DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 828 CE 065 883

AUTHOR Pearce, Diana M.
TITLE Breaking with Tradition: Women and Nontraditional Training in the JTPA System. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Women's Bureau (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 93
CONTRACT J-9-M-1-0074
NOTE 99p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Vocational Education; Demonstration Programs; Federal Programs; Females; *Job Training; *Nontraditional Occupations; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Sex Fairness; Student Attrition; *Success; *Womens Education; Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *Nontraditional Employment Training Project

ABSTRACT

A study analyzed the effects of Wider Opportunities for Women's (WOW) Nontraditional Employment Training (NET) Project. NET was designed to identify and demonstrate strategies to increase the number of women entering and succeeding at nontraditional training in the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) system. Three sites reflected differences in the JTPA system so that lessons learned in the demonstration would have wide application: Hartford, Connecticut; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and the state of Montana. Four types of data were used: JTPA-mandated data, questionnaires filled by samples of trainees, eligibility data, and focus groups. In comparing the sites pre-NET with mid-NET, the study found that the number of women in nontraditional training increased, with this increase overwhelmingly concentrated in Milwaukee (Wisconsin). Comparisons of women on a variety of characteristics did not result in a distinctive profile of the "nontraditional woman." The Milwaukee site gave prospective trainees direct and positive exposure to nontraditional jobs, support services, and retention efforts. Other factors and issues, across all three sites, that contributed to success in nontraditional training for women were as follows: intake workers brought their own attitudes and experiences into the process; women needed the support of other women; JTPA structures and practices restricted programs' ability to respond to changing circumstances; and programming in each site had to be customized. (Appendixes include a list of suggestions from focus groups and 10 data tables.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 367 828

CE

FINAL REPORT:

"Breaking with Tradition: Women and Nontraditional Training in the JTPA System"

Principal Investigator/Author of Report:
Diana M. Pearce

Contract #J-9-M-1-0074

NET Research Initiative

Wider Opportunities for Women
1325 G Street NW, LL
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 638-3143

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Women's Bureau, Department of Labor Project Officer:
Arline Easley

June 1993

This report was funded through Contract No. J-9-M-1-0074
from the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.
The opinions expressed in this document do not necessarily represent the official
positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Labor.

CE 065 883

Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc.

A nonprofit tax-exempt Women's Employment Organization
1325 G Street N.W., Lower Level, Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 638-3143

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Executive Summary

Breaking With Tradition: Women and Nontraditional Training in the JTPA System

Although there have been substantial efforts to increase the number of women in occupations nontraditional for women (those in which 25% or fewer of the workers are women), over the last two decades the proportion of women in non-traditional occupations has remained at about 7% of women workers. While there are many reasons, a key issue is clearly the role of basic employment and training programs, particularly JTPA--the Job Training Partnership Act. In JTPA training, according to one study, over two-thirds of women trainees were concentrated in just two out of nine possible occupational categories: clerical and sales, and service occupations. According to another study, only 9% of women were trained in occupations with wages that average $7.00 per hour or more. This means that JTPA training is simply replicating the high level of occupational segregation and low wages of women workers generally.

With support from the Ford Foundation, Aetna, and the Rockefeller Family Fund, Wider Opportunities for Women undertook to implement the Nontraditional Employment Training (NET) Project, an initiative designed to identify and demonstrate strategies that could be used to increase the number of women entering and succeeding at nontraditional training in the Job Training Partnership Act system.

Three sites were selected to reflect differences in the JTPA system so that lessons learned in the demonstration sites would have wide application in the JTPA system: Hartford, CT; Milwaukee, WI; and the state of Montana. They include two urban centers,

one with a high level of unemployment (Hartford), and the other with a relatively low level (Milwaukee). While Montana's unemployment rate is average, it has a very scattered rural population and economy. WOW trained key leaders from the PIC staff and women's organizations to provide leadership in their communities in the process of developing site-specific goals, and strategies for implementing them that would contribute to the overall goal of increasing the numbers of women in nontraditional training in JTPA. WOW also subsequently provided on-site customized technical assistance, with the emphasis varying from recruitment, to coordination with state and local agencies, to the dissemination of nontraditional occupation career information. The NET Research Initiative has documented and analyzed the effects of the NET project in the three sites from a quantitative and qualitative perspective; this report summarizes the Initiative's findings.

To obtain a complete and accurate picture of the NET project and its participants, several types of data were collected. Each of the sites was asked to provide data on previous and current participants, including data collected to determine eligibility and to document employment outcomes. In addition, supplemental information was collected from a sample of trainees at the beginning of training, at the end of the training, and three months after the training was completed. Lastly, two sets of focus groups were held, one before the NET Project and one mid-NET; focus groups were held with traditional women trainees, nontraditional women trainees, service providers, union representatives and employers.

The quantitative findings were not at all surprising. In examining the situation before the NET Project was implemented, we found that although women were the majority of

trainees in each site, they did not fare as well as men in terms of placement or wages, with data suggesting these differences were due more to occupational segregation than wage discrimination within an occupation.

In comparing the sites pre-NET with mid-NET, we found that the number of women in nontraditional training increased, with this increase overwhelmingly concentrated in Milwaukee. Why Milwaukee? While the economy and ecology of the three sites did not change drastically over the project period, Milwaukee did not have the logistical problems of rural Montana, nor did it have to contend with the high unemployment found in Hartford -- which may be, as one focus group participant put it, a "red light" barrier to innovative efforts. At the same time, this still leaves an intriguing question: was the increase in nontraditional training among Milwaukee women due to the program's ability to attract a wide range of women into nontraditional training, or did the program find, and target, a particular type of woman who is prone to enter nontraditional occupations?

To answer this question, comparisons of women on a variety of characteristics were done, with the finding that there is not a distinctive profile of the "nontrad woman." This means that recruitment into nontraditional occupations should not focus on targeting particular subgroups of women based on their demographics, such as income, educational level, marital status or number of children. It does mean that enrollment in nontraditional training can be increased by a strong emphasis on recruitment aimed at all women entering training. Such efforts, including programs such as those undertaken in the Milwaukee site as a result of the NET Project, give prospective trainees direct and positive exposure to nontraditional jobs (hands-on tryout experiences, tours of nontraditional job sites, panel of

role models -- women in nontraditional occupations, etc.), support and support services during training, and retention efforts.

Beyond these program elements found in Milwaukee, we learned of a number of other factors and issues, across all three sites, that contribute to success in nontraditional training for women:

1. Intake workers often bring into the choice-of-training process their own attitudes and experiences with nontraditional work, both positive and negative, and these need to be addressed.

2. Women in nontraditional training and employment need the support of other women, particularly when isolated from other support systems. In contrast to to the experiences of the few women who had gone into nontraditional training and/or employment before the NET Project, service providers and employers as well as trainees cited the importance of support groups and other all-women elements to trainee morale, skill development, problem-solving abilities, and ultimately, to their retention in nontraditional employment.

3. In part because of the support from other women trainees, women in nontraditional training are finding more support, and sexual harassment appears to be less of an issue. In part, the latter trend seems to be due to better preparation on the part of women, resulting in defusing situations early on, not misinterpreting new-

worker-hazing as gender-based behavior, and handling situations with more confidence. It may also be in part because institutions and employers encountered by women trainees have apparently begun to act on this issue, taking some of the burden off individual women workers.

4. JTPA structures and practices often restrict the ability of programs to respond to changing circumstances. Funding cycles, limited numbers of job openings, and small scale programs often limited the ability of programs to offer a variety of training opportunities, and/or with flexibility (as to timing, hours, location, etc.). The ways in which OJT slots were developed, and trainees placed in them, also seemed to not work well as avenues to nontraditional jobs for women.

5. Child care presents special issues and problems for women entering nontraditional training and/or employment. Some of their special needs include: "seamless" child care (for gaps between different program elements, or gaps between training and employment), 24-hour, and/or portable and/or "on-call" child care, and more dependable quality child care.

6. While many successful program elements are universal in nature, it is important customize programming in each site, requiring increased flexibility on the part of JTPA regulations and performance standards. In one site, for example, many trainees lacked telephones, while in Montana, access to an 800 number was

being considered, to deal with rural isolation of trainees from the support of friends and families. Developing case management, with flexibility to troubleshoot the specific problems that arise for trainees in the particular site, is one possible approach.

Finally, we found that both the JTPA system and its community were changed by their participation in the NET project; not only are more women in nontraditional training, and that training is more effective than in the past, but the community as a whole has begun to change. Of course, some sites and programs are more successful than others, and in all sites, there is much yet to be done. Yet, a change process is underway, and as more JTPAs begin breaking with tradition, women's economic opportunities are increasing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank the many women and men who shared with us their experiences in nontraditional training and employment, as trainees, service providers, employers, union officials, and staff, and without whom this project would not have been possible. I would like to especially thank those staff in the sites who struggled mightily to produce data and help find information, devoting many hours, definitely beyond the call of duty: Tom Hayes and Rick Dedy, Bill Malone and Anne Richmond.

Of course this research would have been impossible without the NET Project, directed by Donna Milgram. Both the NET Project and the Women and Poverty Project are housed at Wider Opportunities for Women, whose Director, Cindy Marano, conceived the NET Project, and has provided not only leadership but many helpful suggestions for this research initiative.

Special thanks, finally, go to Kelley Ellsworth, who organized our many kinds of data, and helped with the analysis, particularly of the focus groups.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Over the last decade, the proportion of women employed in nontraditional occupations has remained at about 7% of women workers[1]. The high profile gains of women in some professions, such as law and medicine, have been countered by no changes, and even some small decreases, in the numbers of women in many blue collar occupations[2]. In part, this lack of progress is understandable, for it reflects economy-wide shifts in employment, such as from manufacturing to the service sector; even when women gained blue collar jobs, some lost them quickly. (Because they were the "last hired", when the cutbacks came, women were the "first fired").

At the same time that it is understandable at one level, the lack of increase of women in nontraditional occupations is puzzling, for there have been substantial efforts

---

[1] Between 1973 and 1984, the proportion of women workers who were in nontraditional occupations increased from 5.3 to 7.3%, and then actually decreased slightly to 6.6% in 1992. These figures were calculated from the following sources: for 1973--The Handbook of Women Workers, Table 38 (U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Women's Bureau, 1975, #297); for 1984--Table 22, Employment and Earnings (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, January, 1985); for 1992--unpublished printouts of Current Population Survey data, Detailed Occupation and Industry Tables: Employed and Experienced Unemployed Persons by Detailed Occupation, Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, (Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, December, 1992).

[2] Some examples of nonprofessional, nontraditional occupations in which the proportion of women has been decreasing include (the numbers in parentheses are the 1984 and 1992 percentages of women, respectively):

auto body repairers (2.1, 0.5)
lathe and turning machine operators (12.9, 8.7)
sales workers, motor vehicles and boats (9.0, 7.0)
grader and scraper operators (1.6, 0.8)
garage and service station related occupations (8.5, 5.6)
grounds keepers and gardeners (7.1, 5.9).

(See footnote #1 for sources for these figures).

to increase the number of women in occupations nontraditional for women: a number of organizations that devote themselves to training women in the trades and other nontraditional occupations had sprung up across the country, networks of women in the trades had been formed, and many employment organizations had developed initiatives for training women in various nontraditional occupations. Even junior high schools began sending girls to the shop and boys to cooking classes.

What was missing in this activity was the adoption of the strategies, developed in these model programs, by major employment and training systems, particularly JTPA--the Job Training Partnership Act. While a few local JTPA-funded programs which trained women in nontraditional occupations had been very successful, overall, JTPA programs remained unaffected. As we shall see, data compiled by JTPA does not generally allow us to determine the occupations for which women are being trained. One study, however, which surveyed 30 local JTPAs (Service Delivery Areas, called SDAs), which served a total of over 14,000 people, found that over two-thirds of the women were in just two (out of nine) occupational categories--clerical and sales, and service occupations[3].

The costs of business as usual in JTPA for women workers have proved very high. A GAO report has documented that just 9% of women--compared to 29% of men trainees--are being trained in occupations with wages that average $7.00 per hour or more. We know that average wages of nontraditional jobs are almost always significantly

[3] The men, in contrast, were distributed much more evenly across all nine categories, with the highest concentration (21%) in machine trades occupations. Jo Sanders, Staying Poor: How the Job Training Partnership Act Fails Women, (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.. 1988).

higher than those of jobs traditionally held by women workers (according to one study, women in female-dominated jobs earned 6-15% less than women with the same characteristics in other occupations[4]). We also know that the high level of segregation of women workers accounts for about one-fourth of the gender gap in wages[5], and that the general decline in occupational segregation has contributed to a narrowing of the wage gap[6]. This means that JTPA training, by virtually replicating the high level of occupational segregation of women workers, is not reducing the gender wage gap nor increasing women workers' wages.

Besides the low wages, many of the jobs women are being trained for do not provide health benefits, sick leave, or paid holidays. (JTPA neither requires that jobs in which trainees are placed have these benefits, nor keeps any data on the quality of jobs, such as the provision of health care benefits). In some cases, single parents on welfare find that not only do their net incomes decrease after training, but their medical benefits, child care and rent subsidies are lost as well. At the same time, their

---

[4] Sorensen, Elaine. "Measuring the Pay Disparity Between Typically Female Occupations and Other Jobs: A Bivariate Selectivity Approach." Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 42, No. 4 Cornell University (July 1989), p.624.

[5] Chiswick, B.R., J. A. O'Neil, J.S. Facles, and S. W. Polachek, 1974. "The Effects of Occupation on Race and Sex Differences in Hourly Earnings," American Statistical Association, Proceedings of Business and Economic Statistics Section, pp. 219-28. About one-third of women workers are in just 10 occupations, D. Pearce, 1974, "Women's Poverty: Moving to the Workplace," Wider Opportunities for Women, Risks and Challenges: Women, Work, and the Future, p. 11-24.

