because of the additional life experience, do recognize the importance of acquiring job skills and would benefit from attending Job Corps--and Job

Corps would benefit for having them.

(3) Job Corps should consider a more interactive basic education classroom environment between teacher and student. When students spend the day solitarily working out of a workbook, it is difficult to stay motivated. A more interactive teacher-student relationship would enhance learning.

(4) Job Corps should place more emphasis on the psychological effects of the physical environment on the students. Some of the private centers are located in old, dilapidated former college campuses, or former army, navy, or air force buildings. These facilities are not conducive to a learning environment.

(5) Job Corps should diversify its vocational curriculum to include computer training and non-trade occupational training, offering the potential for a higher salary. For example, an addition to the curriculum could include training in occupations such as medical technology.

Remember that data on the job training match, which are discussed in Chapter IV, show that only 40 percent of students in the public centers and 35 percent of the students in the private centers find a job related to their training. We also learned that the average salary after completion of the Job Corps program is \$5.22 an hour for the public center graduates and \$4.83 an hour for the private center graduates.

Those wages are consistent with Job Corps graduates throughout the country who are placed in job-training matches.

But those two figures average to only about five dollars an hour. A young person may well ask, why spend a year in a barracks-style living quarters, only to end up maybe getting a job-that pays that little? Any high school dropout can make that much money at a McDonald's restaurant. And, more to the point, they can make a lot more than five dollars an hour selling drugs on the street corner in their home town. Based upon my interviews with Job Corps students and staff, the students are acutely aware of this reality.

AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION

Further research is needed in the following areas:

(1) Research is needed using my method in this study with a large sample of Job Corps centers, in order to determine the accuracy of my measurements as they apply to that larger sample.

(2) A model Job Corps center should be established as a control center. This control center can concentrate on quality and effectiveness of operations. The success of this program can then be compared with other programs in different locations. Other centers can then copy some or all of the successful aspects of this model center.

(3) Research is needed in determining the costs and psychological effects of changing contractors. When one private industry contractor leaves and another one enters to operate a Job Corps center, weeks of negotiating and contract

writing take place between the old contractor and the new contractor and Job Corps officials. Furthermore, staff are pulled off their duties to conduct inventory during this time. These costs are not included in Job Corps financial reports.

Also, when a private contractor announces that they will soon be no longer operating a Job Corps center, the employees of that center experience months of uncertainty wondering if their jobs will be eliminated, or their salaries reduced with a new contractor. These uncertainties affect the quality of service offered to students during this time period.

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that quality of services must be examined along with costs when comparing effectiveness of services in public and private organizations. It makes no sense to keep costs low if the result is degraded service quality. Program effectiveness is more than simply cost-effectiveness. It cannot be measured in dollar and cents terms alone. This is especially true in a human service program such as Job Corps.

When we examine results comparing quality, costs, and effectiveness in the Job Corps centers studied, we find some surprising results. First, there was more quality observed in programs that cost less. For example, when costs at the two public centers are averaged together, the average is less

than the average cost at the two private centers. The quality ratings and effectiveness scores at the public centers also average higher than those at the private centers. This was not an expected result. One might have thought beforehand that there would be some sacrifice in quality when less money is spent. Perhaps a better way to state the finding is that there seems to be a correlation between cost control and quality of services. That is, programs that show relatively better quality results are the same programs that are successfully controlling their expenditures. This suggests the assumption that you can improve a program by spending money on it is not necessarily true and certainly simplistic.

Next, it might have been assumed that the private centers, operated by private industry, a pattern which historically keeps attention focused on markets and costs, would prove the most effective and surely the most cost-effective. But that is not the case. The public centers had a higher overall effectiveness quotient, the result not only of higher quality but also of lower costs.

Let's take this even further and examine quality, costs, and effectiveness within the two sectors (private and public) themselves. Here we find again that, in both cases, the center that cost less exhibited more quality. Among the public centers, Flatwoods had higher quality ratings, but less cost, than did Harpers Ferry. Likewise, among the private centers, Old Dominion's quality ratings were higher and costs less than Potomac's. Again, this result is somewhat

surprising and not what common sense might expect.

