The movement to aid displaced homemakers began in 1975 and local programs received funding support from state legislation, Vocational Education, and CETA. There are no definitive statistics on the number of displaced homemakers in the country although the Department of Labor has estimated the number at 4.13 million. Information from 136 local programs reveals that most are affiliated with secondary or post-secondary educational institutions and were established within the last 18 months. Programs reported contact with over 26,500 displaced homemakers, indicating they could serve more. Half the programs had multiple funding and budgets between $25,000 and $75,000. Most offer job readiness workshops, skills and career assessment, and individual and group counseling. Displaced homemakers need more job-specific training, financial support while in training, and opportunities in nontraditional occupations. Although displaced homemakers lack confidence in their own abilities, employers are satisfied with their work. The focus of the movement should remain with middle-aged and older women. There is a need for training of displaced homemaker advisors, counselors, and instructors. Program evaluations should consider funding, outreach, services offered, and methods of providing services. (Author/HRH)
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The following state-of-the-art review is the first phase of a two-year project funded by the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Adult and Occupational Education, "Identification and Development of Procedures for Facilitating Access to Employment through Vocational Education for Displaced Homemakers." As a basis for materials development, the Request for Proposal specified certain tasks including: determination of the location of displaced homemaker programs around the country, determination of the number of displaced homemakers served and the potential for service to additional displaced homemakers, a review of the literature, suggestion of criteria for program evaluation, determination of kinds of vocational training in which displaced homemakers are enrolled, and compilation of employers' comments.

The report of the results of the tasks specified above are found in the following seven sections, along with other information resulting from our research efforts. Our sources of data included responses to a request for information mailed to local programs and to national organizations; telephone interviews with local program directors, employers, and state vocational education sex-equity coordinators; roundtable discussions with groups of displaced homemakers, vocational educators, and employers; site visits to local programs and to some national and state organizations concerned with displaced homemakers; and search of the literature in computerized data banks and libraries.

We would like to thank the people who helped in many ways -- Vivian Guilfoy of EDC, Harriet Medaris of BOAE, Evelyn Farber of the Women's Bureau DOL, Alice Quinlan and Cynthia Marano of the Displaced Homemakers Network, Grace Sheldrick, Elaine Bakal, Grace Vickery, Nancy Gruber, Susan Laing, and especially the staff members of programs who shared information with us.
Some Highlights of the State-of-the-Art Review

The following is a listing of some of the main points and findings of the state-of-the-art review, roughly in the same order in which they appear in the body of this paper. Please see individual sections for the full discussion on each point.

History of the Movement and Legislation

- The movement began in 1975 as the result of charismatic leadership and grassroots initiative.
- State legislation for funding has been followed by Vocational Education and CETA funding as the major sources of support for local programs.

Numbers of Displaced Homemakers

- There are currently no definitive statistics on the number of displaced homemakers in the country.
- The Department of Labor has estimated that there are 4.13 million displaced homemakers, a figure considered too low by some.

Location and Information from Local Programs

- Based primarily on the Program Directory of the Displaced Homemakers Network, and contact with Vocational Education Sex-Equity Coordinators in each state, 354 programs for displaced homemakers were located and listed.
- Of the 136 local programs which responded to a request for information (38% of programs located sent usable responses in time to be analyzed), 61% were affiliated with secondary or post-secondary educational institutions.
- 78% of responding programs were established within the last one and a half years.
- Programs responding indicated that they had come in contact with over 26,500 displaced homemakers in the last year.

- Seventy-eight percent of programs responding indicated that they could serve more displaced homemakers, given their current resources -- a total of half again as many as they are now serving.

- 47% had some vocational education funding, 43% had CETA funding, and 27% had funding from the state.

- Half of the responding programs had multiple sources of funding.

- 41% of programs had annual budgets over $25,000 and below $75,000; half had budgets above $50,000 and half below.

- Over half of the programs had only one or two full-time staff members or none.

- 65% of programs do not make use of volunteers.

- Local programs vary in what they offer:

  - The majority of programs have job readiness workshops (82%) and individual and group counseling (79%).

  - 75% offer skills and career assessment, but less than half (40%) offer skills training, most of it remedial for general skills (reading, math) rather than job-specific. Only 11% can offer financial support for training, and only 8% mentioned on-the-job training.

Vocational Training and Education

- The majority of local programs focus on counseling rather than job-specific training.

- Displaced homemakers need greater opportunities to receive financial support while in training.

- Displaced homemakers need greater opportunities for training and employment in nontraditional occupations.
Attitudes of Employers

- Most of the employers who had hired displaced homemakers were satisfied, citing dependability and high motivation.
- Displaced homemakers generally lack confidence in their own abilities.
- There is a need for more awareness of displaced homemaker programs among employers.

Problems and Recommendations

- The term "displaced homemaker" has negative connotations, but should not be dropped entirely.
- The definition of a "displaced homemaker" is not clear-cut; areas of vagueness center on criteria of age, employment status, financial resources, and status of children. The focus of the movement should remain the middle-aged and older woman.
- There is a need for more effective outreach to displaced homemakers, especially to minority and rural women.
- Multiple sources of funding are desirable, especially when the funding source tends to restrict the client population, as is the case with CETA.
- There is a need for training of displaced homemaker advisors, counselors, and instructors to acquaint them with those aspects of the problem in which they lack knowledge.
- Displaced homemakers should have opportunities to explore a variety of options, an outcome made more feasible by effective linkages among community resources.

Criteria for Evaluation of Programs

- Criteria should include aspects of funding, outreach, service to displaced homemakers, and methods for the provision of those services.
SECTION 1
THE DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS MOVEMENT: HISTORY AND LEGISLATION

In little over four years the displaced homemaker has gained national attention. This has resulted in some concrete efforts at amelioration of her plight, focused on methods to enable her to re-enter the labor market. The most significant of these efforts include state funding of programs for displaced homemakers. Currently 30 states have passed legislation and, of these, 24 have allocated funds for programs. See Appendix 1-A. Nine states maintain displaced homemaker coordinators with state funds. See Appendix 1-B., and inclusion of displaced homemakers as a special targeted group under P.L. 94-482 of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (see Appendix 1-C for copies of the legislative and regulative references) and Title III of the CETA reauthorization of 1978 (see Appendix 1-D).

In theoretical terms, the displaced homemaker as a "social problem" has proceeded through four typical stages in its "career": (1) Private or interest group recognition, (2) political recognition as appropriate for public decision, (3) public debate, and (4) political outcomes (R. Ross and G. Staines, "The Politics of Analyzing Social Problems", in M. Chester and E. Bolling, et al., Perspectives on Group Life in America, Lexington, Mass.: Xerox Publications, 1975).

The process is, of course, a continuing one, as advocates press for growth and consolidation of gains (which goals are by no means certain in a time of economic retrenchment, as will be discussed later).

That the progress of the movement for displaced homemakers has been comparatively swift can be attributed to several factors. At the individual level, it was the charismatic leadership of two middle-aged formerly married
women, Tish Sommers and Laurie Shields, which galvanized support at the grassroots level, first in their home state of California and then in the rest of the country.

In the early 1970's while working for a program called Jobs for Older Women in Oakland, Tish Sommers became aware of the women who "fell between the cracks" of the country's systems of financial support. These were homemakers, generally over the age of 35, who had lost their means of support (the husband's earnings or AFDC when their children reached majority), who were too young to collect Social Security, who did not qualify for Unemployment Compensation, and who could not collect under the husband's pension plan. Moreover, because of their age, lack of skills and lack of recent employment, finding jobs was very difficult, even though the financial need was immediate and pressing. As coordinator of the Task Force on Older Women of the National Organization for Women, Sommers wrote of the "poisonous combination of age and sex discrimination" and of the necessity to "make a public fuss. Until that happens, a conspiracy of silence reigns, without even statistics to bear witness" ("The Compounding Impact of Age on Sex," Civil Rights Digest, Fall, 1974).