[6] Shifts in the occupational distribution of men and women between 1979 and 1985 account for 6% of the decline in the gender gap between white men and women, and 10% of the black gender gap decline (note that since a large part of the decline is unexplained–77% of the white and 66% of the black gender gaps, this is a substantial proportion of the explained difference). Elaine Sorenson, "Gender and Racial Pay Gaps in the 1980s: Accounting for Different Trends," Final Report to the Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, October, 1991.

training does not gain them access to jobs with real opportunities for advancement, in income, skills, benefits, and security.

B. The NET Project

With support from the Ford Foundation, Aetna, and the Rockefeller Family Fund, Wider Opportunities for Women (WOW) implemented the Nontraditional Employment Training (NET) Project, an initiative designed to identify and demonstrate strategies that could be used to increase the number of women entering and succeeding at nontraditional training in the Job Training Partnership Act system--not in small, marginal programs--but in whole local JTPA systems. The project was designed as the Nontraditional Employment for Women Act was completing passage in Congress, and therefore was designed to show how a local JTPA service delivery area could implement the NEW Act aggressively, if the Act were to be passed.

The Nontraditional Employment Training Project (NET) was designed to provide WOW technical assistance to a partnership of the local Private Industry Council staff and a local women's employment and training organization, supported by a community-wide leadership team of employers, women in the trades, local training providers, education and human services professionals, and union officials. Three sites were selected to reflect differences in the JTPA system so that lessons learned in the demonstration sites would have application widely in the JTPA system. WOW selected three sites for the demonstration project:

(1) Hartford, Connecticut -- a large northeastern city with a high proportion of poor women, a deeply struggling economy, and a job training system with prime

control by the city administration;

(2) Milwaukee, Wisconsin -- a midwestern city with a recovering economy, a strong PIC (Private Industry Council), and a strong industrial base; and

(3) Missoula, Montana -- a large rural PIC serving half of the state of Montana, with a struggling rural economy and job training carried out mostly through OJT (on-the-job training).

In these three sites, WOW trained key leaders from the PIC staff and women's organizations to lead a process of institutionalizing strategies in the community to increase the numbers of women in nontraditional training through JTPA[7]. WOW has also provided on-site technical assistance for more than 18 months to assist the leaders and the community team in:

** analyzing the barriers that keep women in the community out of nontraditional training;

** identifying and adapting strategies used in successful women's nontraditional employment training programs to overcome the barriers;

** providing in-service training to service providers, PIC and other human service staffs, vocational education staff, employers and unions on supporting women who enter nontraditional programs;

** developing community-wide strategies to interest women in nontraditional training; and

** developing contracting, planning, and other strategies to improve the capacity of the local system to sustain and succeed at nontraditional training, placement, and retention.

Although the basic goals in the three sites were very similar, the strategies used to achieve those goals differed, reflecting the unique needs of each location.

---

[7] Lois Haignere and Ronnie J. Steinberge, "Nontraditional Training for Women: Effective Programs, Structural Barriers, and Political Hurdles," in Sharon L. Harlan and Ronnie J. Steinberg, eds., Job Training for Women: The Promise and Limits of Public Policies (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1989).

Milwaukee. In this city, the local NET project put the emphasis on recruiting nontraditional trainees. This included developing program elements that provide prospective women trainees with information on NTOs (nontraditional occupations). At the same time, it included elements that addressed problems of integrating women into male-dominated occupations, and overcoming employer and union reluctance to train and/or hire women in nontraditional occupations.

At the point of intake, a coordinated four-tiered feeder program was developed, with a three-hour NTO career information workshop presented to every woman coming through the PIC's intake centers. For those interested, this was followed by a 40-hour orientation course, which included career exploration, role models, worksite visits and hands-on experience. For those trainees who opted to enter nontraditional training, the program also included an 88-hour survival skills workshop, featuring tool identification and use, physical conditioning, and coping with sexual harassment and isolation. The program also worked with women individually to develop and place them in job-specific nontraditional training. Finally, it provided ongoing support and retention services, during and after training. Training and technical assistance were given to employers and unions. An all-day technical assistance session on nontraditional training was provided for PIC and service providers by WOW.

The occupational training mix was diversified to include computerized machine tooling, building trades, housing rehabilitation, welding, auto repair and sales, printing and foundry trades. Incentives were developed, in the form of additional points in PIC funding process as well as increased set asides of incentive funds, for service providers

who train women for NTOs.

The NET Project also facilitated linkages between various agencies. The YWCA and the Milwaukee Area Technical College joined together to offer a computerized machine tool training, receiving JTPA funding for the first time. The PIC responded to a Request for Proposal from the Vocational Education Administration's State Sex Equity Office for the first time and received funding for its proposal. Training opportunities for women in NTOs have been developed through linkages between the PIC and federal contractors who have not been meeting their affirmative action goals for hiring women and minorities.

Montana. In this state-wide program, the emphasis was put on widely disseminating NTO career information through Job Service and coordinating with the post-secondary school system.

A 20-minute video on women in NTOs was produced and two brochures were created, one aimed at recruiting women into NTOs and the other at persuading employers to hire women for NTOs. (Each of these is to be distributed, along with WOW's training manual, to all JTPA service providers in the state.) Information about NTOs was further disseminated by local media coverage, including evening news television broadcasts as well as feature articles in The Missoulan.

Women's Opportunity and Resource Development (WORD) collaborated with the PIC and the Missoula Vocational Technical School to create truck driver and survey aide training programs. WORD also developed Bobcat Operator training with a major Montana employer and Missoula VoTech (the local technical community college), as

well as a basic carpentry pre-apprenticeship training with the Montana Carpenters Union.

Service Providers statewide received from WOW an intensive two-day NTO training as well as two three-hour technical assistance sessions. Presentations on the NET project were made at a wide variety of agency meetings and conferences, offering NTO placement as a strategy to decrease the disparity in average wage at placement between males and females, improve service to women, and improve average wage at placement figures. The PIC, Montana Displaced Homemakers Network, and the Job Service agreed to the designation of one NTO-trained counselor in each agency.

Hartford. In Hartford, the emphasis was placed on (1) coordinating existing agencies in order to prepare service providers to respond to RFPs (Requests for Proposals) for nontraditional training, (2) resolving state and local policy inconsistencies (such as with AFDC-JOBS) that interfered with efforts to train and place women in nontraditional occupations, and (3) diversifying its occupational training mix.

Current as well as prospective NTO service providers participated in technical assistance workshops. Information on NTOs was included in the career exploration curriculum of the Department of Income Maintenance (which is Connecticut's welfare department). Also, a DIM policy was modified which had made it difficult for welfare recipients to participate in nontraditional training. Incentives were developed, including set-aside monies, to encourage service providers to conduct NTO training.

Labor market research was conducted on potential new occupational areas on which to focus future training programs. The occupational training mix was diversified

through the addition of culinary arts training as well as OJT (on-the-job training) slots in NTOs.

* * * * *

The remainder of this report will be organized into three sections. The first of these will discuss the four types of data used in this project--(1) JTPA-mandated data, (2) forms (questionnaires) filled out by samples of trainees, (3) eligibility data, and (4) focus groups. In each instance, we will discuss what we learned in the process of collecting, collating, and analyzing the data, particularly the problems encountered in using agency-collected data.

The next section will deal with our findings on the outcomes, and will present the results of our quantitative analysis of the various data collected. It will focus on measuring the quantitative impact of the NET project on the enrollment of women trainees in nontraditional training, and placement rates and wages for women trainees. The final section will present the lessons we have learned from the NET Project. These include our findings on the why questions, i.e., why--under what circumstances, with what characteristics, etc.--do women trainees enter and successfully complete training and employment in nontraditional occupations? It will be roughly organized by the step-by-step process of going through nontraditional training, from choosing nontraditional training (including recruitment), through the training experience, to experiences on the job. The final section also summarizes the experience of NET from various participants' perspective--trainees, service providers/ trainers, employers and unions, and PIC/JTPA

staff and policymakers. It includes their evaluations of that experience, and their recommendations for changes and improvements.

II. TYPES OF DATA AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Collection of JTPA-Mandated Data

Each of the sites was asked to provide data on previous participants, data which is reported annually by program year, in order to get a picture of how each site has served women JTPA participants previous to the NET project. Data was requested in three areas: characteristics of participants, outcomes (wage and employment rates), and support services received. Data was requested for all participants, men and women, in all training programs during the program year (which ran from July 1, 1990 through June 30, 1991).

Altogether, this effort to collect and analyze JTPA-mandated data has provided important insights into the limitations inherent in both the form and content of current data collected by JTPA, particularly its usefulness in answering questions as to how women and minorities are being served by JTPA programs.

Collection of the data was more problematic and took somewhat longer than anticipated. Some of the problems were site-specific, and some were generic to JTPA. In one site, the computerization of data had just begun. In another, local data is sent to the state capital for computerization--and had to be retrieved from there, at some cost to the local JTPA organization.

Most important, three problems inherent in JTPA data collection became

apparent. First, only one of the sites was located in a state in which the data was collected so that it was possible to obtain outcome (placement rate and wages) information broken down by not only the gender and race/ethnicity of participants, but also by the occupation for which they had trained. Second, some training, particularly but not only in rural sites, is organized on an individual basis, i.e., where only one or two persons are trained in a given occupation; this makes analysis and evaluation of the data somewhat more difficult. Third, in all of the sites, data on support services is not kept by the individual served, so that it is impossible to link the impact of support services--or their lack--to outcomes at the individual level. Information on services may reflect a single individual getting repeated help, or many individuals getting a given support service only once or twice.

B. Forms/Questionnaires

Under the Ford Foundation and other private grants, data was collected directly from groups of trainees, in the form of questionnaires. This part of the research is of a field experiment type, in which data is gathered before and after an intervention; in this case, the intervention is the NET project itself. (See description, above.) Because the specific intervention was designed on site by the local leadership teams, in the early months of the project, there was no visible presence of the NET Project "on the street", nor any effect on the experiences of men and women entering training. During this period of time (Fall 1991), referred to in this report at Phase I, or "pre-NET," the first set of questionnaires were administered. Each of the three sites (Hartford, CT;

Missoula, MT; and Milwaukee, WI) was visited by the Principal Investigator. In each site, the NET local project leaders were trained as to how to properly select samples, and administer the forms.

The second set of data--referred to here as Phase II--was gathered mostly during the fall of 1992, after substantial amounts of NET activities. Although the interval of about one year between Phase I and Phase II was enough to have an impact on enrollment in nontraditional training by women (see below), the NET intervention is not complete; activities such as training and technical assistance will continue through spring/summer 1993 under the Ford grant. Thus Phase II is really not "post-NET," but rather, "mid-NET." In addition, many of the Fall 1992 trainees at the time of final data collection, had not completed training and/or entered employment.

Three groups of trainees were "sampled" in each site: (1) women in training for traditionally female occupations (such as clerical or nurse's aide jobs), (2) women in training that is nontraditional for women (such as the construction trades or machine tooling), and (3) men in training for jobs that are traditionally male (such as construction trades or machine tooling). This research design sets up a three-way comparison among the three groups surveyed; by comparing the two groups of women, we can determine what issues, means of recruitment, and so forth, are common to women, regardless of the type of training, and what issues are different for women in nontraditional training. Likewise, we can compare men and women who are in the same or similar training (which is nontraditional for women and traditional for men), to determine what is common to persons in these types of training, regardless of gender, versus what is

experienced differently by women.

Three forms, or questionnaires, were obtained for each trainee. The first form was filled out by the trainee at the beginning of training, and the second form--also filled out by the trainee--at the end of the training. (If the trainee left without filling out the form, it was to be filled out by the service provider/trainer). The third form (reporting on subsequent employment) was filled out by JTPA officials, in tandem with the mandated thirteen-week post-training follow-up. In addition, in order to not burden trainees with answering the same questions they had recently been asked (to certify JTPA eligibility), eligibility data was requested from JTPA data management officials.

As with any research, changes were made in the field to accommodate various circumstances and difficulties. A major problem that arose was the burden that this gathering of forms put on JTPA officials and trainers, for which there was no way of compensating them, monetarily or otherwise. In all three sites, their cooperation was not only essential to the success of this project, but forthcoming in many ways, and well beyond the call of duty. Nevertheless, several aspects of the methodology were redesigned to try to reduce this burden to a minimal level. In addition, the nature of the training (individualized, and/or open-entry/open-exit), and the changing scope of the NET project led to several changes and improvements in the design. The two major changes are listed below:

- o Sampling. It was initially anticipated that there would be relatively large classes of trainees, and that only a relatively small sample of individuals was necessary from each of these. It quickly became apparent that most classes were small,

especially in nontraditional training, so that all individuals in a class were included. In addition, in all of Montana, and to some extent Milwaukee, training is individualized--with only one or two trainees in training for the same occupation. In addition, in all three sites, some classrooms also have an open-entry/open-exit policy. As a result, trainees were surveyed if they entered training during a set time period in that site: for Phase I, this time period was July 1, 1991 through December 1991; for Phase II, it was July 1, 1992 through December, 1992.

Surveying all trainees in a site has a singular advantage not originally anticipated, and that is that it removes any possibility of selection bias, e.g., towards polling only the more "successful" trainees. (This is not necessarily nefarious, but simply the result of logistics--those who do not complete training, or are frequently absent, are harder to track down, and if sampling does not require tracking everyone, then it is easy for bias to occur).

- Administration of Forms. The form was designed as a set of straightforward check-off items, requiring little explanation by the administrator, and took about 15 or 20 minutes to fill out. The principal investigator travelled to each site at the beginning of the project, and trained and/or administered the first set of forms herself. Unfortunately, in each case it was not always possible to meet with the class or individual trainees, and thus some forms were left to be administered in the appropriate classes, or to be given to the trainees individually. Sometimes

these forms were not administered, or not given, until months later. To maximize participation during Phase II, the initial forms were administered on site by the principal investigator herself.