There is a single factor here that I believe may be pointed to as affecting cost as well as quality. That factor is management style. A tight, organized, coherent, and consistent management system could well keep costs down and produce better quality. What is important is not ownership, public or private. Instead, the differentiating factor seems to be program management. A well-applied system of management controls costs less, and, at the same time, controls other program elements as well, and thus inspires improved quality.

Good management has its hands on every aspect of the organization. It strives to keep costs at a manageable level and also shows concern for the students and provides an orderly, stable, and safe learning environment. Likewise, good management has a vested interest in the welfare of its employees. It maximizes job satisfaction among its staff by providing a fair salary and a competitive benefits package, and by genuinely seeking out the opinions of all staff members to reinforce morale. Good management, finally, is management consistently applied to all elements of a program. Communication is a hallmark of effective management systems.

None of the centers in this study is as good as it should be. A problem is that none of the centers aim high enough in their quality of services. Among the public centers, Harpers Ferry's management is the weakest, having allowed animosities among staff to spread, in part because of inconsistent, sometimes non-existent communication with staff members. This

has adversely affected the center's overall quality of operations. The other public center, Flatwoods, comes closer to the ideal of good management presented above. Flatwoods' management communicates well with staff members and students alike and provides a disciplined, orderly learning environment for the students. It provides its employees with a fair salary and good benefits. However, even Flatwoods' management has made some decisions that affect quality. They have decided to limit costs by short staffing the center. If Flatwoods would add just a few more staff members, especially in recreation and in administration, that center's quality, which is already reasonably good, could improve considerably.

Among the private centers, Potomac is paying a continuing human resources management penalty. It pays its staff members relatively poorly, which does nothing for morale. It has also ignored for too long the discontent of its staff. Poor management policies allow tension and internal dissension among staff members to spread. Consequently, Potomac has a high staff turnover rate and poor employee (and student) morale. As a result, it must spend an inordinate amount of time and money training new staff members. At Potomac, the scales are tipped so far in the direction of external client satisfaction (students), that little weight is given to internal dissatisfaction.

Finally, at Old Dominion, the lack of discipline among students is severe enough that it adversely affects the entire learning environment at the center. Old Dominion management

has chosen not to act on this matter of lack of discipline. Its managers seem to feel that discipline in a skills training facility program will take care of itself, when in fact control of students is another management responsibility. As long as the regional and national Job Corps offices (i.e., higher Job Corps management) leave the facility alone, there is no credible reason for Old Dominion personnel themselves to resist the laxness of the system and demand a more disciplined and safer learning environment.

Student discipline within a Job Corps center, perhaps even more so than in a typical school, is likely a reflection of a well managed program. The private centers, however, may have fallen into a trap. In offering students extensive freedom (following the modern public school model) before they have acquired the necessary skills to work and earn a living, the programs are cheating the students they aim to help. Educators, especially those who have studied poor student performances in public schools, have concluded that if too much freedom is offered students before they have acquired educational skills, there is a strong probability that little learning will take place. The private centers generally need to bring more control into their operations, shore up their management systems in this respect, by enforcing rules and regulations regarding student behavior.

Private industry usually believes in trusting to market forces, without relying on government intervention, to bring about optimum economic benefits. Applying this same rationale

to Job Corps student discipline is unreasonable. If the private centers are trusting "market forces," avoiding management intervention, to provide the necessary discipline among students, an orderly institution of learning will never evolve.

This dissertation ends on a note relative to the symbolism of physical barriers. The entirety of this research has focused on Job Corps, a program designed as a gateway to a more promising future for America's disadvantaged youth. With that in mind, I came to realize there was an ironic twist to my final analysis. The public centers that I visited, with their long history (an institutional memory's worth) of student discipline, had virtually no barriers at their entrances, nothing to control even the flow of cars driving into the centers. However, the level of discipline and control in evidence once within the centers was commendable, a credit to the way public center programs are managed. In contrast, the privately run centers were both equipped with sturdy long-armed gateways manned by guards controlling access. But inside the centers I found discipline was sorely lacking. Perhaps we should consider this lack of discipline, lack of control, not as a sign of freedom, or progressiveness, but rather as a formidable barrier to that more promising future toward which all gateways of learning should open.