In the interest of making just such a "public fuss", Sommers joined forces with Laurie Shields and brought in lawyer Barbara Dudley to draft legislation. In the spring of 1975 a Displaced Homemakers Bill was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Yvonne Burke of California. The bill, with its newly-coined term "displaced homemaker", became the rallying point around which Sommers, Shields, and Milo Smith formed the Alliance for Displaced Homemakers to drum up support in California and around the country.
As Sommers has stated, "Once the issue of middle years women who needed an assist to move from dependency to self-sufficiency was defined, given a name, and a piece of legislation as a mobilizing handle, older women came out of the woodwork and moved into political action. As a result of television coverage, women wrote by the hundreds, from cities and towns and rural areas -- with one common theme -- 'at last, a candle of hope...' They responded in the practical concrete ways of writing to legislators, of organizing small groups, of soliciting support from organizations of all kinds. In the process many turned themselves around into effective citizen participants. They were no longer victims, but healers of societal wrongs."

(Older Women: Public Policy, Private Pain, paper presented at Western Gerontological Society, May, 1979.) Woman no longer had to think of their problems as personal and insurmountable, but could perceive inadequacies in the social system which could be ameliorated by social action. As lobbying activities grew, individual states passed legislation for displaced homemakers, California being the first (in record time) in September of 1975, and 13 other states following suit in the next two years.

The first displaced homemaker center was established in Oakland, with Milo Smith as director, in 1975. Since the opening of the first center numerous programs and centers for displaced homemakers have been established around the country and/or displaced homemakers have been targeted in existing programs (see listing of programs, Appendices 3-A and B). In October of 1978, Tish Sommers and Laurie Shields, now having formed the Older Women's League Educational Fund, received grants from ACTION and the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor for a national conference on the displaced homemaker. The conference was held in Baltimore, home of the second displaced homemakers center.
in the country, the result of successful efforts to legislate funds in Maryland in 1976. With recognition at the conference of the need for an information clearinghouse and an organization for the interaction of displaced homemakers with service providers, the Displaced Homemaker Network was born and incorporated in Washington, D.C. in quarters donated by the Business and Professional Women's Foundation, under the guidance of Cynthia Moreno of the Baltimore Center and Alice Quinlan. The Network puts out a newsletter every two to three months, Network News, which gives information about legislation and local programs. There is a coordinator in each of the ten Federal regions who reports monthly on current activities (see Appendix 1-E for a listing of coordinators).

The growth in the number of programs around the country gives testimony to the effectiveness of grassroots advocacy which has resulted in legislation. In terms of the "career" of a social problem, outlined at the beginning of this section, interest group recognition (number 1) has led to political outcomes (number 4). What are the current political outcomes? Representative Yvonne Burke's original Displaced Homemaker Bill, which called for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to provide multipurpose service programs, including job readiness, transition counseling, training and placement, did not pass in 1975. Early in the 95th Congress (1977), Representative Burke reintroduced an amended Displaced Homemakers Act, as did Senator Birch Bayh in the Senate, calling for the establishment of 50 multipurpose service centers. After Congressional hearings, Representative Burke and co-sponsor Augustus Hawkins filed new legislation to include the Act under CETA Title III.
In October of 1978, displaced homemakers were targeted in CETA reauthorization as a group facing particular disadvantages in the labor market. Under Title III, 5 million dollars was set aside in 1979 for programs for displaced homemakers to be implemented in FY 1980—3.25 million to go to prime sponsors and 1 million for "national demonstration projects" administered directly by the Department of Labor. The level of funding represents a considerable watering down of the original legislative bill, but is considered by leaders of the displaced homemakers movement as a "foot in the door", and, as such, significant (How to Tame the CETA Beast, Older Women's League Educational Fund, 1979). It represents national visible recognition. Regional DOL/ETA displaced homemaker coordinators have been named. See Appendix 1-F.

Although leaders of the Network were unsuccessful in having the DOL waive poverty guidelines for those displaced homemakers served in Title III programs, they feel successful in having field memos state that priority should be given to those who have been out of the work force the longest (over 5 years) and are over 40. This is in keeping with the original focus of the movement on the mid-life woman. (See Appendix 1-G, CETA Information Sheet which was included in the June, 1979 issue of the Network News.)

As of this writing, funds have not been distributed to prime sponsors or for national demonstration projects. As the number of programs has grown, the competition for funds has grown also, and there is considerable impatience at the local level to determine which programs will be awarded this money.

It should be kept in mind that displaced homemaker programs are not new to CETA; several were funded in 1978-79, mainly under Titles IIB and VI (see Appendix 1-H for a listing of prime sponsors and programs which were in operation in October, 1979, compiled by the Women's Bureau, DOL). In fact, a survey undertaken
by the Displaced Homemakers Network in the winter of 1978 and reported in the June issue of the Network News showed that of 45 programs exclusively for displaced homemakers, CETA led as a source of funding (45%), followed by State (26%) and Vocational Education (20%) funding. Guidelines state that programs under Title III may "supplement but not supplant" activities for displaced homemakers through regular prime sponsor programs. It remains to be seen if this will be the case.

Although CETA has been widely heralded as the answer to the prayers of local service providers, it appears that the past efforts and great potential of Vocational Education legislation as a source of funding should be more widely known and emphasized. It should be remembered that displaced homemakers were targeted by name at a very early stage of the displaced homemaker movement.

Under P.L. 94-482 of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 which supplements Title IX in mandating educational equity for girls and women, community-based organizations are included (on a subcontract basis) along with LEA's state vocational education agencies, and public and non-profit institutions in providing services to displaced homemakers. Each state must include funding for services for displaced homemakers in its annual and five-year plans, although the level of funding is left to the discretion of the states. Responsibility for the coordination of displaced homemaker services usually resides with the state sex-equity coordinators, but is sometimes given to special displaced homemaker coordinators (see Appendix 1-I for the coordinators of each state). After a comparatively slow start in 1977-78, during which many states did needs assessments and little else (see results of a survey by the 80AE, Appendix 1-J), there has been a sharp increase in the number of programs which have displaced homemakers as a target group or as the sole clients.
Several pieces of legislation which would have impact on displaced homemakers were introduced in the current session of Congress. As the session will adjourn shortly, there is little or no hope of action in committees, and the bills will have to be re-introduced in the next session. As listed in the September, 1979 issue of Network News, they include:

- **HR 3005**, introduced by Representative Geraldine Ferraro (D-N.Y.) which amends the internal revenue code of 1954 to allow employers a tax credit for hiring displaced homemakers as other hard to employ groups are currently targeted—in House Ways and Means Committee (see Appendix 1-K).

- **SB 464**, introduced by Senator Daniel Inouye (D-HI) is the companion bill to HR 3005—in Senate Finance Committee (see Appendix 1-K).

- **HR 4602**, introduced by Representative John J. LaFalce (D-N.Y.) is modeled on Representative Yvonne Burke's original displaced homemaker bill. It would provide funds for multipurpose service centers through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare—in House Committee on Education and Labor; subcommittee on employment opportunities (see Appendix 1-K).

- **HR 1542**, introduced by Representative Paul Trible (R-VA) amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow homemakers to open individual retirement accounts based on incomes of their spouses—in House Ways and Means Committee (see Appendix 1-K).

- **HR 4948**, introduced by Representative Ted Weiss (D-N.Y.) amends the Higher Education Act of 1965, making it possible for part-time students to receive financial assistance—in House Education and Labor Committee.

From the foregoing account, it should be readily observed that the grass-roots mobilization of an interest group by determined and energetic leaders has done much to further the goals of the movement. This is a movement started by women for women. But other factors must also be mentioned.
It is unlikely that displaced homemaker issues could have gained national attention so quickly, were it not for a climate already created by the women's movement, the minority-aspiration movement, and the movement against ageism in the society. The ideology of women's liberation, black liberation, Hispanic equality and senior power paved the way for complaints against the deprivation of mid-life and older women.