C. Eligibility Data

Each of the sites was asked to provide eligibility data on trainees who had filled out forms. As with the JTPA-mandated data from the previous Program Year, this data is required to determine eligibility, but was not as readily available as anticipated. Each site provided the data in different forms; although provided on computer disks from two sites, it was not in the same format, and some variables are simply defined differently from site to site, making comparisons difficult. In the third site, all data is computerized only at the state level, and kept only on paper at the local SDA (Service Delivery Area), which required that the data be entered from the paper records. While these circumstances were an inconvenience for the research, they suggest that local programs, especially when they do not have their data computerized locally, have no feedback on characteristics as to whom they are serving, nor on how well. Simple questions, such as placement and wage rates by race or gender, or how many women are in nontraditional training, cannot be answered.

D. Focus Groups

Two sets of focus groups were held in each site, one set "pre" the NET Project (Phase I) and a second set mid-NET. Arrangements were made with each local

partner/CBO; they either hosted the focus groups, or arranged for them to be held, developed lists of participants and sent out invitations, provided refreshments, and so forth. In each site, five types of pre-NET focus groups were held:

(1) Women trainees (and/or ex-trainees) in traditional training programs;

(2) Women trainees (and/or ex-trainees) in nontraditional training programs;

(3) Service providers -- those doing non-traditional occupational training or providing support services to women trainees in these programs;

(4) Unions -- which are both sources of apprenticeship training for JTPA trainees, and employers;

(5) Employers -- frontline supervisors, foremen, etc., who supervise women in nontraditional settings.

The second set of focus groups were of the same types (except that none were held with traditional trainees), plus these included additional groups of PIC/Leadership Team members.

III. FINDINGS: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF DATA

A. JTPA-Mandated Data

To obtain a picture of the "before", pre-NET situation for women and minorities in each JTPA site, the JTPA-mandated data (for the 1990-1991 Program Year) was analyzed. The advantage of the JTPA-mandated data was that it was available on all trainees who had participated in JTPA training in the previous year. The disadvantage, as stated above, is that its organization was such that, in two of the three states, one

could not determine the impact of the type of training on, for example, placement rates, or wages, because the data were not organized in a way that would permit such analysis. Essentially, the JTPA analysis allowed us to develop a profile of trainees, in terms of race and gender, and outcomes, again by race and gender.

The findings from the analysis of the JTPA-mandated data were not at all surprising. Although women were the majority of trainees in each site (see Table 1), they did not fare as well as men in terms of placement or wages. The greatest contrast in terms of gender occurred in Connecticut, with employment rates of 30% for women, and 45% for men, and the least in Montana, with rates of 73 and 76% respectively. Likewise, the ratio of wages (women to men) ranged from .798 in Connecticut, to .876 in Milwaukee, to .887 in Montana (see Table 1 in Appendix B).

How much these differences--in average placement and wage rates of women compared to men trainees--were due to the mix of occupations for which women trainees were being trained, could not be determined from this data for two of the sites. Only in Connecticut was this data provided by program: for example, in the child care program, which was all female, only 50% of trainees were placed in jobs, with average wages of $5.67 per hour. This contrasts to the Connecticut metal machine program, which was 89% male, and which had a placement rate of 73% and average wages of $7.67 per hour.

In Montana, one-third of women trainees were in clerical and sales, and one-third in service occupations training, versus one-fourth of male trainees in both these categories; only 7% of women were in machine and other trades, compared to 39% of

men trainees. (Data was not available on placement or wage rates by occupational group for Montana).

B. Eligibility Data

Phase I. In order to better measure the impact of NET, eligibility data was collected on the samples of trainees who had filled out forms in Phase I and Phase II. In addition, information on outcomes--wages and placement rates--was obtained for Phase I trainees who had completed their training, and/or entered employment. The demographic profile of these samples of trainees is very similar to that obtained from the analysis of the JTPA-mandated data: most of the participants in Hartford and Milwaukee are minority, while the majority in Montana are white (see Table 2). The majority are also female, but that also reflects the programs sampled (see above).

Of course, there are almost no women in training for nontraditional occupations pre-NET: only one in Hartford, one in Milwaukee, and 7 in Montana (or about 9% of women trainees). Phase I placement rates are higher for men in Hartford, but not in Milwaukee or Montana. Wage rates, however, are again higher for men, except in Montana, where there is relatively little difference (see Table 2).

Phase II. As can be seen in Table 3, the numbers of women in nontraditional training in Phase II (which is mid-NET) are also low, particularly in Hartford and Montana, but significantly higher in Milwaukee. This would suggest that the NET Project has not had much of an impact, in at least two sites, but that would be a hasty conclusion. First, the numbers in the table do not include all women who have entered

nontraditional training in these sites, and are thus artificially low. Secondly, the impact of the NET Project should be measured against the particular situation in each site.

In each site, the number of women actually in nontraditional training is higher than the numbers in these tables would indicate, for two reasons. First, in all three sites, the date for cutoff for inclusion in the Phase II sample was set for November 1992 to insure that some trainees would have completed training and/or entered employment by early 1993. This cutoff excluded some trainees in Hartford, who enrolled in a program that had yet to make the on-the-job training placements, and thus these individuals were not yet enrolled in JTPA. Likewise, up to ten women in Milwaukee have participated in the pre-training programs that introduce women to nontraditional options, and are waiting for occupational skills training opportunities to open up or be developed in the areas they have chosen. Because these women have not yet actually begun training, they have not been officially enrolled in JTPA, and thus had to be dropped from the sample (eligibility data is not available on them until they are officially enrolled).

Second, the logistics and timing of the research in Montana resulted in excluding some women who were in nontraditional training from the sample. First, the open-entry, open-exit training means that those who entered training late in the year were not included. Equally important, logistics required that forms be collected in a limited number of cities, even though the NET project is statewide. (The three cities chosen were Missoula, Kalispell/Flathead, and Great Falls). Given the statewide nature of the labor market as well, women participating in nontraditional job training may train in one of the sites, such as Missoula, but be registered in their hometown, say Butte (and since

Butte is not one of the collection cities, they would not be included in the sample).

A good example of how this has artificially lowered the numbers for Montana for Phase II can be seen by example of the 19 JTPA-registered participants in the nontraditional training class put on by WORD. Nine of these women are registered with JTPAs in Montana that are not among the three collection cities (Missoula, Great Falls, and Kalispell), and thus were not included in our sample, but are clearly beneficiaries of the NET Project. The other ten who would potentially fall in the sample, completed their training and/or entered employment before the Phase II forms were collected, and thus do not show up in this sample.

Even though they are not included in our sample, the experience of the women trained by WORD during the Spring of 1992 illustrates the way in which the NET Project has increased the number of women entering nontraditional employment in Montana:

- Of the 19 women funded by JTPA, 14 have already been employed in nontraditional employment, plus two are in nontraditional training.
- Those placed include three full-time permanent truck drivers, one full-time permanent heavy equipment operator, three in temporary full-time jobs for the Forest Service (2 survey aides, 1 soils tester), one construction laborer, and one permanent part-time bus driver for Head Start, a flagger, one dispatcher, and a sales representative for a meat company (note that the last two of these jobs are nontraditional for Montana, but not nationally).
- Wages in the nontraditional jobs range from $6.50/hour (Forest Service jobs) to $19 per hour (truck driver).
- Average wage at placement for all trainees is $9.50 per hour, and there is an 85% placement rate.

To summarize our findings so far, we have found that in comparing the sites pre-NET with mid-NET, there has been an increase in the number of women entering nontraditional training. The number in each site varies greatly however; taking into account both those captured in the sample, and those that are not, the number of women in nontraditional training is the lowest in Hartford, and the highest in Milwaukee, with Montana in between.

C. Analysis of Quantitative Data

In the original research design, it was anticipated that quantitative analysis would be used to explain three outcome measures--placement rates, wages, and retention--comparing both "pre" and "post"-NET, and those in traditional versus nontraditional training. Because the time frame of the project exceeds that of the Women's Bureau research initiative, the data on the "after" experience is not yet available, and thus as explained above, Phase II information available at this point in time is best characterized as "mid-NET".

One question, however, can be answered with the available data, and that is the question of increased enrollments in nontraditional training. That is, we know from the above data that the number of women in nontraditional training increased between Phase I and Phase II, and we also know that this increase is overwhelmingly concentrated in Milwaukee (indeed, the sample numbers show a decrease in the number of women in nontraditional training in Montana between Phase I and II, although we believe this is at least in part a result of data collection anomalies in this site, and not

reflective of the Montana program; see above).

There are two alternative major explanations for this result, the increase in nontraditional trainees concentrated in Milwaukee: (1) women who go into nontraditional training are different from those who do not, and these women are concentrated in Phase II and/or Milwaukee--thus the increase in nontraditional trainees in Milwaukee is due to the different characteristics of women in Phase II and/or Milwaukee, or (2) the increase is due to the distinctive character of the nontraditional program in Milwaukee, while the characteristics of women in nontradition. training, in Milwaukee, and/or in Phase II, do not vary significantly from the characteristics of other women trainees--whether in traditional training, in the other two sites, and/or women in Phase I.

To test these two alternative explanations, two kinds of analysis were done. In both cases, we used only the women, but included women from both Phases. (Obviously, if we want to explain choice of type of training by women, it cannot be chosen by people who are not women). In the first analysis, presented in Table 4, we compared women on a variety of demographic and other characteristics. Since these were continuous measures, we were able to determine if groups were significantly different by using the T-test of the means for each characteristic[8]. We made three types of comparisons. First, we compared women in traditional compared to those in nontraditional training

[8] The t-test of the means compares the mean, or average of two groups--for example, average age--and determines if the difference between them is statistically significant, i.e., if it is unlikely to occur by chance. In our example, if one group has an average age of 25 years, and the other, 31 years, and the t-test is significant at the $p<.05$ level, that means that such a difference would only occur by chance 5 times out of a hundred, and thus it is likely to be a "true" difference.

(columns 1 and 2; the t-tests are in column 3). Second, we compared women by site (Columns 4, 5, and 7; the t-tests for Hartford versus Milwaukee are in column 6, and the t-tests for Milwaukee versus Montana are in column 8). Third, we compared women in Phase I with those in Phase II (Columns 9 and 10, with the t-tests in Column 11).

The results from this analysis are quite clear. Overall, it is apparent that there are few significant differences between these groups. First, the comparison of women in traditional and nontraditional training tells us that there is no significant difference between these two groups of trainees in terms of their age, education, wage of the best job they have held, and so forth. The only variable for which there is a significant difference is that of the number of children: women in non-traditional training have on the average 2.37 children compared to only 1.79 for women in traditional training. Given the special problems of child care for women in nontraditional training and employment (see below), this variable runs counter the expected direction; that is we would expect women with more children to be less likely to enroll, or stay, in nontraditional training, other things being equal.

Comparisons by site yield a few more statistically significant differences, but again they go in the "wrong" direction, with the exception of education. That is, Milwaukee trainees' best jobs' wages are significantly less than those of Hartford trainees, they have more children; and they are less pleased with their child care arrangements (see columns 4, 5, and 6, Table 4)[9]. Milwaukee trainees do have significantly more education than

[9] Over a fourth of Milwaukee women in nontraditional training are unhappy with the child care arrangements, and 18% are both unhappy and planning to change; because establishing new child care arrangements--or continuing with unsatisfactory arrangements--is generally disruptive to training, it would be expected that being satisfied with child care would make it easier to be in nontraditional training, again

those in Hartford, although the actual difference is less than a year.

Turning to Milwaukee-Montana comparisons (Columns 5, 7, and 8), we again find that where differences with Montana are statistically significant, they would suggest that nontraditional training ought to be concentrated among Montana rather than Milwaukee trainees (e.g., the former have more work experience, are older, have fewer children, and lower housing costs[10]). Other than these characteristics, there is little difference between trainees in the three different sites.

In the final three columns, trainees are compared by Phase. Compared to trainees from Phase I, those in Phase II are less pleased with their child care, and have lower income, but also lower housing costs. None of these differences are substantively very large, nor do they suggest important time-related changes. Again, the comparison by Phase shows that there are very few differences between trainees enrolled in Phase I compared to Phase II.

In sum, these comparisons indicate that there is not a distinctive profile of the "nontrad woman". Moreover, there are not consistent or significant differences between Milwaukee and other sites' trainees, or between Phase I and Phase II. Put another way, the women in nontraditional training in Milwaukee in Phase II are virtually indistinguishable -- in terms of various demographic characteristics -- from other groups of women trainees, such as women in other sites, women in Phase I, or women in

---

given the difficulties women in nontraditional training and employment have with child care (see below).

[10]Lower housing costs free up resources for other needs, and also mean that the individual is less vulnerable to losing her housing (because she cannot make the rent), which often creates a crisis which is disruptive of continued participation in training.

traditional training. Their choice to enroll in nontraditional training is thus the result of site-specific program variables--such as recruitment, support and support services, and retention efforts undertaken in the Milwaukee site as a result of the NET Project.

Before turning to these programmatic issues, one more type of analysis was done. While not likely, it is possible that the various trainee characteristics compared above do have a differential impact on choice of training that can only be seen when the other characteristics are "controlled." In Table 5, parameter estimates are given for these variables. (These are derived from OLS regressions; properly, these should be derived from logistic equations, but because this analysis was not anticipated in the original proposal, software was not available to undertake such calculations. It is expected, however, that given the clear results, the numbers would change, but not the direction or strength of the findings).

The first two versions of this model include only variables measuring trainee characteristics. ('Percent Housing' is the proportion of family income spent on housing). As with the t-tests, none of the variables reaches statistical significance, except education and the number of children. Again, as with the t-test comparisons, while the fact that increased education increases the likelihood of being in nontraditional training is logical, having more children, and/or young children, also increases the likelihood of that choice, which is counter-intuitive (see discussion above of Table 4). In the second version, the addition of the 'Best Job Wage' increases our information about labor force participation, and percent housing tells how much of family income goes to housing (see above), but both variables reduce the N (because of missing values on these variables);

moreover, none of the variables reaches significance. In the third version, we introduce dummy variables for the sites; because of high correlations between these two dummy variables and race (percent nonwhite), none are significant, although the adjusted R square increases significantly. Only when we drop race, and add Phase II (version 4), or drop Percent Housing and Welfare and add Phase II (version 5) does any variable become significant, and that is of course, Milwaukee.