WORKS REFERENCED

- Adams, Gordon. 1981. The Politics of Defense Contracting. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Ahlbrandt, Roger S., Jr. 1973. "Efficiency in the Provision of Fire Services." Public Choice 18 (Fall): 1-15.
- Alchain, A. A. and Demsetz. 1972. "Production, Information Costs, and Economic Organization." American Economic Review. 62.
- Appleby, Paul H. 1945. Big Democracy. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Atkinson, Scott E. and Robert Halvorsen. 1986. "The Relative Efficiency of Public and Private Firms in a Regulated Environment: the Case of U.S. Electric Utilities." Journal of Public Economics. 29 (April).
- Baldwin, J. Norman. 1987. "Public versus Private: Not That Different, Not That Consequential." Public Personnel Management. 16, No. 2, (Summer).
- Banfield, E. 1975. "Corruption As a Feature of Governmental Organization." Journal of Law and Economics. 20.
- Bellante, Don, and James Long. 1981. "The Political Economy of the Rent-Seeking Society: The Case of Public Employees and Their Unions." Journal of Labor Research. II, No. 1, (Spring).
- Bennett, James T. and Manuel H. Johnson. 1979. "Public Versus Private Provision of Collective Goods and Services: Garbage Collection Revisited." Public Choice 34: 55-64.
- _____. 1981. Better Government at Half the Price. Ottawa, IL: Carolina House.
- Bennett, James T. and T. J. Dilorenzo. 1983. "Public Employee Unions and the Privatization of Public Services." Journal of Labor Research. (Winter).
- Brown, M. K., and S. P. Erie. 1981. "Blacks and the Legacy of the Great Society: The Economic and Political Impact of Federal Social Policy." Public Policy. 29: 299-320.
- Bruggink, Thomas W. "Public Versus Private Water Delivery: Cost Comparisons," Public Finance Quarterly, 14 July (1986).

- Boyatzis, R. E. 1982. The Competent Manager. New York: Free Press.
- Bozeman, Barry. 1987. All Organizations are Public: Bridging Public and Private Organizational Theories. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bozeman, Barry. 1988. "Exploring the Limits of Public and Private Sectors: Sector Boundaries as Maginot Line." Public Administration Review. (March/April).
- Brilliant, Elinor. 1973. "Private or Public: A Model of Ambiguities." Social Service Review. 47 (September).
- Brown, M. K., and S. P. Erie. 1981. "Blacks and the Legacy of the Great Society: The Economic and Political Impact of Federal Social Policy." Public Policy. 29 : 299-320.
- Bruggink, Thomas W. 1982. "Public Versus Regulated Private Enterprise in the Municipal Water Industry: a Comparison of Operating Costs." Quarterly Review of Economics and Business. 22, (Spring).
- Buchanan II, Bruce. 1975. "Red-Tape and the Service Ethic. Some Unexpected Differences Between Public and Private Managers." Administration and Society. 6, No. 4, (February).
- Buchanan, B. H. 1974. "Government Managers, Business Executives and Organization Commitment." Public Administration Review. 35:339-347.
- Butler, Stuart. 1985. Privatizing Federal Spending: A Strategy to Eliminate the Deficit. New York: Universe Books.
- Carrington, Tim. 1986. "Lifting of General Dynamics Suspension Increases Congress--Pentagon Tensions." Wall Street Journal. 10 (February).
- Management: Public and Private Perspectives. Editors, J. L. Perry and K. L. Kraemer. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Cervantes, A. J. 1983. "Memoirs of a Businessman-Mayor," in Public and Private Perspectives. Editor, J. L. Perry Kraemer. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Clarkson, K. W. 1980. "Managerial Behavior in Nonproprietary Organizations." Economics of Nonproprietary Organizations. Editor, K. W. Clarkson. Westport, CT: JAI Press.
- Combs, Paul W. 1985. Job Corps to 1973. Unpublished Ph.D.