Yet, the ideological issues should not be over-emphasized. It is no accident that hearings on mid-life women sponsored by the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Aging and Subcommittee on Retirement Income and Employment, 95th Congress, should focus on issues of independence or dependence. The economic costs of the AFDC, SSI, and other welfare programs are staggering. The government is rightly concerned about the issue of millions of women unable to support themselves or to take care of their own health costs, women who live on the average eight years longer than men, and who stand a good chance of living in poverty in old age. According to 1976 figures, three out of every four women who are widowed, divorced or separated, without children under age 18 and without paid work experience, are living in poverty; median income in 1976 was $2,100 per year (reported in B. Hurwitz, "Displaced Homemakers", New York: American Jewish Congress, National Women's Division). With increasing age, there is a greater likelihood of poverty. For example, among women 45-54, 8.4% lived in poverty in 1974; at age 65 and over 18.3% were poor. And of those women 65 and over who lived alone, 30% of white women and 68% of minority women had low incomes (Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, "Mature Women Workers: A Profile", 1976).

And finally, another factor in the swift passage from private pain to public policy has been the image, fostered by the media, of the displaced
homemaker as "America's number-one lady in distress." Women as homemakers, those who had stayed home to raise children, readily accord with notions of those who deserve to be helped. Legislators may have identified mothers, sisters, and other members of their own families as being potentially in a position to need support.
SECTION 2
NUMBERS OF DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS

There are no truly reliable figures on numbers of displaced homemakers, as is repeated many times in the literature. The U.S. Census does not identify displaced homemakers as a group; participants in Federal programs are not routinely cross-tabulated by age and sex. Tish Sommers and Laurie Shields have observed that "homemaking is kept out of the realm of [labor] statistics", and that homemakers are in the "statistical shadows of their husbands" (Women in Midlife—Security and Fulfillment, Compendium, 1978). They observe that "being counted is the first step to being included in public policy."

The pool of potential displaced homemakers is indeed large. According to 1975 Census data, there were 10 million widows, an increase of 41% since 1950; only 66.5 percent of women 55-64 are still living with husbands. There were 4 million divorced women (an increase of 166% since 1950) and over 2 million separated women. 3,164,000 widows and 2,435,000 divorced women were between 35 and 64. Almost 3 million unemployed women will lose Federal assistance when children attain majority. Since 1968 the number of households headed by women has grown 10 times faster than the number of two-adult families has grown (Carol Eliason, Neglected Women, Wash.: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, 1978).

During three years of advocacy, the Alliance for Displaced Homemakers estimated that there were between 3 and 4 million displaced homemakers—women who are widowed, divorced or separated, who are not in the labor force and have no children under 18.

Based on a national survey of marital status, labor force participation, and income by the Census Bureau, the Women's Bureau of the Department of
Labor has compiled statistics on the estimated population of displaced homemakers. They record a total of 4.13 million, 3.38 of whom are 40 and over. (See Appendix 2-A for total U.S. estimates and estimates by Federal region, and definition of displaced homemakers used in the analysis.)

As spokeswoman for the Displaced Homemakers Network, Alice Quinlan has expressed some doubt concerning these "conservative" figures, and thinks they could even be doubled (National Adult Education Conference, Boston, November, 1979). Her perception is supported by a recent study of displaced homemakers in Connecticut, a comparatively wealthy state (Kathleen Palm and Sharon Shepela, Displaced Homemakers in Connecticut: Survey and Evaluation of Services, Connecticut Department of Education, Fall, 1979) which estimated the population of displaced homemakers as 64,500 in comparison with the Women's Bureau figure of 46,000. In accounting for the larger estimate, the researchers note that they did not subtract from the potential population women receiving maintenance or child support payments because the percentage of such women is so low, and support payments so low. (The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year found that only 7% of men comply in paying alimony, and only 21% comply in paying child support. Child support payments average only $218 per month nationally.) They further note that women who are not living with husbands but are not legally separated are "statistically invisible", as are many minority group and other women who never visit state agencies for help. The researchers therefore subtract from the population of women in the state all those who are not displaced homemakers, and arrive at the higher figure.

Most state assessments decry the lack of accurate statistics, and have to "make do" with what is available. In New Mexico, for example, (New Mexico
Commission on the Status of Women, *Start From Where You Are*, January, 1978) was based on women who contacted state Employment Security Offices—1,094 compared with the Department of Labor estimate of 24,000 displaced homemakers 40 and over in the state.

Data from the 1980 Census should shed more light on the question of numbers.
SECTION 3
INFORMATION FROM LOCAL PROGRAMS

Location of Local Programs

The basis for our listing of local programs is the "Displaced Homemaker Program Directory: A Listing of Centers, Programs and Projects Providing Services to Displaced Homemakers", published by the Displaced Homemakers Network, Inc. in August, 1979. (See Section 1 on history and legislation of the displaced homemakers movement for information about the organization.) We have added to this listing on the basis of updated information sent to the Network which they shared with us, and in some cases, on the basis of our own contacts with local programs which led us to other programs in the area. Appendix 3-A is the original listing from the Network to which we have added twenty programs. In some cases the addresses of programs, telephone numbers and/or directors have changed since the original listings in the Directory in August, and we have accordingly changed the item in our listing. We have relied heavily on the Program Directory because of the status of the Network for over a year as a clearinghouse for program information. Because our time was so short, we could not have done a thorough job of locating local programs and obtaining information from them without the listing from the Network. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

Appendix 3-B contains a listing of programs with funding for vocational education, usually under P.L. 94-482 of the Vocational Education Amendment 1976, which targets displaced homemakers as a special population for service. (See Section 1 on history and legislation.) We obtained these additional names as the result of calls to sex-equity coordinators or the person designated as the vocational education displaced homemaker coordinator in all 50 states.
We asked them for programs not listed in the Network Directory. Most of these programs are not in the original Network Directory because they were funded after August, 1979. Others which were established before that time perhaps had no contact with the Network and, therefore, were not listed.

We could not list the new programs funded under CETA Title III because the awards were made too late for our time schedule. However, we received a listing of CETA prime sponsors, with programs funded for displaced homemakers under other titles. In a few cases, we added these programs to our listing; in other cases, the programs were already listed, and in other cases, we were unsuccessful in "tracking down" the program from the information provided. We, therefore, cannot claim that our listing of local programs is definitive.

Moreover, new programs seem to be "cropping up overnight" in the experience of Network leaders, who see the need for revision of the Directory since August (only four months from the publication). We can also anticipate that some programs will not be funded from year to year (see section on Problems below) and will, therefore, have to cease providing service. For the most part, the programs listed are those which: (a) had contact with the Displaced Homemakers Network before August, 1979 and were, therefore, listed in their Directory or (b) were funded by CETA or vocational-education with the provision that services be provided to displaced homemakers (solely or as part of a more general population), usually after August. There are without doubt programs in the U.S. which give service to displaced homemakers but were not funded for that purpose particularly, and have had no contact with the Network. (We are thinking particularly of various CETA training programs and programs at Women's Centers.) These could not be included in this listing.
It should be emphasized that inclusion in our listing is in no way an endorsement of the program or the services provided. We received information about services provided from about half of the programs listed in Appendix 3-A and, because most of the programs are so new, comparatively few of those listed in Appendix 3-B. Therefore, we know little about programs listed in Appendix 3-B beyond the fact that they were funded to give some types of service to displaced homemakers (usually as part of a more general population of clients). Even when we did receive a reply to our inquiry for information from local programs, we made no attempt to evaluate systematically or to judge the effectiveness of those programs. Although desirable as a future goal, such a task was well beyond the scope of this short-term project.