In the last two versions shown in Table 5, 'Best Job Wage' is dropped (this increases the N again, while 'Yrs Work'--number of years worked in the last 10 years--contributes work experience information, although neither variable is ever substantively or statistically significant. Most importantly, variables for Phase II-site are included--'NET Site 1' for Hartford-Phase II, and 'NET Site 2' for Milwaukee-Phase II, allowing us to drop the dummy variable for 'Phase II'. In Version 7, 'nonwhite' is also dropped, which reduces the coefficients for both of the city variables even more.

The final version of our model, version 7, has both the highest adjusted R squared and F statistic, and it is clear in its finding: both in terms of substantive size and significance level, it is apparent that choice of nontraditional training is largely due to being in training in Milwaukee during Phase II. The only other variable that is close to statistical significance is 'number of children', and the size of the parameter estimate (coefficient) is quite small, and again, in the "wrong" direction.

The analysis of data so far, in a sense, answers our questions with another, even larger question, which is 'Why is the enrollment in nontraditional training, in Milwaukee in Phase II, so much higher than in Phase I Milwaukee, or than it is in the other two

sites in either phase?' Although it is of course not possible to definitively answer that question with the available data, four factors, roughly in order of importance, would seem to provide a partial answer to this question. First, the local economies were and are very different; Hartford is by far in the worst shape, with its unemployment rate rising from 10.5% in 1991 to 11.4% in 1992, with frequent (and often permanent) layoffs throughout this period across the board in the aircraft engine, insurance, and other major industries. In contrast, Milwaukee's unemployment rate was well below the national average in these two years at 5.7 and 5.8%. Montana's statewide unemployment rate was only slightly higher, at 6.9 and 6.7%, respectively, just under the national average. One effect of the economy, cited by several service providers, is that newly trained and inexperienced workers are put in competition with more skilled and experienced workers who have been laid off; in their experience, this depresses both placement rates and wage rates.

A second major factor is the nature of the JTPA program in each site, as it has been influenced by the NET Project. Milwaukee is unique in its emphasis on directly exposing potential nontraditional trainees to nontraditional occupational options, such as through videos, worksite visits, and so forth. Also, because it is a larger program than either of the other two, it was able to provide a more diverse set of nontraditional choices for women.

The third and fourth factors relate to culture and geography. In Hartford, a substantial number of trainees were Hispanic (none were in either of the other sites); a number of persons cited aspects of Hispanic culture as a barrier to women entering and

continuing in nontraditional training. (It should be pointed out, however, that there were Hispanic women in Hartford in nontraditional training, who were not JTPA-funded). In Montana, the sheer logistics of sparsely-populated areas present formidable barriers. For example, videos, brochures, and orientation/introduction to nontraditional training meetings can only reach a small proportion of the target population under the best of circumstances. Similar observations apply to efforts to work with employers (particularly front-line supervisors), unions, and service providers.

One factor that does not seem to account for the different outcomes by site is that of previous experience with nontraditional training programs. On this score, Hartford would be out in front, for it has had a number of programs over the last two decades, both public and private, which have successfully integrated women into nontraditional jobs. Milwaukee has also had some experience, under the CETA initiative to increase the number of women in nontraditional training, with efforts to integrate nontraditional training for women in public, federal job training programs. In both cases, these efforts have either died out, as when CETA was replaced with JTPA in the early nineteen-eighties, or have been isolated in private organizations. The latter was the experience in Montana previous to the NET project, as the local community-based organization, WORD, had put on private nontraditional training, but had not worked with public and/or federal job training programs.

IV. LESSONS FROM THE NET PROJECT: WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT NONTRADITIONAL TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT IN THE JTPA PROGRAM

In one sense, the quantitative analysis leaves us with more questions than answers. If indeed there is not a distinctive profile of the "nontrad woman", at least in terms of quantifiable or concrete characteristics such as age, education, race, and so forth, then we are left with the question of how to successfully increase the number of women in nontraditional occupational training in JTPA. What program elements and structures are important, how important are various barriers--and how do we overcome them, and how do we build on and expand successful results? Equally important, what have we learned, from the less successful as well as the more successful programs, so that future efforts will be even more rewarding?

In this section these questions will be addressed by discussing eight themes, or "lessons", that emerged. In varying degrees, these discussions will draw on one or both sets of focus groups, as well as some of the answers to questions on the forms filled out by the trainees. As a result, the perspectives from all three sites, and often all the different groups involved in the local NET projects will be represented.

A. Recruitment of Women into Nontraditional Training Requires Focusing on Attitudes and "a priori" Assumptions of Intake Workers

Again, from the quantitative analysis it is clear that there is not a discernible profile of the type of woman trainee attracted into nontraditional training. From the forms filled out by trainees, we learned that most women (and men) sought training of

any kind because they wished to increase their skills or education, with job-related reasons a close second (higher wages, a "better" job) (data not shown). In short, motivation for entering training did not distinguish traditional from nontraditional trainees.

The choice as to which type of training to enter, for women, was the product of two processes, one informal, and one more formal. Women tended to hear about training programs by (the informal process of) "word of mouth", from friends, relatives, etc. (see Table 7), but choose to enter nontraditional training because they have learned about it from, or had it recommended by, another training program, a social worker, an orientation or presentation, etc. (See Table 8). This suggests that those who hold key positions in the formal process, including intake workers, service providers who do assessment, and those who do orientation programs, play a key role in recruitment.

Many of these workers recognized their key role as gatekeepers into nontraditional training; at the same time, many brought to their position certain beliefs about women trainees and what their choice of nontraditional training might mean. (Whether these beliefs are true is not at issue; beliefs are real in their consequences, i.e., in this case, in their impact on the behavior of gatekeepers towards women entering training). Three of these beliefs seem particularly relevant. First, in several sites, intake workers or service providers talked about the way women trainees were more certain about what they wanted to train for (compared to men), with that certainty almost always focused on an occupation traditional for women, such as clerical or a health field occupation. As one intake worker stated:

> We have a high percentage of people who come in here with a very definite idea of what they think they want, whether it's realistic or not. They come in and they think they are going to be a secretary or a computer operator or something. They think they know. Whether [or not] they are suitable at all because of their aptitudes or abilities or their interests, they think they know. And to pry them away from that is probably the most difficult thing of all because you have to make something else more enticing...I think for the better jobs women restrict themselves even more than men do. I think generally that's true. [With equal academic abilities] I think women say, "I am going to do only this," whereas men will say, "if it pays me big money I will do it," whether or not they are able to.

Particularly from the point of view of intake workers, a second obstacle to recruiting women into nontraditional is the "desperation" factor: that is, many trainees (both men and women), come in more or less desperate for a job. This issue is not about the type of training--indeed, in two of the sites, there are nontraditional opportunities for training through OJT placements, which provide both training and a job with pay. Rather, the issue is more one of certainty, of the known versus the unknown; thus, with trainees in what one worker called "the survival mode," undertaking something unknown such as nontraditional is seen as risky. As one worker put it:

> At the time we are seeing them, they are in pretty desperate straits, so now is not the time to talk to them about something new, or about something that might take more time than they have....they come through the front door, and they need a job now because their rent is due.

Third, from the point of view of intake workers, there is the issue of "culture", of past experience and upbringing, and of current resistance from their family and friends. As one service provider explained:

> I think a lot of women just don't see themselves in that role. It is just too much of a jump to think of themselves as being a machinist or a welder or something like that so I think a lot of it is psychology and old fears about crossing gender roles--at least that's what a lot of women talk about when they speak of their families and their husbands who would be upset if they do this.

At the same time, some recognized that lack of experience with nontraditional work was not a barrier, and that it even cut both ways (i.e., not everyone who has grown up on a ranch, or who has experienced nontraditional employment, is automatically more likely to choose a nontraditional occupation).

For at least some intake workers and service providers, their own doubts and beliefs about nontraditional training parallel those they hold about women trainees, and why they would not choose nontraditional training. As one intake worker put it:

> ...you bring someone who has no experience in this whatsoever and try to impress these people, I mean...they are real keen....Participants--they know, and they can sense whether or not we are sure about this thing, and they can sense it that we are kind of walking a tight rope here. And that's the way I feel, that we are walking a tight rope with them, and that's why I have a problem....I feel like I am playing with peoples' lives....You bring in 500 women in a 6 month period, and we only show that we have 4 that may have been placed in a non-traditional job....If you have 496 people sitting there wondering "Well where is my turn?" "Well when am I going to get in?" We don't have the slots, you have to wait 6 months, and then when the 6 months come around we don't have the funding.

While some intake workers and service providers held such negative beliefs, by the mid-point of the NET project, this was far from universal. Others brought a very different set of attitudes and beliefs to their work, about both nontraditional training and women entering such training. That is, some saw nontraditional training as not all that different from what women, especially women who were single parents, had been doing all their lives:

> But men don't look at the fact that being a single mother, if I have a sofa that is extremely heavy, I have to move it. If I have to clean behind my ice box, I've got to move it. There is no man there to move it and it takes some physical strength to do that. I know I am not in shape, so I am not going to think about it! [Anyway] you have a lot of men who are weaklings.

In addition, many intake workers recognized the importance of role models--seeing women like themselves actually doing this work, and/or talking about it, and the chance to "try out" various kinds of nontraditional occupations (such as during an orientation or pretraining program), as key to recruiting women into nontraditional training programs.

B. To Enhance Success and Retention of Women in Nontraditional Occupations, Two Issues of Coordination Need to be Addressed: Gaps in Program Elements, and Provision of Support Services.

The development of nontraditional training programs for women in the net project has sometimes resulted in a series of programs, such as an orientation, followed by a nontraditional "try-out", followed by a pre-employment program, and only then, actual training. If each of these elements is spaced out by gaps of one or more weeks without training, two things happen: participants' enthusiasm wanes, and their support services, such as child care, are disrupted. For those on welfare, which often is stricter in terms of its requirements for continuous participation, these problems can quickly escalate. For example, if child care is being provided through welfare, and welfare only pays for child care during actual training, the participant is forced to either keep on moving her child in and out of child care--which is disruptive to the child as well as the provider, and may result in loss of the slot--or try to cover the costs of child care during the program gaps herself.

The issue of support services, especially child care, was not simply one of need for the services. Data from the forms indicated that women in nontraditional training were

just as likely to have younger children (and hence a need for preschool child care) as women in traditional training. Since the development of child care systems has been largely built around a model of the kind of work and the hours that accompany it, that most women do--9 to 5, Monday through Friday--many women cannot find child care that meets their needs as nontraditional trainees or workers. As one service provider put it:

> I think child care is a big problem...they see that unless they have a lot of back-ups, they are not going to be able to do it [work in nontraditional jobs]....In general, I'd say our work lives are set up not to be supportive of parenting, so even working a 40 hour week can be really stressful, but [when] I look at the non-traditional fields, they are set up for people who have a wife at home.

Essentially, both nontraditional trainees and program staff knew that women who were mothers, and particularly single parents, needed to have back-up child care, almost always in the form of relatives, in order to make it in nontraditional training. As one service provider flatly stated:

> My experience in talking with prospective students is that unless they have a relative who is going to be available on a 24-hour a day basis, they cannot consider her for the nontraditional job because of the child care situation.

Many of the stories of previous failures of women entering nontraditional training revolved around the collapse of a child care arrangement; unfortunately, these are difficult to document, beyond secondhand accounts or generalizations as above, for it is very much like counting holes--i.e., counting the nontraditional trainees who did not enroll.

Clearly, along with new models of training, these results suggest that a new model of support services, especially child care, needs to be developed. In Montana, program

staff are talking about transferable, or portable child care, to match the itinerant nature of many nontraditional jobs in construction and roadbuilding. More round-the-clock and weekend child care needs to be developed, perhaps expanding the models developed by a few hospitals.

C. Women in Nontraditional Training and Employment Need the Support of Other Women, Particularly When Isolated from Other Support Systems.

In each of the sites, the importance of support was shown by both the negative experiences of women who lacked such support (as happened pre-NET in these sites), and positive experiences later in the NET Project. Particularly in the first set of focus groups, there were many stories of the problems encountered by women in training, and even more so, on the job, when they were the only woman on the site--even if they were not the "first" woman. In contrast, particularly in the second set of groups, there was widespread recognition of the importance of support groups and support.

The recognition of the importance of support groups can be seen by the way they were deliberately structured into the programming. In one site, shared transportation provided by the program, over fairly long distances, created strong bonds. In another, groups were set up to meet after training had ended, and trainees had entered employment. Whatever the form--whether support groups, orientations, pre-training programs, or occupational skills classes--the most important issue, however, is the presence of "women only" elements in the program design. Although some staff felt it created jealousy on the part of men trainees (due to the "special treatment" such

elements may imply), evaluations of all-women elements emphasized three positive aspects:

(1) Without having to compete with men trainees (who often brought more general background, such as familiarity with machines and tools), women trainees are able to develop their skills in isolation from men, and to develop confidence in their abilities; this was further enhanced if the teacher/role model was also a woman, as in the following example:

> S did such a good job....I find myself very illiterate when it comes to mathematics and equations. I get very confused. But...it wasn't that hard....S made it so that you could not fail. She wanted everyone to succeed and so she took a lot of time with [you]--if somebody had a question and just couldn't get it, she'd go over it until they got it right, until they understood what was happening. And I think she created a feeling in the classroom that everyone was equal.