dissertation, Vocational and Technical Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

- Dahl, R. A., and C. E. Lindblom. 1953. Politics, Economics and Welfare. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Davies, David G. 1971. "The Efficiency of Public Versus Private Firms: The Case of Australia's Two Airlines." Journal of Law and Economics. 14 (April).
- De Alessi, L. 1974. "Managerial Tenure under Private and Government Ownership in the Electric Power Industry." Journal of Political Economy. 82:645-653.
- Dehoog, Ruth Hoogland. 1984. Contracting Out for Human Services. Economic, Political, and Organizational Perspectives. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- _____. 1985. "Human Services Contracting: Environmental, Behavioral and Organizational Conditions." Administration and Society. Vol. 16 (February)
- Donahue, John D. 1989. The Privatization Decision. Public Ends, Private Means. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Downs, A. 1967. Inside Bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Department of Labor, U. S. (DOL). Employment and Training Administration, Job Corps handbook. Job Corps in Brief, 1990. (Available at the National Commission for Employment Policy, 1522 K. Street, NW, Suite 300, Washington D.C. 20005).
- Federal Reserve Bank of New York Quarterly Review. 1978. "Federal Pay Scales: How Much is Too Much?"
- Finley, Lawrence K. 1989. "Alternative Service Delivery, Privatization, and Competition," in Public Sector Privatization. Alternative Approaches to Service Delivery. Editor, Lawrence K. Finley. New York: Quorum Books.
- Fisher, John E. 1972. "Efficiency in Business and Government." Quarterly Review of Economics and Business. (August).
- Fogel, Walter and David Lewin. 1974. "Wage Determination in the Public Sector." Industrial and Labor Relations Review. 27.

- Gage, T. J. 1981. "Getting Street-Wise in St. Louis." Reason. (August).
- GAO. (General Accounting Office.) 1981. "GSA's Cleaning Costs are Needlessly Higher than in the Private Sector." Washington, D.C. 24, (August).
- Gilbert, A. 1977. "The Transformation of Social Services." Social Services Review. 51 (December).
- Goodman, John C. and Michael D. Stroup. 1986. "Privatizing the Welfare State," in Privatization: The Key to Better Government. E. S. Savas. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, Inc.
- Goodsell, Charles T. 1985. The Case for Bureaucracy. A Public Administration Polemic. Second Edition. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, Inc.
- Grupp, F. W., and A. R. Richards. 1975. "Job Satisfaction among State Executives in the U.S." Public Personnel Management. 4:104-109.
- Hanrahan, John D. 1977. Government for Sale: Contracting Out, the New Patronage. Washington D.C.: American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees.
- Havemann, Joel, and William J. Lanouette. 1978. "The Comparability Factor In Federal Employees' Pay." National Journal. (September 30).
- Hayes, Frederick. 1977. Productivity in Local Government. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Heller, M. 1985. "Crime Pays for U.S. Prisons." Management Today. (June).
- Hermann, Robert, Eric Single, and John Boston. 1977. Counsel for the Poor. Criminal Defense in Urban America. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Hirsch, Werner Z. 1965. "Cost Functions of an Urban Government Service: Refuse Collection." The Review of Economics and Statistics. (February).
- Hirshmann, Albert O. 1970. Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Holloran, Richard. 1986. To Arm a Nation. New York: MacMillan Publishing.