Information About Local Programs

We received information about local programs in response to a letter we sent (see Appendix 3-C). The letter was mailed to all programs listed in the original Network Directory, to some of the supplements to the Directory if they were located in time, and to all programs listed in Appendix 3-B. In addition, another letter was written by the Displaced Homemakers Network asking for cooperation in responding to our request, and sent to every program in the original Directory. This probably increased our response rate significantly. As mentioned previously, programs in Appendix 3-B had a poor rate of response probably because most had begun recently, (some wrote that they could not provide any information at this time) and also because they received only one letter requesting information. The starred programs in Appendix 3-A and 3-B indicate programs which provided usable information which we coded. The programs which responded seem to be representative of the whole listing of programs. We could not detect any factors which divided the respondents from the non-respondents. We thought
that perhaps the respondents had larger staffs and could spend time answering requests, but this was disproved by the fact that a full 56% of those responding had only one or two full-time staff members. Whatever bias may be found in the tables of responses is probably due to the fact that programs with vocational education funding are over-represented because we concentrated on finding new programs, while those with CETA funding are under-represented, because the new programs were not yet in operation. It should be mentioned that we received many responses too late to be included in this analysis.

For the purposes of analysis we have divided responses according to programs which (a) are funded with vocational education monies alone; (b) are funded by vocational education and at least one other source of funds, and (c) are funded by one or more sources, excluding vocational education. We labeled the first group "VE", the second "M" and the third "O". In all, we received 26 usable responses from the VE group, 38 from the M group and 72 from the O group, a total of 136 programs. Not every program responded to every item of our inquiry, and we have indicated the total number of responses to any one item we received from each group of programs.

As can be seen in the table below, a full 61% of programs for displaced homemakers are affiliated with secondary or post-secondary educational institutions. For those with vocational education funding alone, the figure is a full 82%, indicating that, at least among this group of respondents, funding to other than educational institutions is rather rare. The fact that 47% of those responding had some vocational education funding probably weights the responses toward affiliation with educational institutions.
Table 1: Institutional Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Community or jr. college</td>
<td>10 (38)</td>
<td>9 (24)</td>
<td>15 (21)</td>
<td>34 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Vocational/technical school</td>
<td>5 (19)</td>
<td>11 (29)</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>20 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Four year college</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>6 (16)</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>17 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Public school system</td>
<td>6 (23)</td>
<td>5 (13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Women's center - not academic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Religious groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Private non-profit</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>5 (13)</td>
<td>11 (15)</td>
<td>17 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. YWCA</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>14 (19)</td>
<td>17 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Local social service agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>8 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Other women's group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALES</strong></td>
<td>26 (100%)</td>
<td>38 (100%)</td>
<td>72 (100%)</td>
<td>136 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Began How Long Ago

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 6 mo. or less</td>
<td>11 (46)</td>
<td>11 (29)</td>
<td>22 (31)</td>
<td>44 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. about 1 yr - 1½ yrs</td>
<td>10 (42)</td>
<td>20 (52)</td>
<td>29 (42)</td>
<td>59 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. About 2 years</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>5 (13)</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>16 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. About 3 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. About 4 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. About 5 years or longer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>5 (7)</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALES</strong></td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>38 (100%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
<td>132 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be readily observed that the majority of programs are quite new. 78% were established 1½ years ago or later. It should be kept in mind that the first program specifically for a client population called "displaced homemakers" began in 1975. The programs which indicated they served displaced homemakers...
before that time (a mere 5%) were indeed doing so, but not as a separate group. The largest percentage of new programs is in the VE group, with 46% at 6 months or less. These new programs have not had time to acquire other funding sources. The median age of those in the M group is slightly older; they have had more time to organize and to seek additional funds.

Table 3: Number Served Since January 1, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 20 or less</td>
<td>8 (32)</td>
<td>6 (17)</td>
<td>5 (7)</td>
<td>19 (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 21-50</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>16 (22)</td>
<td>20 (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 51-100</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
<td>4 (21)</td>
<td>13* (18)</td>
<td>24 (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 101-200</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
<td>6 (17)</td>
<td>13* (18)</td>
<td>25 (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 201-300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5* (14)</td>
<td>12* (17)</td>
<td>17 (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 301 or more</td>
<td>2* (8)</td>
<td>12* (35)</td>
<td>13* (18)</td>
<td>27 (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
<td>35 (100%)</td>
<td>72 (100%)</td>
<td>132 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates that at least one respondent based number of displaced homemakers served on a large percentage of telephone contacts or "open forums". This includes 2 programs in the f. category of the VE group; 2 in the e. and 7 in the f. categories of the M group; and in the O group, one in the c., d. and e. categories and 7 in the f. categories.

The correct title of this table should perhaps be "number of displaced homemakers who have come in contact with a displaced homemaker program" rather than "number served". The numbers are inflated by local programs having counted any type of contact, in many cases. Furthermore, some programs may have indicated the number served since the program began, rather than since January first if the program was older than a year, because of the ambiguous way in which the request was worded. When we were fairly certain that this was the case, we divided the number indicated by the time since the establishment of the program. In other cases we suspect that local
programs indicated total number of clients rather than only displaced homemakers. When we suspected this was the case, we tried to determine how many were displaced homemakers from other information they suggested.

A tally of the specific numbers indicated that the VE group had come in contact with 3,072 displaced homemakers; the M group had come in contact with 8,344 displaced homemakers; and the O group had come in contact with 15,112. This adds to 26,528 displaced homemakers who have had some contact with a local program. 132 programs responded to this item. As there are at least twice as many programs listed in Appendices A and B, one can interpret that at least 53,000 displaced homemakers have some knowledge of the programs in their area. This seems a very high number until one realizes that if there are 4 million displaced homemakers in the country, only one in eighty had some contact with a displaced homemakers program.

Table 4: Estimated Number of Additional Displaced Homemakers Who Could be Served with the Same Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Can't serve any more</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
<td>7 (25)</td>
<td>14 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Can serve more</td>
<td>18 (90)</td>
<td>21 (75)</td>
<td>41 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>20(100%)</td>
<td>28(100%)</td>
<td>55(100%)</td>
<td>103(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is somewhat surprising that such a high percentage of programs (78%) indicated that they could serve more displaced homemakers given their present staff, financial resources and facilities. Even if the 33 programs who did not respond to this item did not do so because they could serve no more, the percentage would still be high.
The VE group indicated they could serve 3,052 more displaced homemakers, the M group 5,212 and the O group 5,040, which adds to 13,304. The respondents indicate, therefore, that they could serve half again as many displaced homemakers as they are currently serving. The VE group, with the largest percentage of new programs, had the highest percentage of programs (90%) which could serve greater numbers. But a large percentage of programs in all three groups are being under-utilized. Many of our telephone informants (see next section) indicated that outreach was a problem; the data supports their perceptions.

Table 5: Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE (N)</th>
<th>M (N)</th>
<th>O (N)</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. CETA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23 (61)</td>
<td>35 (49)</td>
<td>58 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Vocational Education</td>
<td>26 (100)</td>
<td>38 (100)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. State Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (13)</td>
<td>32 (44)</td>
<td>37 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Local Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (19)</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>15 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Educational Institutions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (21)</td>
<td>11 (14)</td>
<td>19 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Fees paid by Displaced Homemakers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (21)</td>
<td>7 (10)</td>
<td>7 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (21)</td>
<td>17 (24)</td>
<td>25 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total percentages are not given because categories are not mutually exclusive. Columns add to more than 100%.

The fact that the largest number of programs (47% of total respondents) had some vocational education funding can be attributed, at least in part, to our focus on "discovering" new programs with this source of funding. As mentioned previously, CETA funded projects are under-represented because
awarding of funds to local programs under Title III was still pending at the
time of our data collection and analysis. Nevertheless, it should be noted
that vocational education funding represents a significant portion of the
financial resources of displaced homemaker programs around the country.

Among those programs with mixed vocational education and other funding
(the M group), CETA led as a source of additional funds (61%), followed by
auxiliary funding from the educational institution which was affiliated with
the program (21%), fees paid by the displaced homemakers, sometimes on a
sliding scale and sometimes a flat amount (21%) and local government agencies,
most notably city or county school boards (19%).

In the "other" category for both the M and O groups were government agen-
cies with limited funds for displaced homemakers (4 were partially funded by
WIN, 2 by WEEA, 2 by BVR, 1 by ACTION and EOG), local social service agencies
such as United Way (8), women's and religious organizations such as the National
Council of Negro Women (4), private contributions (3) and private business (3).