(2) Women in all-women program elements were able to develop strong bonds, resulting in ongoing support through friendships and support networks among fellow trainees. All-women groups were empowering for the participants; this in turn made for a lot of camaraderie, and helped many get through difficult times during training and as they entered employment. As one described it:

> This is a support group. I am just going to support her. If she supports me, I'll support her with the answers.

(3) Having been together in all-women groups, or participating in an on-going support group, women nontraditional trainees were able to deal more effectively with men--both coworkers and supervisors/trainers--who were biased in their dealings with women. That is, they could "reality-

check" with each other to determine if their own treatment was really deserved (for example, by poor workmanship), or was part of a pattern. Women through such groups share their experiences, learn from each other's experiences, and build up a repertoire, from which they can anticipate as well as react to, encounters in male-dominated workplaces.

This kind of effect was described by one service provider as follows:

> They went as a class, so there was a lot of camaraderie that was built up because they were together, and they were starting a new thing at S-T ....everybody was in it together. So there...were [not] the kind of horror stories that you [hear] ....As far as I know they have not had the kind of difficulty that might have been traditional.

An example of the impact of the support and empowerment women in all-women training groups or elements provide each other can be seen in this story told by one nontraditional trainee about herself:

> [Referring to her instructor] He told me the part was no good. I said the part was good. I said it was good, and I started writing down how much more I needed to take off to make it fit, and he went over and started doing my work, and I asked him what he was doing, and I got really mad and said, "Don't touch that!" and he went in and started feeling it and cutting and said, "you are right," and I said, "I know I am right," and he said, "You don't know anything," and I said, "I know more than you think I do!"

Service providers often recognized the importance of support for women trainees:

> ...support...is necessary...for everybody, but also just particularly for women in non-traditionals. The support that just says, "you can do this, we believe you can do it, or you wouldn't be in this program"...The teachers themselves, being aware of the kinds of barriers that are in all of our trainees, they can take situations, and they can see problems--and [then] they don't have to get to a boiling point....Teachers just can have a lot that they can do, too. (SP)

The flip side of the positive impact of support groups on women's experience of nontraditional training and employment, is the negative impact of isolation. In Montana,

the importance of overcoming isolation is being recognized; efforts are underway to develop an 800 number support system, to overcome geographic as well as gender isolation; in other sites, this recognition of the importance of avoiding or overcoming isolation can be seen in the practice of placing several women together in employment, and/or supporting the development of ongoing support networks among nontraditional women, including local tradeswomen networks linking new trainees and experienced women workers in the field.

D. JTPA Structures and Practices Often Restricted the Ability of Programs to Respond to Changing Circumstances.

One focus group participant described JTPA as a "slow car in a fast economy." Some of the elements cited of the "slow-car" syndrome included:

1. The funding cycle is often such that there is a lag of one to two years between the determination of the need/opportunity for trainees in a particular occupation, and those trainees entering the labor market.
2. Many JTPA programs are quite small in scale, and provide little variety in training for men, thus providing few nontraditional opportunities for women.
3. Much of JTPA training is based on the twin assumptions that trainees bring few skills and little work experience to training, and that if given some training, the jobs will be there--what one called the "field of dreams" approach (if you build it, they will come, i.e., if you train them, the jobs will come). At the same time, particularly but not only in high unemployment areas, new private-sector jobs are

part-time, low wage, temporary, and/or often low skill. Project findings indicate that JTPA might--in such an economy--relax such requirements as placement in full-time, non-temporary jobs with wages above a given threshold (although some felt pressured to do so, in order to get jobs for their trainees). Yet this flexibility would have a negative outcome in JTPA performance standards. The dilemma, of training people for jobs that do not exist (this should not be taken literally, but as a way of describing a very tight labor market), prompted some to suggest such alternatives as public-sector job programs, job creation, self-employment, and other options.

4. In some sites, JTPA practices allow employers with OJT slots to pick from a list or group of potential trainees; not surprisingly, in a mixed group, women are rarely if ever picked for a nontraditional OJT opening. (One site has finessed this issue by sending all-women lists to the employer).

5. In some instances, would-be trainees are "OJT-qualified" and then told to find an employer with a job with sufficient training to qualify as OJT. Although this is apparently more often done with male applicants, even if women were given the same opportunity, it is unlikely that they would--in the absence of any training or support--find and develop nontraditional OJT slots for themselves. Note: new JTPA regulations will prohibit this practice.

E. Women in Nontraditional Training and Employment Are Slowly Being Accepted.

Nontraditional trainees in the three sites are reporting less resistance, or sabotage, and more acceptance, than was true before the NET project. Sometimes this acceptance comes with conditions: no special treatment for women, the women must act feminine, or the women should be "masculine-like". (Consistency does not necessarily apply!) Nontraditional trainees even speak of most men on the job as being helpful, with resentment only if they get coveted special privileges, such as working Sunday (which pays double time).

F. Sexual Harassment Continues to Be an Issue, But Less Prominent Than at the Beginning of the Project.

In the first set of focus groups, sexual harassment was a prominent issue. Three concerns in particular arose at that point: defining it, combatting it, and dealing with the repercussions of sexual harassment solutions.

Not surprisingly, men and women differed in their definition of sexual harassment, with the men reacting negatively to broad (and changing) definitions of sexual harassment. As one (male) employer recounted:

> ...the girls were saying that where they work there were pictures up...and they were offended by it and they said that's sexual harassment and I jumped in with both feet and I said what are talking about? You can put up a Playgirl centerfold if you want to. To me they're carrying the sexual harassment issue way over the other line. Anything that you do is offensive.

At the same time, women found that even when they found certain behavior offensive, they were reluctant to label it as sexual harassment--unless it was personal. Contrast the

first two quotes below with the third, obviously painful and awkward realization, all from nontraditional women trainees or workers:

> It depends on the situation...let's say they have a calendar from Snap-On Tools, kind of racy, [but] it's not totally offensive, just kind of racy. If you have to walk around partitions to see this thing, you can't really say he's doing it just to offend me. (nontraditional)

> I can deal with dirty jokes, guys will always tell dirty jokes, and that's all right...I can listen to them, it doesn't bother me, but when it's directed at me and they're commenting on me then I get hot under the collar. (nontraditional)

> I had one guy grab my butt. It was kind of weird because it was really meant in fun. The way the conversation was going, it was somewhat innocent in itself at the time. But I didn't like the way he did it....after I thought about it, I realized that wasn't what I wanted. It just wasn't very funny. [and]...I couldn't just go home and say nothing's happened today...

Even so, particularly for women trainees, who are new to the job or worksite, and often are the first and/or only woman on the job, drawing these distinctions is particularly hard. Since teasing, harassment, and hazing are "normal" treatments of new employees or apprentices, discerning when behavior directed toward them is sexual harassment, and when it is not, is perplexing. As first a union official, and then a former nontraditional trainee explained, harassment and teasing that is not gender-based, while difficult to experience, is to be expected:

> When you come in as an apprentice, you are low man on the totem pole. Regardless of [whether you are] male or female or a minority, you can't take it personally if somebody tells you to do something that somebody next to you is not doing. It's a fact that you're going to be asked to carry lumber, ...to dig dirt out of a hole before one of the journeymen is [asked]. That's just the way life is. You've got to pay your dues before you become a journeyman.

> I had that happen [whole work group teasing/harassing] when I was new on the job, but then once you know the guys on an individual basis, that's never happened. Even if one guy starts it, and [now] these guys kind of know me, everyone'll kind of chuckle and let it go, and that's the end of it.

Figuring out when sexual harassment is the issue is further exacerbated by the fact that women have few or no women "elders" (journeyman, union stewards) they can check it out with, to sort out what is "normal", and what is in fact sexual harassment, as one union official explained:

> It's easier for [women] to think that they are being picked on,...not realizing that there have been 4000 apprentices that have come through the same program and have done the same stuff...Right now we don't have any women business agents or anybody that a girl could turn to if she thinks she is being picked on....The only way she could is to find a female journeyman. Right now we have three. [Interviewer: Out of 4000?] Yeah.

Even when one had determined that one had experienced sexual harassment, trying to find an acceptable middle ground of reaction was very difficult for these women; at one extreme, some women found it effective to set limits--even if it meant being 'humorless' or leading (apparently) the life of a nun:

> ...I mean, like, I don't think domestic abuse jokes are funny. They laugh at them, they think it is funny, and they make cracks about it, and I just told them, "You guys want to talk about, don't do it in front of me, because I've been there, and it's not funny at all." I learned...how to set limits for them and to stick by them.
>
> I had a guy that used to ask me out all the time, and I told him...I have a policy, I don't sleep with my co-workers, and he says "Whoops!"

At the other extreme, women sometimes tried to "fight fire with fire", and become like the guys, a tactic which reveals the limits on acceptance experienced by early 'icebreaker' women trainees, as described by this service provider:

> ...she was telling jokes, that I wouldn't [repeat.] [I] talked to her, "you're the first woman we've had out here, a transition period. If you have a problem, let me know, we'll deal with it right away, we don't want you to feel uncomfortable, we don't want it to affect your work habits"...A couple of weeks later, she's telling dirty jokes...still not in good taste. So at lunch time, I pull her aside, and I said "I can't very well stand up for you and make the guys treat you like a lady if you are

> telling jokes like that." She got mad. She said, "I got a right to say whatever I want to say." So I said, "you're on your own."

Institution-wide, and top-down combatting of sexual harassment seemed to be the most effective, for it did not rely on the individual either defining what was harassment, or setting out personal rules and limits that become self-limiting as well. As described by a nontraditional women, and an employer, this approach was clear and straightforward:

> Everyone knows I work for the city and it's against the rules and everyone knows it's against the rules. So I have that behind me. I think that in a lot of other cases, there are no formal rules and it's a lot harder then.
>
> ...we're a public service. So we are driving in people's driveway, we are going into people's houses. We don't want people to come out to your truck to talk to you and if you got posters hanging on the ceiling in your truck, it's offensive. So we went through the whole company, all offices, all vehicles, all anything and lockers, mens' room and ripped 'em all out.

Combatting sexual harassment presented some women with certain dilemmas. Especially if nontraditional women trainees or workers are isolated, even well-intentioned education programs may put them in a bind, as one described the repercussions:

> ...all of a sudden, I'm the focus of attention because everyone in the building has had an hour of film about how bad men are and how all they want to do is get into your pants you know...and then all the men are mad at you.

Some women described having to choose between tolerating "lesser" forms of harassment (especially if it was generalized, not aimed specifically at them, e.g., rough language, jokes, pictures, etc.) in order to gain acceptance, and taking a stand at the risk of being blackballed out of future jobs:

> [A guy made a sexually suggestive remark; at the time] I'm in the trade for three months. First woman in the company, and [do you think] I'm going to go to the office and say, "these guys are picking on me, this is sexual

> harassment"?...This guy was running the job [who had] said this to me, [and] he could run us around and make us spend so much energy if he wanted to get totally petty on me. So you don't want to tick them off.

Service providers, from their perspective, described similar dilemmas:

> Then [after raising the issue of sexual harassment] you get labeled, okay, because these same guys go to different job sites and they say, "look out for her, we had this problem with her and she's bad news and all she wants to is sue people and try to get a settlement."
>
> If somebody sues or files a complaint...they don't get a job after that or they're told that they weren't trained properly even though that's the contractor that does the training. So you suddenly don't have a job. [Interviewer: So filing a complaint is a serious thing to do?] Yes, not just for women, I know minority men, and they just sit for years without a job.
>
> ..they are real reluctant [to complain], because there is this camaraderie, like a brotherhood, among workers and they see that....We always end up with all the parties involved talking and of course the woman has to go back and work with the supervisors she has just turned in and suddenly in a week or few days, little complaints come in about the quality of her work...You know that she is not doing anything different workwise than she ever did but [soon] the woman will not say anything more....You call people in and they all say "no everything is fine." You go on the jobsite and you know something is wrong....after the woman has been pushed out and she's gone, then you go back to investigate the job again. The guy steps forward and says "she was a hard worker." "Why didn't you...come tell me?" "Well, I was worried about my job, if I had taken the side with her, my name would have been mud.."(SP)

In contrast, sexual harassment seemed to be much less of an issue in the second set of focus groups. This was probably a function of three factors. First, most of the women in nontraditional training have not yet entered employment, or have only recently done so, and some have been in training groups that are up to now, primarily women. Second, employer awareness of the issues has increased, and general hostility of male employees seems to be less in evidence. Finally, and most important, as participants in NET Project training, the women themselves have anticipated these situations, and thus

are able to deal early with a problem, and/or have the support of fellow trainees, in or outside of the workplace. Rather than surprising their male workers with a delayed reaction, as they come to define an action as sexual harassment hours or days afterwards, women in the second set of focus groups knew it when they saw it, knew what they wanted to do–and why, and proceeded to do it:

> Ugly, ugly, ugly, ugly, sexual harassment type ugly....Yes, pornography on my tool box...and then management always wanted it to be just the way it was because they didn't want any problems...(SP)

> [Did the policy [on sexual harassment], you think, have any effect?]
> Yes, because if it happens and you don't report it, it just keeps happening. But they followed [up] and they fired the person right away. (nontraditional)

While ambivalence–driven by their isolation coupled with the knowledge of possible negative repercussions–characterized the reactions of women to sexual harassment in the first set of focus groups, as described above, the mid-NET women trainees were clear about their rights, and acted quickly and confidently. This is another indicator of the way in which participation in nontraditional training and employment is empowering for women.

G. NET Works Best When It Is Customized for Each Site.

At first glance, the quantitative analysis would suggest that the 'Milwaukee model' should be replicated in other sites, for it is clearly very successful at increasing the number of women entering nontraditional training. But several different points were made in the focus groups that suggest a "customizing" model may be more appropriate, one which combines certain universal elements (such as developing women-only

elements, and recruiting without reference to a specific 'type' of woman) with elements specific to the local economy and JTPA system. In Montana, for example, it was pointed out that the rural nature of the state affects training programs in a number of ways. For example, the small population and low density make targeting of a few occupations inappropriate--the economy simply cannot absorb large numbers of people trained in a single field. This in turn affects recruiting and the structure of training programs. Obtaining support services, such as transportation and child care take on very different dimensions: trainees must own cars, and child care may have to be on a 24-hour, weekly basis, to accommodate jobs in remote sites.