- Home Builders Institute Bulletin (HBI). 1990. "Looking Back: An Analysis of JTPA Program Funding." (Available from the Home Builders Institute, 15th and M Streets, NW, Washington D.C. 20005).
- Johnston, Benjamin. 1975. Job Corps: A Social Experiment That Works. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kaufman, Herbert. 1981. The Administrative Behavior of Federal Bureau Chiefs. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Kelman, Steven. 1987. Making Public Policy: A Hopeful View of American Government. New York: Basic Books.
- Kilpatrick, F. P., M. C. Cummings, and M. K. Jennings. 1964. Source Book of a Study of Occupational Values and the Image of the Federal Service. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Krashinsky, Michael. 1978. "The Cost of Day Care in Public Programs." National Tax Journal. XXXI, No. 4.
- Leonard, Thomas. 1986. "Privatizing Government Programs: What This Means." Government Executive. 18 (October).
- Levine, Charles H., B. Guy Peters, and Frank J. Thompson. 1990. Public Administration: Challenges, Choices, Consequences. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman and Company.
- Levitan, Sar A., and Frank Gallo. 1988. A Second Chance: Training for Jobs. Kalamazoo, MI: W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Long, G. E. 1975. "Public-Private Sectoral Differences in Employment Discrimination." Southern Economic Journal. 42:89-96.
- Long, James E. 1982. "Are Government Workers Overpaid? Alternative Evidence." The Journal of Human Resources. XVII.
- Long, Norton. 1966. "Public Policy and Administration: The Goals of Rationality and Efficiency." Public Administration Review. 14.
- Mahaffey, Maryann. 1983. "Privatization vs. The Constitutional Commitment to the Promotion of the General Welfare." Detroit College of Law Review. 4:1339.
- Mathiason, D. G. 1984. "Rethinking Public Management." The Bureaucrat. 13.

- McGee, Henry W., and Manuel Pastor, Jr. 1988. "Privatization is a Blunt Weapon Against Minorities." Wall Street Journal. (July 24).
- Meyer, Robert A. 1975. "Publicly Owned Versus Privately Owned Utilities: A Policy Choice." Review of Economics and Statistics. 57 (November).
- Moe, Ronald C. 1987. "Exploring the Limits of Privatization." Public Administration Review. (November/December).
- Morgan, David R., and Robert E. England. 1988. "The Two Faces of Privatization." Public Administration Review. (November/December).
- Mosher, Frederick C. .1968. Democracy and the Public Service. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mosher, Frederick C. 1984. A Tale of Two Agencies: A Comparative Analysis of the General Accounting Office and the Office of Management and Budget. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- NCPQ—National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life. 1978. "Employee Attitudes and Productivity Differences Between the Public and Private Sectors." National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life. Washington, D.C.
- Neuberg, Leland. 1977. "Two Issues in the Municipal Ownership of Electric Power Distribution Systems." The Bell Journal of Economics. 8.
- Neustrom, J. W., W. E. Reif, and R. M. Monckza. 1976. "Motivating the Public Employee: Fact vs. Fiction." Public Personnel Management. 5:67-72.
- New York Times. 29, November, 1988. As quoted in Clyde H. Farnsworth, "Goodwill and Progress Make a Brief Tenure."
- Niskanen, William A., Jr. 1971. Bureaucracy and Representative Government. Chicago: Aldine, Atherton, Inc.
- Ostrom, Vincent. 1973. The Intellectual Crises in Public Administration. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.
- Ostrom, Vincent, and Elinor Ostrom. 1971. "Public Choice: A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration." Public Administration Review. 31 (March/April).