Table 6: Money from More Than One Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE N (%)</th>
<th>M N (%)</th>
<th>O N (%)</th>
<th>Total N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38(100)</td>
<td>31 (44)</td>
<td>69 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. no</td>
<td>26(100)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39 (56)</td>
<td>65 (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>26(100%)</td>
<td>38(100%)</td>
<td>70(100%)</td>
<td>134(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the total number of programs which responded, about half had multiple
funding sources (51%). Among the 64 programs with vocational-education fund-
ing, 59% (38) had some other source of support.
Table 7: Annual Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE (%)</th>
<th>M (%)</th>
<th>O (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. $5,000 and under</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. $5,100-$15,000</td>
<td>4 (22)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. $15,100-$25,000</td>
<td>3 (17)</td>
<td>6 (22)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>12 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. $25,100-$50,000</td>
<td>8 (44)</td>
<td>6 (22)</td>
<td>10 (19)</td>
<td>24 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. $50,100-$75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (27)</td>
<td>9 (17)</td>
<td>16 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. $75,100-$100,000</td>
<td>2 (11)</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. $100,100-$200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (15)</td>
<td>12 (22)</td>
<td>16 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. $200,100 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>7 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS: 18 (100%) 27 (100%) 52 (100%) 97 (100%)

As might have been expected, those programs with only one source of funding (the VE group) had the highest percentage of programs which run on $25,000 or less per year (45%). The programs in the O group which run on $25,000 or less (22%) are probably those with one funding source. Programs as a whole are split almost evenly between those with annual budgets above $50,000 (51%) and those below $50,000 (49%). Forty-one percent of programs had annual budgets over $25,000 and below $75,000.

Table 8: Number of Full-Time Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE (%)</th>
<th>M (%)</th>
<th>O (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 0</td>
<td>7 (30)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 (20)</td>
<td>21 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1</td>
<td>9 (39)</td>
<td>13 (35)</td>
<td>11 (15)</td>
<td>33 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 2</td>
<td>4 (17)</td>
<td>7 (19)</td>
<td>9 (13)</td>
<td>20 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 3</td>
<td>2 (9)</td>
<td>5 (14)</td>
<td>9 (13)</td>
<td>16 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 4</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>10 (14)</td>
<td>13 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4 (11)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. 6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (11)</td>
<td>13 (18)</td>
<td>17 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. over 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>5 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS: 23 (100%) 37 (100%) 71 (100%) 131 (100%)
Over half of the local programs have only one or two full-time staff members or none at all. Only 22% have five or more. Among programs with vocational-education funding, more which had multiple funding could afford larger staffs: none in the VE group had 5 or more full-time people, while 27% in the M group did. Every program in the M group had at least one full-time person; 30% of the VE group had no full-time workers.

Table 9: Any Volunteers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. yes</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>14 (38)</td>
<td>31 (44)</td>
<td>46 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. no</td>
<td>22 (96)</td>
<td>23 (62)</td>
<td>39 (56)</td>
<td>84 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>37 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>70 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>130 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of programs do not make use of volunteers. Although the Baltimore Center, for one, has shown that the creative use of volunteers can do much to enhance programming and aid volunteers who hope for future employment, two-thirds of the local programs do not use volunteers. Of those that do, only 20% have more than 5.
**Table 10: Services and Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Referral</td>
<td>12 (46)</td>
<td>20 (53)</td>
<td>51 (71)</td>
<td>83 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Individual counseling</td>
<td>19 (73)</td>
<td>23 (61)</td>
<td>53 (74)</td>
<td>95 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Peer support groups/group counseling</td>
<td>21 (81)</td>
<td>30 (79)</td>
<td>56 (78)</td>
<td>107 (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Skills assessment</td>
<td>16 (62)</td>
<td>30 (79)</td>
<td>56 (78)</td>
<td>102 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Job readiness</td>
<td>21 (81)</td>
<td>33 (87)</td>
<td>57 (79)</td>
<td>111 (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Skills training</td>
<td>8 (31)</td>
<td>16 (42)</td>
<td>31 (43)</td>
<td>55 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job placement assistance</td>
<td>20 (77)</td>
<td>23 (61)</td>
<td>37 (51)</td>
<td>80 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Follow-up after placement</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>10 (26)</td>
<td>7 (10)</td>
<td>20 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Auxiliary services (child care, transportation, legal services, health counseling and/or care)</td>
<td>12 (46)</td>
<td>23 (61)</td>
<td>41 (57)</td>
<td>76 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Financial aid</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>12 (17)</td>
<td>15 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Exploration of non-traditional jobs</td>
<td>7 (27)</td>
<td>12 (31)</td>
<td>10 (14)</td>
<td>29 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. On-the-job-training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (8)</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>11 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Totals do not add to 100% because categories were not mutually exclusive.

The most "popular" service offered by displaced homemaker programs (82%) is aid in job readiness. This is usually given in the form of short-term group workshops on subjects such as interview strategies, resume writing, stress management, and time management.

Seventy-nine percent of activities fall into the category of peer support groups or group counseling, in which personal topics such as self-image and self-esteem are discussed. Sometimes this is labeled "assertiveness training".

Among the ten Massachusetts displaced homemakers we spoke with during a round-
table discussion, those who had contact with displaced homemakers programs cited this aspect as the most important. The displaced homemakers spoke of the importance of knowing others were "in the same boat" and of the comfort and added courage which come with sharing experiences and feelings. Similarly, our telephone conversations with directors of displaced homemaker programs around the country (see Appendix 3-D for a listing and Appendix 3-E for topics discussed) revealed that they often perceived success in terms of the renewed sense of self-worth among their clients.

Seventy-five percent of responding programs offer some kind of skills assessment, either self-evaluation as an adjunct to counseling and/or using a variety of testing instruments. Assessment also includes career exploration, sometimes taking the form of visits to work places and/or occasionally a limited amount of hands-on experience and the sharing of job search experiences. Only 21% mentioned specifically exploration of non-traditional jobs.

Seventy percent offer some individual counseling, especially during the initial phase of contact when internal turmoil and external problems are apt to be most acute.

Sixty-one percent mentioned referral to other resources; in some cases, such as the telephone referral service offered by the New Mexico Commission on the Status of Women to women in rural areas, this was the only contact with the displaced homemaker. Some programs may not have mentioned this as a special activity because it is so much a part of other services, such as job placement assistance, which was offered by 59%.

Some type of auxiliary service is offered by 56% of responding programs. It most often involves the services of consultants or lecturers who give short courses on nutrition, law, parenting, money management, physical fitness.
or auto or home maintenance. Less frequently, there is aid in transportation or child care. In fact, among the telephone informants child care was low-priority, with several noting that clients were middle aged and had few young children or that displaced homemakers made their own arrangements when there was a need.

Skills training (offered by 40%) is typically short-term and more often focused on acquisition of general skills, e.g. basic English and math as preparation for the G.E.D. exam, than on skills specific to a certain type of job, e.g. carpentry or shorthand (See next section on Vocational Education for a further discussion of training for displaced homemakers). The majority of programs do not themselves run training programs for specific occupations. Rather, displaced homemakers are referred to local training programs according to interest and availability, for which a stipend is sometimes available, as through CETA.

Only 15% offer follow-up after job placement, and only 11% and 8% offer financial aid and contact with on-the-job-training opportunities, respectively. These activities would be desirable in the view of many of our informants (see next section).
According to our mail and phone respondents, the skills training activities in which displaced homemakers are enrolled include: basic English (including reading and grammar), basic math, secretarial skills (including typing and shorthand), communication skills, courses in self-employment in small business, practical nursing, home health aid to the elderly, occupational therapy assistance, accounting, carpentry, management of institutional housekeeping services, industrial and mechanical fundamentals (including electricity and use of machines), and restaurant and beverage service. This listing certainly does not exhaust all the vocational training activities in which displaced homemakers are involved (there is virtually no field in which displaced homemakers could not be involved), but it includes those which respondents named directly.