In contrast, Hartford would seem to be similar to Milwaukee--urban, industrialized, and a high percentage minority population. There was one very big difference between these two cities, however, what one person called a "red light barrier", and that is a very bad economy in Hartford: unemployment rates are over 10%, and large layoffs of both factory and clerical workers are continuing. As a result, placement rates and wages for all JTPA programs and their trainees in Hartford have plummeted, and trainees of all kinds find themselves competing with the unemployed--recently laid off, highly skilled and experienced workers. This has impacted JTPA intake workers, making them nervous about introducing new ideas like nontraditional training, while service providers have had to restructure their training and placement activities. In such a situation, emphasis on flexibility and "rapid response", including individualized OJT training slots, may be necessary. Development of support services, such as transportation to hard-to-reach outlying job sites, or unusual-hours-child care, may be

necessary to combat low placement rates in a high-unemployment community.

The need to customize the NET process included customizing technical assistance strategies provided by W.O.W. Although the process of developing the NET Project in each site was inherently individualized (see the description above), some participants felt constrained by the NET model and strategies.

H. The NET Project Had Impacts that Began with Nontraditional Training and Employment and the Local JTPA System, But Went Beyond Both.

The first, and some participants thought the longest-lasting, impact of the NET Project was that it brought together people in each community, across racial and ethnic lines, substantive areas, and across wide ideological gulfs. Although it was not cited as ending ancient feuds, there were instances of people talking to each other for the first time, who shared common goals but had somehow never connected before. Working together on projects such as a nontraditional video were not only educational, but also increased understanding between different groups such as service providers and employers.

A second impact that went beyond the project, was that it spurred other institutions, such as the local Vo-Tech college and the welfare authorities, to adopt new and more flexible approaches, thus opening up opportunities for women to obtain nontraditional training.

Finally, the NET Project inspired many of those involved into thinking in new terms. This process started with tackling the issues of nontraditional training for women,

but extended to other JTPA problems and issues as well. Rather than try to summarize a truly rich and diverse set of ideas, these suggestions for change are appended to this report (see Appendix A); these are not our suggestions, based on our findings. (Our own recommendations follow this section). This list of ideas is intended to convey, by its sheer diversity, the way in which the introduction of one new idea, nontraditional training for women, had a broad impact, both direct and indirect, on the JTPA local systems.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Below we have detailed a number of recommendations. Each is based on one or more of our findings (see above). In each area, we have summarized, under "rationale", the relevant findings(s) and other information, but in order to avoid repetition, the reader is referred to the more detailed discussions above.

I. JTPA Structure and Funding:

Rationale: In a typical JTPA, the contracting agency--usually but not always the local PIC--issues its RFPs (requests for proposals) in the fall; the bids from service providers (the ones who do the training) are due during the following winter or early spring, and the contracts are awarded before June 30. Actual training does not begin until after July 1 (the JTPA Program Year runs July 1 through June 30th), and often begins in the next fall. Depending upon the length of training--which is usually but not always limited to six months--it may be the winter, spring, or even later before trainees enter the labor market. Between the beginning and end of this cycle, which may be as little as 12 and as

much as 36 months or more, the local economy as a whole may change, increasing or decreasing the demand for workers in specific occupations.

Recommendations:

1. Make the funding cycle (release of RFPs, bidding, contract awarding) more responsive to the local job market; this may require some legislative changes. This could include such measures as:

   a. Conduct yearly labor market research so that trainees may be assured that they are training for jobs that currently exist.

   b. Fund a labor market specialist--perhaps for a regional group of SDAs--to anticipate new businesses, and expanding occupations/industries.

2. Develop training that is generic to several specific occupations or develop measures to ensure that trainees will be more employable even if the local labor market experiences high overall unemployment rates:

   a. Build in more occupational choices, so that local SDAs do not have 'all their eggs in one basket', e.g., by training participants in a wide range of occupations.

   b. Develop funding mechanisms that allow for generic contracts to trainers, with specific occupations specified at a later date (either by the trainer, or jointly by the trainer and the SDA), at a point in time that is as close as possible to the beginning of training.

   c. Develop occupational training that is more flexible, preparing individuals

need more supportive services than has been the norm for mostly male training programs.

1. Program elements should be snugly scheduled so that there is no undue delay or gaps between actual training components. These gaps are problematic because they are disruptive to child care arrangements (for both the child and the provider), as most programs do not provide funding for child care between components. As a result, participants who are between components--for example, waiting for an OJT slot to open up--may lose their child care 'slot', and/or become discouraged, leading some to dropout.

2. Provide funding for child care for those entering training who are participating in pre-training programs, such as nontraditional "try-out" programs or pre-training preparation programs (for example, strength training, tool identification). Because some programs do not register participants before they actually enter training, and support services are not provided to not-yet-registered participants, lack of child care at this stage may preclude participation in pre-training program elements that lead trainees to choose nontraditional training.

3. Fund "seamless" child care, during and between program elements, and into employment (up to one year, possibly on a sliding fee scale).

4. Develop child care models that meet the needs of nontraditional workers who are mothers of young children: 24-hour and/or drop-in centers, portable child care centers (to be moved as jobs move--for example, following a road construction crew.)

5. Pay relatives to provide child care (particularly difficult-to-find child care, such as evening/night, or short notice extended hours).

6. In order to increase reliability and quality of child care, increase pay and benefits of child care workers.

7. Develop a broader and more flexible definition of supportive services, beyond child care and transportation. For example, trainees may need telephones to notify training program or employer when they are ill; those in training long distances from home may need telephones to maintain contact with children, care providers, and so forth. Note: Telephones may need to be provided through other sources of funding, private or public.

8. Provide, in the local JTPA system, a person whose job is to manage support services, and various crises, to help women continue in training; this is similar to the concept of the case manager under the AFDC JOBS program.

IV. Support for Women Trainees

Rationale: Both women trainees themselves, and service providers, found that providing training programs or elements, before, during, and after training, were important to the morale, and retention, of women in nontraditional training. Lack of confidence, particularly in areas of importance to nontraditional occupations (such as math skills) and isolation, were frequently cited issues.

Recommendations:

1. Pre-training classes for women entering nontraditional training should provide necessary academic skills (such as math), pragmatic information (such as tool identification), and physical strength skills, as appropriate to the training that is to follow.

2. During training, there should be all-women elements or classes, with attention to the specific needs of women trainees.

3. During and continuing after training, support groups for women and/or other support mechanisms (such as mentors) should be developed to help women make adjustments to nontraditional training and mostly male worksites; these provide support, reality checks, networking, and practical advice.

4. For women entering nontraditional occupations who are isolated from each other, because of geographical distance and/or family responsibilities, provide means to overcome isolation, such as through an 800 number.

5. To connect women newly entering nontraditional occupations with women already in their fields, provide support for nontraditional tradeswomen networks and organizations.

V. Data Collection

Rationale: At the time of this study, data collected in two of the three sites did not permit either the local JTPA, or outside researchers, to link the type of occupational

training to wage and employment outcomes for women, nor to assess the role of supportive services.

Recommendations:

1. Ensure that new data collection procedures mandated in recent JTPA legislation permit federal officials, local JTPA officials, and others, to link, by race and gender, individual characteristics (such as education or welfare receipt), the specific kind of occupational training received, and supportive services received (whether through JTPA, AFDC-JOBS, or otherwise), with outcomes such as employment rate and wages.

2. Develop a finer-grained measure of "success" for measuring outcomes for JTPA trainees, that takes into account not only the wage at placement, but fringe benefits and trainee individual and family needs.

VI. The Local JTPA Program and the Community

Rationale: The three sites of the NET Project developed very different programs, depending upon local circumstances, the state of the economy, the nature of the labor market, history, and so forth. Evidence from these three sites suggests that "customizing" is very important, and that, conversely, very few elements are universally applicable. For example, targeting a few occupations is a strategy that does not work well in a rural setting, with relatively few employment opportunities spread over a large geographical area.

Recommendations:

1. Develop a customized approach to nontraditional training in each community, using input not only from employers and unions, but also other key players, such as providers of supportive services.

2. Provide special grants to local JTPAs, perhaps in partnership with local women's training or service organizations, to develop new models of training and service delivery that address the new issues that arise for women entering nontraditional training. For example, provide grants to develop alternative child care systems that meet the needs of single parents in nontraditional training and employment, or to develop systems that provide training and support after training in sparsely populated rural communities.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The goal of the NET Project has been to institutionalize the training of women in nontraditional occupations into the JTPA system. The goal of the NET Research Initiative has been to learn not only how successful the NET Project has been, but more importantly, to learn from the effort--both its more successful aspects, and its less successful ones--how best to achieve the NET goal.

In one sense, we learned much more than we had intended. Finding out the data limitations within the JTPA system was certainly an unexpected, but very important, byproduct. Although in some cases, data is collected, it is often not in a form that can

be used to answer crucial questions about the kind of training women are receiving, and how training and outcomes are related. Even less useful was information on support services; it is simply not possible to link support services receipt, and training and employment outcomes.

This Research Initiative employed a wide variety of data, including not only information collected by the JTPA system, but also questionnaires filled out by trainees themselves, and focus groups of not only trainees, but trainers, employers, PIC staff and policymakers. In this way, our conclusions reflect not only the experience, but the perspective of different players in the system.

While it is dangerous to try to generalize from such diverse kinds of data and viewpoints, several key conclusions stand out. First, we have learned, or perhaps had confirmed again for us, that there is no stereotypic "nontrad" woman out there; to recruit women into nontraditional training thus becomes a task of overcoming general barriers of lack of knowledge, culture and gender stereotyping, both among potential trainees and the JTPA training program gatekeepers (e.g., intake and assessment workers). Second, we have learned that we have much to learn. To be effective, efforts such as the NET Project work best when adapted to the local situation, geography, and economy. Finally, we found that both the JTPA system and its community were changed by their participation in the NET project; not only are more women in nontraditional training, and that training is more effective than in the past, but the community as a whole has begun to change. Of course, some sites and programs are more successful than others, and in all sites, there is much yet to be done. Yet, as can be seen by the creativity and

innovation evinced in the evaluations of participants (see Appendix A), a change process is underway.

APPENDIX A

Ideas for Changes from Focus Groups

Perhaps the best measure of the impact of the NET program on the JTPA system, and the NET sites generally, is the response given when participants were asked how they would change the program in the future, or what they would do differently if they had to do it over. Many different ideas were given, and the list below gives a sense of the way in which this program has sparked innovation, as well as opened up new opportunities for women in nontraditional training.

It should be noted that these ideas came out of informal discussions (the two sets of focus groups), and are at best, a "wish list" untied to the constraints of the real world. In some cases, these ideas reflect ignorance of JTPA law and regulations, or inherent legal limitations on what the JTPA program may legitimately do. Others may be done under the law quite easily. Our listing of these ideas in no way is an endorsement of them by Wider Opportunities for Women, the Department of Labor, or any of the local organizations, such as the Private Industry Councils or the local community organizations involved in the NET Project. Indeed, many do not represent a consensus, but are the idea or wish of a single person.

1. Change the Term 'Nontraditional'. A number of people "took issue" with the term 'nontraditional'. For some, the problem was that it immediately made doing such work problematic for women, i.e., the word nontraditional suggested that it was not normal or ordinary for women to do this--one suggested it was 'stigmatizing'. (See discussion above

about 'comfort'). This seems almost in contradiction of the goal of nontraditional programs, which is to break down these stereotypes, and make nontraditional more nearly normal and accepted for women. One person suggested that instead of doing lists of nontraditional jobs, that the lists be of traditional jobs; this way of approaching it has the advantage that the latter is a much shorter list, while listing of nontraditional occupations tends towards the 'stereotype' nontraditional job--outdoors, trades, etc., and of necessity is not comprehensive.

It was also suggested that this was especially important for children; they should be given alternatives to 'Dick, Jane and Spot', but not have them labelled as nontraditional.

2. Develop Nontraditional Approaches That Are Customized for Rural Settings.

These would include such ideas as:

- Do not target just a few occupations(rural economies cannot absorb large numbers of welders at one time, for example), nor focus on just the fastest growing occupations (in rural areas, these tend to be services and tourism-related jobs, most of which are low-paying).
- For tracking/research purposes, the lack of geographic concentration and the relatively longer-term training used in rural areas need to be accommodated.

3. Change the Structure of JTPA.

In order to increase nontraditional options for women, a number of suggestions were made about how to structure JTPA at the local level:

- Develop more training options for men--which in turn provides more nontraditional options for women.
- Need to develop youth-oriented nontraditional, and link with youth program operators.

- o Bring in service providers and intake workers early in the NET process.

- o Train the trainers, intake workers, service providers, etc.--they too have stereotypes of the nontraditional woman; in some cases, this may mean going out to satellite centers to do training of all personnel. Develop a certification process for these people, as nontraditional Trainers.

Likewise, a number of suggestions were made that would be implemented at the national level:

- o No more pilot programs--they develop enthusiasm, and then it dies when funding ends.

- o Make the funding cycle more flexible--currently the system is too rigid to change rapidly enough, i.e., too much time passes from proposal to trainees entering employment. Note: some aspects of funding mechanisms are mandated by law, thus requiring legislative changes.

- o Allow part-time placements as 'trial' placements, with expectation that they will be converted to full-time by employer.

- o JTPA should pay administration costs, as well as newly starting up programs, until it can develop contacts for placements.

- o Need to develop more training options, such as single subsidized classroom training slots (rather than whole classes).

- o Define further training or education as a 'successful' outcome--now only a job is counted as success. Note: while JTPA does define further education or training as a positive termination, such a person does not contribute to the placement rate, which is defined solely in terms of job placement.