- Ostrom, Vincent, and Frances Pennell Bish, Editors. 1977. Comparing Urban Service Delivery Systems. Structure and Performance. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.
- Paine, F. T., S. J. Carroll, Jr., and B. A. Leete. 1966. "Need Satisfaction of Managerial Personnel in a Government Agency." Journal of Applied Psychology. 50:247-249.
- Perry, James L., and Timlynn T. Babitsky. 1986. "Comparative Performance in Urban Bus Transit: Assessing Privatization Strategies." Public Administration Review 46, (January, February).
- Pescatrice, Don R., and John M. Trapani. 1980. "The Performance and Objectives of Public and Private Utilities Operating in the United States." Journal of Public Economics. 13.
- Pier, William J., Robert B. Vernon, and John H. Wicks. 1974. "An Empirical Comparison of Government and Private Production Efficiency." National Tax Journal. XXVII, No. 4.
- Poole, R. W., Jr. 1980. Cutting Back City Hall. New York: Universe Book.
- Porter, L. W., and V. F. Mitchell. 1967. "Comparative Study of Need Satisfaction in Military and Business Hierarchies." Journal of Applied Psychology. 51: 139-144.
- Rainey, H., W. Backoff, and C. H. Levine. 1976. "Comparing Public and Private Organizations." Public Administration Review. 36.
- Rainey, H. 1977. Comparing Public and Private: Conceptual and Empirical Analysis of Incentives and Motivation Among Government and Business Managers, Unpublished Dissertation, Ohio State University.
- _____. 1983. "Public Agencies and Private Firms: Incentive Structures, Goals and Individual Roles." Administration and Society. 15.
- Rhinehart, J.B. , R.P. Burrell, DeWolfe, A.S., Griffin, J.E., and Spaner, F.E. 1969. "Comparative Study of Needs Satisfaction in Government and Business Hierarchies." Journal of Applied Psychology. 53, 230-235.
- Roessner, J. D. 1977. "Incentives to Innovate in Public and Private Organizations." Administration and Society. 9.

- Rosenbloom, David H. 1989. Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics and Law in the Public Sector. Second Edition. New York: Random House.
- Salamon, Lester M. 1981. "Rethinking Public Management: Third-Party Government and the Changing Forms of Government Action." Public Policy. (Summer).
- _____. 1989. Beyond Privatization: The Tools of Government Action. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- Savas, E. S. 1982. Privatizing the Public Sector. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers, Inc.
- _____. 1987. Privatization: The Key to Better Government. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers, Inc.
- Seidman, Harold, and Robert Gilmour. 1986. Politics, Position, and Power: From the Positive to the Regulatory State. Fourth Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sharp, Elaine B. 1980. "Toward a New Understanding of Urban Services and Citizen Participation: The Coproduction Concept." Midwest Review of Public Administration. Vol. 14 (June).
- Smith, Sharon P. 1976. "Pay Differentials Between Federal Government and Private Sector Workers." Industrial and Labor Relations Review. 29.
- _____. 1976. "Government Wage Differentials by Sex." The Journal of Human Resources. 11.
- _____. 1978. "Federal pay scales: how much is too much?" FRBNY Quarterly Review. (Autumn).
- _____. 1981. "Public-Private Wage Differentials in Metropolitan Areas." In Public Sector Labor Markets. Ed. Peter Mieszkowski and George E. Peterson. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- Spann, Robert M. 1977. "Public versus Private Provision of Government Services," in Budgets and Bureaucrats: The Sources of Government Growth. Editor, Thomas E. Borcherding. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Stahl, O. Glenn. 1976. Public Personnel Administration. Seventh Edition. New York: Harper & Row.
- Starling, Grover. 1982. Managing the Public Sector. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

- Starr, Paul. 1987. The Limits of Privatization. Economic Policy Institute.
- Stevens, Barbara J. 1984. "Comparing Public- and Private-Sector Productive Efficiency: An Analysis of Eight Activities." National Productivity Review. (Autumn).
- Sullivan, Harold J. 1987. "Privatization of Public Services: A Growing Threat to Constitutional Rights." Public Administration Review. (November/December).
- Teeples, Ronald and David Glycer. 1987. "Cost of Water Delivery Systems: Specification and Ownership Effects." Review of Economics and Statistics. 69, (August).
- Trapani, John M. "The Performance and Objectives of Public and Private Utilities Operating in the United States," Journal of Public Economics, 13, (1980).
- Tullock, Gordon. The Politics of Bureaucracy, Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1965.
- United States Department of Agriculture, "Dietary Report.", 1990. Washington, D.C.
- United States Department of Labor, Region III Summary (1988). Washington, D.C.
- United States Department of Labor, Vocational Training Summary Report (1990). Washington, D.C.
- United States Department of Labor, Educational Summary Report (1990). Washington, D.C.
- United States Department of Labor, Job Corps Policy Handbook (1990).
- Waldo, Dwight. 1947. The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration. New York: Ronald Press.
- Wamsley, Gary L., Charles T. Goodsell, John A. Rohr, Orion F. White, and James F. Wolf. 1987. "The Public Administration and the Governance Process: Refocusing the American Dialogue," in A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. Editor, R a l p h C . Chandler. New York: Free Press.
- Warren, L.W., P.P. Van Riper, N. H. Martin, and O.F. Collins. 1963. The American Federal Executive. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Appendix A
Financial Report Summaries