The listing includes: (a) courses or short-term workshops given "in-house" or in nearby facilities by multi-service displaced homemaker centers, (b) courses given in training institutions (vocational-technical schools, two-year colleges, etc.) sometimes with CETA or vocational education "displaced homemaker" funding, in which some displaced homemakers are enrolled (along with other categories of students in the same course) either by coming directly or being referred by a multi-service center, and (c) an intermediate category of training which links the displaced homemaker center to the training institution as, for example, when mini-courses which include hands-on experience are given specifically for displaced homemakers in vocational-technical schools (the displaced homemaker program pays the instructor) or when courses stressing job readiness and career exploration are offered to displaced homemakers who receive
credit toward an associate degree at the affiliated community college.

It appears that many of the 40% of local programs which were categorized as offering skills training (see Table 10 in Section 3) offer in-house workshops or tutoring in general subjects such as remedial English and math (often as preparation for the G.E.D. exam) or basic communications skills, rather than training for specific jobs. Of those which did offer vocational training for specific jobs, the most popular was secretarial, followed by courses on how to run a small business, with a smattering of others such as accounting and "food and beverage service".

It is evident from brochures and letters we received from local programs and telephone information, that displaced homemaker programs focus on counseling and workshops to offer support and to foster awareness of what the displaced homemaker can do and wants to do, rather than the provision of training directly. As Table 10 in Section 3 shows, this is true of all categories—those programs with and without vocational education funding. Rather than offering specific training themselves, displaced homemaker programs more often said that they referred clients to CETA training programs or to the local community college.

The in-house training course has its pros and cons. On the "con" side, the displaced homemaker may be tempted to take the course simply because it is available; her options may be prematurely limited because most programs are not large enough to offer a range of training opportunities. This was the case with at least one of the displaced homemakers who participated in our roundtable discussion.

On the "pro" side the displaced homemaker has the support of the peer group and probably special consideration and understanding of her status as a
re-entry woman, which she may not have were she "mainstreamed" in a regular
class. Moreover, and this is most important, there may be nothing else available
to her. Just as the displaced homemaker has "dropped through the cracks" of
the financial support system, she may also drop through the cracks of the
vocational training and education system. She may not be in dire enough
financial need to qualify for training through CETA, but she may not be able to
afford any other training. The American Association of Community and Junior
Colleges, as part of their Policies for Lifelong Education Program are
concerned with the lack of financial aid to any but full-time students.
Michigan, for example, has a tuition reimbursement program for displaced homemakers
in each of 24 community colleges, but even when tuition reimbursement is
available the displaced homemaker may not be able to manage financially.
Co-op and work-study regulations should be reassessed to make them more
responsive to the needs of displaced homemakers. A few well-funded programs are
able to give stipends while the displaced homemaker is in vocational training
but certainly not many. Therefore, the displaced homemaker may well accept
whatever employment is available to meet immediate needs, often "dead-end" jobs
without chance of advancement. Taking courses after work to upgrade employment
is certainly a possibility, but may involve too great a drain of time and
energy. Obviously, on-the-job training would be a desirable option for many
displaced homemakers but only 8% of responding programs (see Table 10, Section 3)
stated that they had developed or placed clients in such positions. One
respondent mentioned three women who were receiving training to be painters at
the local Air Force base, but this was the exception rather than the rule.
Perhaps more programs had assisted in placement in on-the-job training, but had
not reported it as part of the program, per se.
One group of programs for on-the-job training of women who meet low income guidelines is sponsored by the Department of Labor as national demonstration projects. Fourteen "Supported Work Corporations" around the country offer training, counseling and supportive services such as transportation and child care while paying women wages as they learn. In Massachusetts the majority of participants come from the "unassigned pool" of WIN, but 35% are over 30 and ages range up to the low fifties. Half do not have a high school diploma. Employers are recruited from the private sector (e.g. banks and computer firms) who provide facilities for the training of five women at a time, guided by a full-time supervisor hired by the program. Employers commit themselves to hire, and 60% of women in the Massachusetts program stay with the company at which they trained. Programs like these are extremely limited compared with the numbers of eligible people in the country but if expanded they could offer valuable service to displaced homemakers.

It almost goes without saying that displaced homemakers deserve good counseling and help with realistic assessment of options. They should be steered toward training for available good paying jobs. But are resources for training available?

We have heard numerous complaints that training under CETA, Vocational-Education and WIN (available to poor women with children under 18) is unresponsive to the needs of the displaced homemaker. Critics cite the fact that most training is sex-stereotyped, that older women are excluded and that training which is available does not lead to viable employment in the private sector. Obviously, conditions vary from region to region, and city to city. The above mentioned program in Massachusetts is only one example of programs which seem to be working well. Aggregate statistics show a mixed picture.
A publication by the American Vocational Association (Facts and Figures on Vocational Education in the U.S., March, 1979) indicates that vocational education programs are expanding to meet the needs of emerging areas of employment (see Appendix 4-A). Vocational education planners and implementors must gear their programs to the local labor market. Information of expanding areas of local employment such as that prepared in Massachusetts and New York (see Appendices 4-B and C) must be used in allocating funds and building programs.

But it appears that there has not always been a match between vocational education and training programs and the needs of adults versus young people. The A.V.A. report shows that adult enrollment in programs preparatory for employment actually went down from 1976 to 1977 (see Appendix 4-D) although there was a small increase in total enrollment. Furthermore, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in its study of federal programs including CETA, found that in 1976 enrollment in Title I training programs of persons 45-54 totaled only 4 percent and was even less for older age groups. According to the study, "Persons in each of the age groups over 44 are enrolled at less than half their proportion of the unemployed populations" (from How to Tame the CETA Beast, Older Women's League Educational Fund, 1979).

A fact sheet by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges indicates that in two-year colleges women now comprise 52% of the population and 53% of part-time students. The fastest growing segment are women over 35, up by 5.9 percent between 1974 and 1976. There are no statistics to show how many of these women are displaced homemakers, but many undoubtedly are—those displaced homemakers, that is, who have the resources, financial and otherwise, to upgrade their employment possibilities with further education. A survey of
A.A.C.J.C. members, done under the supervision of N. Carol Eliason, Director of the Women's Opportunity Center of A.A.C.J.C., showed that of 600 community and junior colleges who responded, 230 replied that they had some kind of service for displaced homemakers usually counseling and usually subsumed under the more general category of re-entry women. (See Appendix 4-E for names of colleges, contact people and some remarks about services.)

The fact that about a third of two-year colleges recognize that mature women students have special needs may be considered a hopeful sign. Other statistics are far less hopeful, however. The A.V.A. report shows that enrollments of "adult disadvantaged" students in member institutions, a category which would include a substantial proportion of displaced homemakers, decreased by 16.1% between 1976 and 1977 in courses preparatory for employment. (See Appendix 4- F.)

And in what types of courses are women being trained and educated? A high proportion of jobs with higher earnings, more mobility and more opportunity to learn on the job are in areas considered "non-traditional" for women. It is no accident that funding for displaced homemakers is legislated under P.L. 94-482 which insures sex equity in vocational education. The A.V.A. report indicates that there has been a modest 7% increase between 1976 and 1977 in female enrollment in non-traditional areas, with greater increases in certain sub-categories (see Appendix 4-G). But a report by the Project on Equal Education Rights (PEER) of the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund (reported in the October, 1979 issue of the Federal Education Project Newsletter) found widely differing rates of participation by women in non-traditional vocational education according to state (see Appendix 4-H). The highest was 20.09% (Michigan) and the lowest was only 1.77% (Delaware). Even a state like Massachusetts, which is about
average, should be doing more to foster enrollment of women and girls in non-
traditional areas, according to a report by the Massachusetts Advocacy Center
("Equal Opportunity Denied: Vocational Education in Massachusetts").