4. Change the Training Itself.

- o Modernize training: include, for example, CNC (computerized numerical control) training in basic machinists training.

- o Include nontraditional elements in traditional training: for example, teach computer literacy, including basic knowledge of hardware, to those in traditional training, such as clerical.

- o Enrich the training for women, with more instructors per class and/or smaller classes, and longer training. Note: this would of course require substantially more resources, for both training and related support services.

- o Build up physical strength and stamina in training, so women on job can "run" for 8 hours or more.

- o Add self-employment as a JTPA option.

5. Add elements to the pre-training/training.

   - o Add one or two days at end of training, to do resumes, learn how to job search in this field. Note: many programs already provide these elements.

   - o Include modules on the nature of nontraditional work--that it is seasonal, how to handle layoffs (and to expect intermittent employment), how career ladders are constructed in specific occupations, etc.

   - o Add emphasis on work readiness--importance of contacting employer if not coming in, or quitting; being on time.

   - o Be clear about realities of nontraditional: sexual harassment, hazing, etc.

6. "Sell" nontraditional to employers, incoming JTPA trainees, and the larger public.

   - o Have a nontraditional job fair for employers.

   - o Have a periodic feature (e.g., monthly), on the 'nontraditional employee of the month', with story and picture on a woman in a nontraditional job.

   - o Have an award for the 'nontraditional Employer of the Month/Year', given for employer who has hired the most women, developed a good nontraditional mentality, etc.

   - o Present nontraditional options to trainees early in intake, rather than waiting until after assessment, etc.

   - o Allow trainees who are interested in nontraditional, and clear about their choices, to bypass further nontraditional orientation, and enter nontraditional training (or pre-training prep class) directly.

7. Deal with the Economy. The shortage of jobs, and the stiff competition faced by new trainees, was mentioned in several contexts. As one person put it, a bad economy is a 'red light barrier', preventing the accomplishment of anything, no matter how good the program. Suggestions for change included:

- o In high unemployment communities, use some JTPA training monies for job creation.

- o Bring back the WPA, or CETA-type PSE (Public Service Employment)--it would provide jobs and training opportunities, and much needed hard and soft infrastructure, from bridges to child care.

- o Use JTPA money for sophisticated labor market research, or better utilized state and local resources to develop better knowledge of the local labor market and future trends.

- o Particularly in bad economic times, allow a longer job search for new trainees who are welfare recipients (one site, only allowed 6 weeks).

8. Enhance support services.

   - o Especially for long training, add stipend so trainees do not have to work.

   - o Put more money into child care, not only to increase services, but to increase salaries, and thereby cut down on turnover, and increase stability of this support service.

   - o Ensure that all trainees have telephones: these are needed in order to be responsible about calling in when sick, child care falls through, etc., and for job search. (In one program, one-third of trainees did not have a telephone in the home). Note: telephones are not an anticipated support service under JTPA, and thus would have to be provided through other funding sources, private or public.

   - o Provide money to forestall housing crises, e.g., to prevent eviction.

9. Provide support for women.

   - o Provide ongoing support for women through group meetings, and follow-up, into employment.

   - o For isolated rural women, provide free 800 number.

   - o Early in training, provide women with mentors, who would be experienced nontraditional women.

APPENDIX B

TABLES

Table 1. JTPA PY90-91 Trainees, by Site

	Hartford		Milwaukee		Montana	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Placement Rate (%)	30.0%	45.0%	64.0%	75.0%	73.0%	76.0%
Placement Wage (per hour)	$6.69	$7.13	$5.75	$6.56	$5.58	$6.29
Ratio of Wages (W/M)	0.798		0.876		0.887	
Overall, % Women	70		58		60	
Overall, % Minority	90		84		11	

Table 2. Number in Training, Placement Rates and Wage at Placement by Race, Gender and Type of Training: Phase I (Pre-NET)

A. Number in Training

	Hartford			Milwaukee			Montana		
	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training
Black	14	1	7	7	1	8	2	0	0
Hispanic	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian/Indian	0	0	3	2	0	0	5	0	1
White	1	0	0	0	0	0	52	7	13
Total	30	1	13	9	1	8	59	7	14

B. Placement Rates

	Hartford			Milwaukee			Montana		
	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training
Black	21.4%	0.0%	85.7%	85.7%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	-	-
Hispanic	40.0%	-	100.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Indian	-	-	67.7%	50.0%	-	-	80.0%	-	100.0%
White	0.0%	-	-	-	-	-	61.5%	28.7%	46.2%
Total	30.0%	0.0%	81.8%	77.8%	0.0%	50.0%	68.0%	28.7%	50.0%
N	(30)	(1)	(13)	(9)	(1)	(8)	(59)	(7)	(14)

C. Wages at Placement

(Average: number in parentheses=number with wages)

	Hartford			Milwaukee			Montana		
	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training
Black	6.67(3)	-	7.62(6)	5.65(6)	-	7.63(4)	10.00(1)	-	-
Hispanic	7.81(6)	-	8.00(1)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian/Indian	-	-	7.50(2)	7.25(1)	-	-	6.99(4)	-	5.50(1)
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.70(32)	12.28(2)	6.46(6)
Total	7.43(9)	-	7.64(9)	5.88(7)	-	7.63(4)	6.82(37)	12.28(2)	6.32(7)
Wage Ratio Female/Male			0.972			0.771			1.079

Table 3. Number in Training, by Race, Gender and Type of Training
Phase II: Mid-NET

	Hartford			Milwaukee			Montana		
	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training	Women in Traditional Training	Women in Nontraditional Training	Men in Traditionally Male Training
Black	13	1	0	4	15	2	1	0	0
Hispanic	6	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0
Asian/Indian	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	1
White	0	[illegible]	0	4	5	0	47	4	5
Total	19	1	2	11	21	4	51	4	6

Table 4. Variable Means and T-tests, Women in Training, Phase I and Phase II, by Traditional or Nontraditional Training, Site, and Phase I and Phase II

Variable	1 Trad	2 Nontrad	3 T-test Trad-NT	4 Hartford	5 Milwaukee	6 T-test H-Mke	7 Montana	8 T-test Mke-MT	9 Phase I	10 Phase II	11 T-test
Age (years)	29.1 (179)	30.2 (34)	NS	26.9 (51)	27.9 (41)	NS	30.7 (121)	.05*	28.9 (107)	29.6 (106)	NS
Education (years)	12.2 (179)	12.5 (34)	NS	11.7 (51)	12.4 (41)	.023*	12.3 (121)	NS	12.1 (107)	12.3 (106)	NS
Wage of best job	$5.62 (143)	$6.07 (23)	NS	$6.37 (36)	$5.38 (34)	.006^	$5.54 (96)	NS	$5.68 (88)	$5.70 (78)	NS
Yrs Worked of last 10	6.02 (159)	5.7 (30)	NS	6.1 (40)	4.5 (36)	NS	6.3 (113)	.096*	6.57 (94)	5.37 (95)	NS
Num children (<18 yrs old)	1.79 (138)	2.37 (30)	.0063^	1.37 (51)	2.04 (41)	.016*	1.35 (121)	.001^	1.55 (107)	1.43 106	NS
Age of youngest child	5.64 (136)	6.42 (31)	NS	6.36 (36)	4.69 (36)	NS	5.98 (95)	NS	5.32 (87)	6.29 (80)	NS
Happy w/ Child Care (6=happiest)	5.06 (127)	4.48 (29)	NS	5.4 (32)	4.4 (32)	.016*	5.0 (92)	NS	5.19 (83)	4.68 (73)	.042*
Housing Cost ($/month)	$219.53 (165)	$201.58 (33)	NS	$254.71 (42)	$253.15 (40)	NS	$190.09 (116)	.097^	$234.62 (102)	$197.32 (96)	.080*
Family Income (categories 1-6)	3.81 (165)	4.15 (33)	NS	3.93 (43)	4.37 (37)	.057*	3.68 (118)	.01*	4.07 (102)	3.65 (98)	.031*
Percent Income Spent on Hsg	55.2% (155)	47.2% (33)	NS	64.7% (37)	54.9% (36)	NS	50.0% (114)	NS	50.5% (97)	57.5% (90)	NS
Months at Current Address	27.0 (177)	33.6 (34)	NS	27.1 (50)	36.9 (41)	NS	25.5 (120)	NS	26.6 (106)	29.5 (105)	NS
Number Places Lived, last 5 yrs	4.28 (172)	2.6 (33)	NS	2.36 (49)	2.82 (38)	NS	5.07 (118)	NS	4.42 (104)	3.58 (101)	NS

N.B Number in parentheses is the number of trainees in the subgroup (N).

NS = No significant.

* Probability of .10 or less.

Table 5. Estimates of Impact of Trainee Characteristics, Site, and Phase, on Enrollment in Traditional Versus Nontraditional Training

Dependent Variable: Enrollment in Traditional Versus Nontraditional Training

Independent Variables	1 Parameter Estimate	1 P	2 Parameter Estimate	2 P	3 Parameter Estimate	3 P	4 Parameter Estimate	4 P	5 Parameter Estimate	5 P	6 Parameter Estimate	6 P	7 Parameter Estimate	7 P
Intercept	.5120	.1183	-.5308	.1663	-.0581	.8667	-.2573	.4803	-.2007	.5012	-.3446	.2379	-.3475	.2333
Age	.0007	.8773	.0032	.5627	.0023	.6369	.0051	.3213	.0050	.2717	.0023	.5789	.0022	.5947
Yrs School	.0105	.0953*	.0190	.5047	-.0084	.7447	-.0077	.7792	-.0114	.6262	.0231	.2842	.0235	.2759
Yrs Work	.0001	.9760	-.0031	.5102	-.0009	.8455	-.0001	.9839	.0011	.7776	.0029	.4769	.0021	.5939
BJ Wage	-	-	.0002	.2795	.0002	.1815	.0003	.1671	.0002	.2058	-	-	-	-
# Kids	.0562	.0279*	.0439	.1665	.0216	.4549	.0148	.6301	.0415	.0902	.0349	.1238	.0334	.1389
Young kid	.0589	.4574	.1355	.1351	.0458	.5740	.1224	.1465	.1121	.1404	.0354	.6135	.0409	.5567
Months	.0001	.8664	.0003	.7449	-.0003	.7215	.0001	.9166	.0001	.8592	-.0002	.7340	-.0002	.7606
Num Place	.0024	.5774	-.0016	.7134	-.0013	.7354	-.0384	.6655	-.0006	.8629	-.0014	.7026	-.0014	.7053
Pct Hsg	-	-	.0262	.7777	-.0346	.6764	.0591	.4091	-	-	-	-	-	-
Welfare	.0460	.4636	.0774	.2886	.0352	.6002	.0591	.4091	-	-	.0142	.7992	.0111	.8427
Nonwhite	.0445	.4826	.0833	.2670	-.0435	.7005	-	-	-.1160	.2627	-.0710	.4483	-	-
Hartford	-	-	-	-	.0213	.8814	-.0444	.6508	.0639	.5767	.0394	.7371	-.0193	.8271
Milwaukee	-	-	-	-	-.0396	.8078	.3238	.0002~	.4423	.0001~	.0618	.6528	-.0041	.9690
Phase II	-	-	-	-	-	-	.0427	.4971	.0321	.5496	-	-	-	-
NET Site 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.0181	.8797	.0099	.9340
NET Site 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5198	.0001~	.5448	.0001~
N	171		129		129		129		153		171		171	
Adjusted R Sq	.0081		-.0099		.2179		.1103		.1882		.2392		.2412	
F	1.154		.885		3.397~		2.231^		3.955~		5.135~		5.529~	

* Probability of .10 or less.
^ Probability of .01 or less.
~ Probability of .001 or less.

Table 6. Demographic Profile of Trainees, by Site, Type of Training, Gender and Phase

A. Phase I

Subject	Characteristic	Women in Traditional Training				Women in Nontraditional Training				Men in Traditional Male Training				Total
		Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	
Race/ Ethnicity	Black	47%	78%	3%	23%	100%	100%	0%	22%	64%	100%	0%	44%	28%
	Hispanic	50%	0%	0%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	0%	3%	12%
	White	3%	0%	88%	54%	0%	0%	100%	78%	0%	0%	93%	40%	55%
	American Indian	0%	11%	8%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
	Asian/Other	0%	11%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	13%	4%
Number of Children	Has children	73%	89%	85%	82%	100%	100%	71%	78%	36%	57%	71%	56%	77%
	Has 1 child	23%	22%	37%	32%	0%	0%	57%	44%	18%	43%	29%	28%	32%
	Has 2 children	40%	22%	31%	33%	100%	0%	0%	11%	0%	14%	7%	6%	25%
	Has 3 or more children	13%	44%	15%	17%	0%	100%	14%	22%	9%	0%	21%	13%	17%
Age of Youngest Child	2 yrs old or under	27%	33%	32%	31%	0%	100%	43%	44%	9%	43%	36%	28%	32%
	3-5 yrs old	23%	11%	25%	23%	0%	0%	28%	22%	0%	0%	14%	6%	20%
	6-12 yrs old	20%	33%	17%	19%	100%	0%	0%	11%	9%	14%	14%	13%	17%
Education	< High School	17%	11%	5%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	43%	7%	12%	9%
	High School Grad/GED	77%	89%	42%	57%	0%	0%	86%	67%	82%	43%	50%	60%	58%
	Post High School	7%	0%	53%	33%	100%	100%	14%	33%	18%	14%	43%	28%	32%
Academic Skills	Reading < 7th Grade	7%	0%	3%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	27%	0%	7%	13%	6%
	Math < 7th Grade	17%	100%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	14%	0%	6%	12%
Employment Experience	Ever Employed	80%	100%	92%	89%	100%	100%	100%	100%	63%	100%	100%	88%	92%
	Empl'd w/in past 2 yrs	58%	78%	75%	68%	100%	100%	71%	78%	100%	99%	57%	69%	76%
Wages of Best Job	$5/hr or less	26%	56%	57%	48%	0%	0%	60%	43%	33%	40%	36%	36%	45%
	$5.01-7.00/hr	43%	44%	26%	33%	100%	100%	40%	57%	0%	20%	14%	12%	30%
	$7.01 or more	30%	0%	16%	19%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	40%	50%	52%	25%
Single Parent		73%	67%	54%	61%	100%	100%	29%	44%	0%	0%	0%	0%	46%
Long term Welfare		50%	78%	12%	30%	100%	100%	14%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	23%