Potomac - Private
412 students

Residential Living	\$2,440,000
Education	\$499,700
Vocational Training	\$1,099,200
Medical/Dental	\$614,700
Administration/Management	\$2,682,700
Other Expenses	<u>\$911,500</u>
Total	\$8,247,800

*\$418,132 was added to Vocational Training for contracted instruction from Home Builders Institute, that was not included in the financial report.

Old Dominion - Private
346 Students

Residential Living	\$1,573,383
Education	\$339,651
Vocational Training	\$615,352
Medical/Dental	\$250,587
Administration/Management	\$1,431,048
Other Expenses	<u>\$434,454</u>
Total	\$4,644,475

*\$381,225 was added to Old Dominion for contracted vocational instruction from Home Builders Institute, that was not included in the financial report.

Harpers Ferry - Public
168 Students

Residential Living	\$1,077,552
Education	\$308,632
Vocational Training	\$447,335
Medical/Dental	\$157,984
Administration/Management	\$665,952
Other Expenses	<u>\$291,144</u>
Total	\$2,948,599

*\$306,581 was added to the Harpers Ferry vocational training expense category for trade union vocation instruction that was not included in the financial report. \$79,000 was subtracted from vocational training operating expenses for expenses that were included in two different categories, operating expenses and salaries, wages, and benefits.

Flatwoods - Public
220 Students

Residential Living	\$1,197,583
Education	\$300,202
Vocational Training	\$460,949
Medical/Dental	\$160,010
Administration/Management	\$761,478
Other Expenses	<u>\$381,260</u>
Total	\$3,261,482

*\$255,560 was added to the vocational costs for Flatwoods because of trade union construction costs that were not included in the financial report. Additionally, \$85,420 was added for Home Builders Institute costs that were not included. \$76,000 was subtracted for operating expenses that were included in two different categories, operating expenses and salary and wages.

*The budgets for the public centers did not include any expenses for the "other expenses" category. That expense is included as a total figure for all public centers by the Job Corps Regional Office. Therefore, it was impossible to determine the costs for each public center in this category. However, Job Corps officials said these costs were similar to the costs for the private centers. Since the average costs for "other expenses" was \$1,734 in the private centers, I used that for both public centers. The cost in that category, then, is \$1,734 multiplied by the number of students at that center.

Appendix B
Student Survey

Please circle the response that you feel is most accurate.

1. How would you describe living conditions in your dormitory?

Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
------	------	------	-----------
2. How would you rate the services provided by the nurses and doctors?

Fair	Good	Excellent	Poor
------	------	-----------	------
3. How would you rate the job training classes that you are taking?

Good	Excellent	Poor	Fair
------	-----------	------	------
4. How would you rate the Math and English classes that you are taking?

Excellent	Poor	Fair	Good
-----------	------	------	------
5. How would you rate the GED class that you are taking?

Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
------	------	------	-----------
6. The people who are running this Job Corps center—What kind of job do you think they are doing?

Fair	Good	Excellent	Poor
------	------	-----------	------
7. If you needed help with a problem of any kind, what is the likelihood that you could get the help you needed here at this center.

Good	Excellent	Poor	Fair
------	-----------	------	------
8. How would you rate this center at meeting your expectations?

Excellent	Poor	Fair	Good
-----------	------	------	------

9. How would you rate the food in the cafeteria?

Poor Fair Good Excellent

10. How would you rate the recreational opportunities that are available to you at this center?

Fair Good Excellent Poor

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**