According to the roundtable discussion group of vocational educators with
whom we met (see Appendix 4-I), training for non-traditional work is among the
most important, and also most problematic, issues in relation to the
displaced homemaker. Among problems cited were the attitudes of vocational
counselors themselves, who often share the stereotyped notions of the general
population, the lack of confidence of mature women and their initial resistance
to non-traditional jobs, the lack of support once on the job ("Your boss may
be Archie Bunker") and the lack of follow-up and counseling after job
placement. (Among our mail respondents, only 15% said they had any such follow-
up.) In the words of one participant, "The work place is a different situation
from the womb-like atmosphere of the displaced homemaker center." Women in
construction face problems of physical stamina, especially in outdoor work,
and none of the participants knew of many women over 40 who were employed on
outdoor construction projects.

But not all non-traditional work is physically demanding. In Massachusetts,
for example, high technology jobs and those in allied health fields are expanding
and offer good opportunities. Jobs involving respiratory therapy and medical
electronics, for example, are less sex-stereotyped because they are newer. One
of our roundtable participants described a successful CETA funded project to
train computer programmers. Half the participants are women, and while most
are younger (c.f., the criticism of ageism in CETA programs, mentioned above)
the ages have ranged up to 51. The program includes 100 hours of classroom time
on math review, writing, communications skills and technical skill training.
Performance standards are high and participants are challenged by written assignments, role-playing and simulation of on-the-job work experiences. But for the majority who complete the 30 week training course, the struggle is worth it (and it is a struggle for some displaced homemakers, the director stated) because entry level programmers make $11,500.

Even in male-intensive jobs in such areas as construction, transportation, manufacturing and electronics, displaced homemakers need not come up against unnecessary barriers. The Non-traditional Occupation Project of the Boston YWCA (Vivian Gullfoy and M. Grothe, Preparing Women for Non-Traditional Occupations, Report to the U.S. Department of Labor, 1978) demonstrated that the women over 30 in the program (3 out of 10) were as satisfied with the program, had the same rate of completion as younger participants, had as many job placements, and received the same wages as other participants. Among elements of the 16 week course, women received hands-on classroom instruction in electricity, construction, carpentry, painting, papering, and plastering, actual work site experience in large urban institutions and physical fitness training. The report of the project indicates that factors which discourage women (and, by extrapolation, displaced homemakers) from participation in non-traditional work can be overcome.

In summary, there is a need for more short-term training of displaced homemakers which will lead to available permanent jobs with good pay. As one of our panel members observed, "Look at the manpower training from World War II. Women did everything!...Employers are not looking at our skills, our courage."
SECTION 5
SOME RESPONSES OF EMPLOYERS

Attitudes, experiences with, and perceptions of displaced homemakers were elicited from employers during a 2½ hour roundtable discussion (see Appendix 5-A for a list of participants) and also via telephone calls (see Appendix 5-B). Some of those who responded had hired displaced homemakers through displaced homemakers programs, others had hired them when women came on their own initiatives, and a few had not hired any.

Almost everyone we spoke with mentioned the positive qualities of maturity, dependability, and motivation of displaced homemakers. As a personnel assistant at a large supermarket chain commented during the roundtable discussion, "We've had better luck with older people [in our office]. Younger people party all night, sleep late, don't show up for work, etc. People over 35 make valuable, committed employees." The supermarket chain employs 285 people in their main office, about 10 percent of whom could be categorized as displaced homemakers. Some were part-time cashiers and wanted to work full-time.

In most cases, displaced homemaker programs had contacted employers to request consideration of their "graduates", or women had been employed as the result of their own initiatives. Most employers had not been aware of displaced homemaker programs before being contacted by one of them, or were still not aware of ways to make contact with the displaced homemakers labor pool. In only one case could an employer remember seeking out a displaced homemaker for a job: she had been one herself. The public relations director of a large hotel commented: "I could relate to this. It had happened to me. I had done a lot of volunteer work in politics and women's organizations."
I know volunteers who could run General Motors, but an employer doesn't look for that. I was lucky—I was at the right place at the right time when I needed work and bluffed my way through. I learned on the job. But it's hard to do if you have kids. The hours are long. I could see myself through her [the displaced homemakers'] eyes—she learned a lot from me."

This employer/former displaced homemaker was rather atypical in having been able to "bluff my way through." Many employers mentioned the displaced homemaker's lack of confidence in her own abilities. The training manager of a large public utility learning center commented on the organizational and planning skills that are transferable from homemaking, but commented, "Women don't realize this. They are their own worst enemies." Having been affiliated with the Northeastern University Women's Career Project which focuses on the transfer of skills from home to work, (see description of program in *The Coming Decade: American Women and Human Resources, Policies and Programs, 1979*, Hearings before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate, p. 405) this manager is particularly perceptive. The program at the public utility features on-the-job intensive, short term training. The "entire company is available to them. We hired one woman in her 60's who does the work of two twenties!" he stated.

Similarly, a large corporation has an affirmative action training program, and, according to our informant, seeks out older women. Nationally, the program has been very successful. The woman hired through the local displaced homemakers center is a service representative for copying machines and has been twice promoted.

Employers who hire women for traditional jobs are generally satisfied. The social service agency in a Boston suburb "places a high value on life
experience". The roundtable discussant who represented a large department store chain reported that their "first choice is the mature woman who can identify with the customers. Part-time workers are eligible for fringe benefits, and schedules are flexible...Women can go up the ladder to the executive training program." But she, too, mentioned the lack of self-confidence of mature women--"they don't realize they're good"--and mentioned that only the more confident women go into the commission sales departments, such as men's clothing and furniture.

Another problem mentioned frequently was the unwillingness or the inability of middle class women, especially, to accept low-paying entry-level positions. Some women have no desire to "go up the ladder" and are happy with jobs paying $150 a week. These jobs are readily available, said the roundtable discussant from the savings bank. But many more women cannot afford to take low-paying jobs if they have a house and children to support, even if the possibility of advancement is present. In some cases, in fact, no real advancement exists. The representative of the Division of Employment Security characterized the situation as "very difficult", especially if transportation and experience are lacking. Other women have unrealistically high aspirations. Some of these women have heeded advice to get advanced degrees in business or education, and cannot find work. The president of an employment service for women stated flatly, "Business won't hire women over 50...Women are over-educated for the jobs out there. More education isn't the best answer."

Many of our discussants thought that training in the use of business machines would almost guarantee a job. But one said many of these jobs are boring, and should be done by two part-time people.

Putting women in non-traditional jobs is seen as desirable but problematic by counsellors because women often feel isolated. Our roundtable discussion
group of vocational educators which had met the week before (see section on vocational education) had agreed that many older women were reluctant to entertain thoughts of such jobs, that a small amount of hands-on-experience or even just a realistic look at what the work entailed was enough to change attitudes, and that women sometimes encountered difficulties with male co-workers at first, and felt a lack of support. The owner of the floor covering business to whom we talked had never hired a woman. He would not be averse to this, he said, because he had seen many women on construction sites in the Boston-Cambridge area, but he felt that lugging heavy rolls of floor covering may be too strenuous. He would gladly hire a middle-aged woman as an estimator, but there are "no women around with experience, and I don't have time to do on-the-job training."

Of the employers who mentioned problems with displaced homemakers, one reported a lack of "professionalism"—being able to take orders from younger people—and another stated that the woman really "wasn't ready to work. She hadn't recovered from her loss sufficiently." An employer in a large social service agency spoke of hiring a displaced homemaker, aged 40, who has 7 children. She works full-time and the older children care for the younger ones. The employer complains that she is frequently late and absent, and wishes she would not spend so much time talking to her children on the phone. The employer would be willing to pay for a course for the woman to upgrade her office skills, which need improvements, but she does not have the time after work, and he is not willing to give her time off during working hours.

But others' experiences have been more positive. The training manager from a large corporation stated, "Tell other employees that they should overcome the fear that women's families will interfere with their work. The women are committed
and determined and they work out any family arrangements on their own without involving the employer."