Table 6. Demographic Profile of Trainees, by Site, Type of Training, Gender and Phase

Phase II

Subject	Characteristic	Women in Traditional Training				Women in Nontraditional Training				Men in Traditional Male Training				Total
		Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	
Race/ Ethnicity	Black	63%	36%	2%	21%	100%	75%	0%	64%	50%	50%	0%	25%	31%
	Hispanic	21%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	17%	5%
	White	16%	36%	92%	67%	0%	25%	100%	36%	0%	0%	83%	42%	58%
	American Indian	0%	18%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%	8%	5%
	Asian/Other	0%	9%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	8%	2%
Number of Children	Has children	58%	73%	73%	69%	100%	95%	75%	92%	50%	25%	83%	58%	75%
	Has 1 child	16%	45%	35%	32%	0%	15%	0%	12%	0%	25%	33%	25%	28%
	Has 2 children	11%	18%	24%	20%	0%	25%	50%	28%	50%	0%	17%	17%	21%
	Has 3 or more children	21%	9%	11%	14%	100%	50%	25%	4%	0%	0%	17%	17%	22%
Age of Youngest Child	2 yrs old or under	21%	36%	34%	31%	100%	40%	0%	36%	0%	25%	17%	17%	31%
	3-5 yrs old	16%	27%	12%	15%	0%	20%	50%	24%	50%	0%	50%	8%	17%
	6-12 yrs old	5%	0%	20%	14%	0%	30%	25%	28%	0%	0%	33%	17%	18%
Education	< High School	21%	9%	6%	9%	0%	20%	0%	16%	50%	25%	17%	25%	13%
	High School Grad/GED	68%	64%	39%	49%	100%	50%	50%	52%	50%	75%	33%	50%	50%
	Post High School	11%	27%	55%	41%	0%	30%	50%	32%	0%	0%	50%	25%	37%
Academic Skills	Reading < 7th Grade	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	5%	0%	4%	0%	50%	0%	17%	3%
	Math < 7th Grade	5%	0%	8%	6%	0%	5%	0%	4%	0%	25%	17%	16%	7%
Employment Experience	Ever Employed	84%	100%	92%	91%	100%	85%	100%	88%	100%	75%	100%	92%	96%
	Empl'd w/in past 2 yrs	48%	91%	63%	63%	0%	50%	75%	52%	100%	50%	100%	83%	68%
Wages of Best Job	$5/hr or less	15%	63%	42%	38%	0%	25%	25%	24%	0%	75%	17%	33%	35%
	$5.01-7.00/hr	32%	27%	24%	26%	0%	35%	0%	28%	0%	0%	0%	0%	24%
	$7.01 or more	15%	0%	14%	12%	0%	10%	25%	12%	100%	0%	50%	50%	16%
Single Parent		NA	64%	63%	NA	NA	85%	100%	NA	NA	0%	0%	NA	NA
Long term Welfare		16%	18%	12%	13%	100%	75%	75%	76%	0%	50%	0%	17%	27%

Table 7. How Trainee Obtained Information on Training Program

A. Phase I

How did you find out about this particular training program?	Women in Traditional Training				Women in Nontraditional Training				Men in Traditional Male Training				Total
	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	
Saw a newspaper article about it	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Saw a newspaper ad about it	0%	0%	7%	4%	0%	0%	14%	11%	9%	0%	0%	3%	4%
Heard a radio program about it	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Heard a radio ad or PSA about it	3%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Saw a TV Program about it	0%	0%	3%	2%	0%	0%	14%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Saw pictures of women doing this	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	0%	3%	1%
Saw video about training	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Was given brochure or flyer about it	0%	0%	3%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	18%	14%	7%	13%	4%
Saw poster about it	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Received mailing about it	0%	11%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Saw listing in school catalogue	0%	0%	8%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Told by another program	20%	0%	22%	19%	0%	100%	14%	22%	18%	71%	21%	31%	22%
Told by social worker	20%	0%	24%	20%	100%	0%	0%	11%	27%	14%	43%	31%	22%
Heard woman speak about this work	3%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	3%	3%
Told by friends, relatives, etc	57%	67%	42%	49%	100%	0%	57%	56%	55%	43%	36%	44%	51%
Other	23%	22%	24%	23%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	21%	13%	19%

Table 7. How Trainee Obtained Information on Training Program

B. Phase II

How did you find out about this particular training program?	Women in Traditional Training				Women in Nontraditional Training				Men in Traditional Male Training				Total
	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	
Saw a newspaper article about it	0%	0%	6%	4%	0%	0%	50%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Saw a newspaper ad about it	0%	0%	4%	3%	0%	0%	25%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Heard a radio program about it	11%	0%	2%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	8%	4%
Heard a radio ad or PSA about it	11%	0%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Saw a TV Program about it	6%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Saw pictures of women doing this	0%	0%	4%	2%	100%	5%	25%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Saw video about training	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	5%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Was given brochure or flyer about it	11%	18%	8%	10%	100%	5%	25%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%
Saw poster about it	0%	0%	6%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Received mailing about it	0%	0%	8%	5%	0%	5%	25%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Saw listing in school catalogue	0%	0%	12%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Told by another program	5%	36%	20%	19%	0%	30%	25%	28%	0%	0%	17%	8%	19%
Told by social worker	26%	0%	16%	16%	0%	25%	50%	24%	50%	25%	0%	17%	19%
Heard woman speak about this work	0%	18%	6%	6%	0%	25%	25%	24%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%
Told by friends, relatives, etc	58%	73%	43%	51%	0%	15%	25%	16%	50%	50%	33%	42%	44%
Other	11%	18%	18%	16%	0%	15%	0%	12%	0%	25%	50%	33%	17%

Table 8. Reasons Given by Trainees for Choosing A Particular Training Program

A. Phase I

Why did you choose this particular program?	Women in Traditional Training				Women in Nontraditional Training				Men in Traditional Male Training				Total
	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	
It was recommended by:													
My social worker	30%	11%	32%	30%	100%	0%	0%	11%	27%	14%	36%	28%	28%
A friend	20%	22%	22%	21%	0%	100%	43%	44%	36%	29%	21%	28%	26%
A family member	13%	22%	12%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	14%	0%	6%	12%
A co-worker	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	29%	0%	6%	2%
My partner	7%	0%	5%	5%	100%	0%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Some other person	17%	11%	8%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	18%	0%	21%	16%	12%
Unspecified	27%	33%	42%	37%	0%	0%	43%	33%	45%	43%	7%	28%	36%
It has been a long time interest	47%	67%	59%	57%	0%	0%	43%	33%	45%	14%	43%	38%	52%
I like the wages	17%	33%	36%	30%	0%	0%	29%	22%	27%	29%	29%	28%	30%
It is close to home	13%	0%	22%	17%	0%	0%	14%	11%	18%	0%	0%	6%	15%
It offers support services	20%	11%	25%	22%	100%	0%	0%	11%	9%	0%	7%	6%	18%
I heard about it:													
From my church, club, other group	3%	0%	0%	1%	100%	0%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
During job orientation	23%	22%	31%	28%	0%	0%	14%	11%	18%	43%	29%	28%	27%
At another trng prgm (formally)	7%	0%	5%	5%	0%	0%	14%	11%	0%	14%	29%	19%	9%
At another trng prgm (informally)	10%	0%	12%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	14%	21%	16%	11%
On the radio	3%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Unspecified	3%	11%	7%	6%	100%	0%	0%	11%	27%	14%	21%	22%	10%
I saw:													
A newspaper ad/article about it	0%	0%	3%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	7%	6%	3%
A pamphlet/flyer on it	0%	11%	2%	2%	0%	0%	14%	11%	9%	0%	7%	6%	4%
A magazine article about it	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Pictures of women doing this work	0%	11%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Read about other women doing this	3%	0%	2%	2%	100%	0%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
It was required by social worker	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	29%	0%	6%	1%
It was only program available	3%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	18%	0%	7%	9%	4%
It was only program fit schedule	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	7%	6%	2%

Table 8. Reasons Given by Trainees for Choosing A Particular Training Program

B. Phase II

Why did you choose this particular program?	Women in Traditional Training				Women in Nontraditional Training				Men in Traditional Male Training				Total
	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	
It was recommended by:													
My social worker	42%	0%	20%	22%	100%	30%	50%	36%	50%	0%	17%	17%	25%
A friend	11%	64%	22%	25%	0%	10%	0%	8%	0%	50%	17%	25%	23%
A family member	26%	9%	20%	20%	0%	5%	25%	8%	50%	25%	0%	17%	19%
A co-worker	0%	18%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	17%	4%
My partner	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Some other person	5%	9%	6%	6%	0%	15%	0%	12%	0%	25%	17%	17%	8%
Unspecified	37%	45%	33%	36%	0%	20%	75%	28%	50%	50%	33%	42%	37%
It has been a long time interest	58%	27%	55%	52%	0%	50%	25%	44%	0%	0%	17%	8%	48%
I like the wages	11%	36%	53%	41%	0%	75%	25%	64%	0%	0%	33%	17%	45%
It is close to home	16%	9%	14%	14%	0%	10%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%
It offers support services	16%	9%	31%	25%	0%	50%	25%	44%	0%	0%	0%	0%	27%
I heard about it:													
From my church, club, other group	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	15%	0%	12%	0%	25%	0%	8%	4%
During job orientation	42%	18%	22%	26%	0%	30%	25%	28%	50%	0%	17%	17%	27%
At another trng prgm (formally)	5%	18%	10%	10%	0%	30%	0%	24%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12%
At another trng prgm (informally)	5%	27%	12%	12%	100%	35%	25%	36%	0%	0%	0%	0%	16%
On the radio	5%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Unspecified	11%	27%	12%	14%	0%	25%	25%	24%	0%	25%	0%	8%	16%
I saw:													
A newspaper ad/article about it	5%	0%	8%	6%	0%	0%	25%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%
A pamphlet/flyer on it	0%	0%	4%	2%	0%	5%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%
A magazine article about it	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Pictures of women doing this work	5%	0%	6%	5%	100%	15%	0%	16%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%
Read about other women doing this	11%	9%	6%	7%	100%	10%	0%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%
It was required by social worker	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
It was only program available	5%	9%	2%	4%	0%	5%	0%	4%	0%	0%	17%	8%	4%
It was only program fit schedule	0%	9%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%

Table 9. Child Care Arrangements (Youngest Child)

A. Phase I

Type of Person Providing Child Care	Women in Traditional Training				Women in Nontraditional Training				Men in Traditional Male Training				Total
	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	
Relative, sibling	33%	67%	14%	24%	100%	0%	0%	11%	9%	14%	29%	19%	22%
Babysitter, friend	10%	0%	5%	6%	0%	0%	14%	11%	0%	14%	0%	3%	6%
Daycare Center	20%	0%	31%	24%	0%	100%	0%	11%	0%	14%	21%	13%	21%
Partner,child's father	0%	22%	15%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	21%	13%	11%
Daycare Home	0%	0%	17%	10%	0%	0%	57%	44%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%

B. Phase II

Type of Person Providing Child Care	Women in Traditional Training				Women in Nontraditional Training				Men in Traditional Male Training				Total
	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	
Relative, sibling	16%	55%	10%	17%	0%	15%	0%	12%	50%	25%	50%	42%	20%
Babysitter, friend	11%	0%	6%	6%	0%	10%	25%	12%	0%	0%	17%	8%	8%
Daycare Center	11%	0%	16%	12%	100%	50%	25%	48%	0%	0%	0%	0%	19%
Partner,child's father	11%	0%	16%	11%	0%	5%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%
Daycare Home	5%	9%	8%	7%	0%	5%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%

Table 10. Satisfaction with Child Care Arrangements

A. Phase I

How Do You Feel About Your Child Care Arrangements?	Women in Traditional Training				Women in Nontraditional Training				Men in Traditional Male Training				Total
	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	
Not happy,not going to change	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	100%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Not happy,trying to change	0%	0%	3%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
OK, but would change if could	3%	22%	12%	10%	0%	0%	14%	11%	9%	14%	7%	9%	9%
Best can afford	3%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	14%	11%	0%	29%	14%	13%	4%
Pretty good	7%	11%	19%	14%	0%	0%	14%	11%	0%	0%	7%	3%	12%
"The best"	57%	44%	41%	46%	100%	0%	29%	33%	0%	0%	14%	6%	36%
NA / no children in childcare	30%	22%	19%	22%	0%	0%	29%	22%	91%	57%	36%	59%	31%

B. Phase II

How Do You Feel About Your Child Care Arrangements?	Women in Traditional Training				Women in Nontraditional Training				Men in Traditional Male Training				Total
	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	Hartford	Milw	Montana	Total	
Not happy,not going to change	0%	9%	2%	2%	0%	5%	25%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Not happy,trying to change	5%	18%	8%	9%	100%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%
OK, but would change if could	0%	9%	6%	5%	0%	20%	0%	16%	0%	0%	17%	8%	8%
Best can afford	11%	0%	4%	5%	0%	10%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Pretty good	5%	0%	17%	11%	0%	15%	0%	12%	50%	0%	17%	17%	12%
"The best"	21%	9%	31%	26%	0%	35%	75%	40%	0%	25%	33%	25%	30%
NA / no children in childcare	53%	36%	31%	37%	0%	15%	0%	12%	50%	75%	33%	50%	36%