Our roundtable informants agreed that short and long term training programs and on-the-job training were desirable for displaced homemakers. One member commented that "only one in a hundred have the skills and orientation to get a good [high paying] job. Most have to get it." She suggested that one way to sharpen skills was to work for a temporary agency. All agreed that realistic, informed counseling and support were necessary.

They suggested that in Massachusetts adult vocational-technical training has not been a priority, but that things are beginning to change. They look to the vocational-technical schools as places that can produce needed workers.
The problems and recommendations which we identify in this section represent recurring themes in our contacts with our national consultant panel (see Appendix 6-A for those present), our telephone interviews, our site visits (see Appendix 6-B), our three roundtable discussions with displaced homemakers, vocational educators and employers, responses to our mailed request for information and contact with knowledgeable individuals in the displaced homemaker movement. Informants advised us of problems as well as successes and we have relied heavily on their perceptions in the presentation of this section.

The term "displaced homemaker". One of our telephone informants stated, "They [the displaced homemakers] see themselves in it— it describes them—but they hate it." Actually, among our groups of roundtable discussants, the displaced homemakers objected to it the least, with several saying that it adequately described their state of having been psychologically uprooted, and feeling lost. But others who had not been part of a program claimed that the term had too negative a connotation—it made them think of displaced persons after World War II—and one said that her children objected to it strenuously.

Our vocational educator and employer roundtable participants almost universally objected to the term. One educator made the point that "You can't approach employers with the idea that it's their duty to hire these poor souls [which the term "displaced homemaker" suggests]. They have to see that it's to their own benefit." The employers agreed that the term was too negative and that we should think of another more positive way to refer to women who were entering or re-entering the job market.
We are therefore giving considerable thought to an acceptable name for the project, which will be used for identification in connection with the various products. The term "displaced homemaker" should not and, indeed, cannot be dropped, however. The name has been used for over four years as a rallying point for diverse activities, and has gained in recognition, if not happy acceptance, among the general public. The term "displaced homemaker" relates to a set of circumstances and conditions different from the "single mother" (which connotes a young woman) or the "re-entry woman" (any mature woman who goes back to school or work). Moreover, the term is now found in indices of various data banks, such as ERIC, as a description to retrieve relevant written materials.

Definition of a "displaced homemaker". This is an important issue since it can be used to decide who can be served by displaced homemaker programs and/or which programs or activities can be funded by Federal and State agencies. The basic problem centers on the "fit" between regulations and the population needing service. Issues of age and employment status are central.

(a) Age as a criterion. The leaders of the grassroots movement have always insisted that the focus on middle age is a sine qua non—that older women have to fight against both sexism and ageism and are, therefore, at a double disadvantage. The displaced homemaker movement was begun on behalf of the middle-aged woman. It appears that most programs exclusively for displaced homemakers take this philosophy to heart: a survey of 46 programs by the Displaced Homemaker Network, reported in the July, 1979 issue of Network News, showed that 75% of clients were over 40. Our 30 telephone interviews also indicated that the majority of programs served women whose average age was in the low 40's. But some programs, especially in rural areas and those which serve
minorities, indicated that clients who had been married for as long as 10 or more years were still in their 20's. And women with small dependent children, no means to arrange for childcare, and no skills were even harder to employ than older women. There was sometimes no other place for these women to go, as the WIN and CETA programs were deemed ineffective in counseling and as a means to employment.

It appears that programs which include displaced homemakers among other target populations lose the focus on middle-age more easily. This is why the Displaced Homemakers Network lobbied as strongly to insure that memoranda concerning CETA Title III funding specify that women over 40 be given priority. It would be easy to say that all displaced homemakers were being served, when only women in their 20's and 30's were clients. This could be a logical outcome of not specifying age, especially in light of the Civil Rights report mentioned in an earlier section, which showed that Federal employment programs favored the young.

(b) Employment status as a criterion. Most definitions include the fact that the displaced homemaker has been in the home for a number of years without work. But this definition applies more to the middle class woman who has had the luxury of staying home with children and managing on a husband's wages, then it does to the lower class woman, often a minority group member, who has always had to work. A 1979 study by the Center for Human Resource Research (Lois-B. Shaw, "A Profile of Women Potentially Eligible for the Displaced Homemaker Program under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1978") concluded that the majority of women otherwise eligible for CETA displaced homemaker programs do not fit the stereotype in that they have had considerable, albeit irregular and low skill, work experience. Should women who
have been on AFDC be counted as displaced homemakers, while those who have managed to work not be included as eligible for services?

(c) Other criteria. There is little debate about including in the definition the loss of the support of the spouse through death, divorce, separation (incarceration, etc.) or disability. All women who re-enter school or the work force are not displaced homemakers. The definition used by grassroots leaders, either implicitly or explicitly, is the woman who is pushed into the labor market by financial necessity after the loss of support. But the question remains of how dire the necessity. One of the most prevalent complaints we heard from local CETA-funded programs was the inability to serve women who did not meet CETA poverty guidelines. A few of the participants in our panel discussion claimed that the loss of support for middle class women was even more devastating than for those with fewer resources before the loss. If she cannot find a way to make a living, the middle class woman may lose her home and all her assets before becoming eligible for some kind of support. Actually, the Network found that of displaced homemakers served by the 46 programs surveyed, 75% had annual incomes below $5,000.

Another problem area involving criteria for service involved age of dependent children. In New York State, for example, state funding regulations prohibit service to women with children below 16. But many middle-aged women continue to have children into their 40's. Informants from some programs felt frustrated in having to turn these women away.

There are pros and cons for a rigid definition of the displaced homemaker. Upholding a rigid set of regulations suggests that the loss of flexibility may lead to many needy women being turned away. But if criteria are too vague the older, unskilled, poverty-stricken woman may be forgotten in favor of more
employable, less "difficult" groups. Funding under vocational-education is more flexible, but we have become aware of some difficulties and misinterpretations. The "Rules and Regulations" (see Appendix 1-C) under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 lists displaced homemakers along with "other special groups". Clearly, persons who are simply "single heads of households", persons who are currently "part-time workers but who wish to secure a full-time job" and women who are in traditional female jobs and wish non-traditional jobs are not all displaced homemakers. But we suspect that in a few instances they may be being counted as such.

In view of the factors above, we think that the emphasis in the definition of the displaced homemaker should be on the middle-aged woman who has lost her means of support and must re-enter the world of work. But too great insistence on having spent time at home may link the definition too rigidly to the middle class woman. There should be flexibility in including women who have been irregularly and under-employed as well.

Finding the women who should be helped. One of the most prevalent problems cited by our telephone informants is that of outreach—getting in contact with the women program leaders know are "out there", but who do not present themselves. These are often the most isolated, the most lacking in confidence and the most needy. Word-of-mouth was often mentioned as the most effective means of bringing people to the program, but these women are often not part of a social network and do not belong to social organizations. Television spots may reach them, but as a means of outreach, television is used rather rarely by local programs, probably because of the time and/or expense involved. (It appears easier to get articles and ads in the local press, and programs make use of that. They also use posters and notices in centers of community life,
such as the local supermarket. Other approaches included contact with local clergymen, lawyers and funeral directors, making presentations to local women's groups, and radio spots.)

The problem is most acute in relation to minority groups. Hispanic women, especially, are unlikely to contact a program for displaced homemakers. One program which has had success in attracting younger Hispanic women is the Mi Casa Resource Center in Denver. They attribute part of their success to a sensitive community-based advisory board. Located in a two-story house in the middle of the community, women know that the Center is available and effective to help in an emergency such as those involving food stamps or housing. Once women in crisis have made contact, they accept other services, such as G.E.D. preparation and counseling. Sometimes younger women bring their mothers, but there is still a need to reach older women.

Another problem category are rural women who may live far from any displaced homemaker activity and may lack transportation. Ohio and Washington are trying to reach more women outside urban population centers by vocational-education funding of programs in community colleges throughout the state. The danger is that resources may be spread too thin to be effective, but the programs appear to be working. (For a description of the program in Ohio which has since been expanded, see Carol Bodeen, "What Happens When Homemakers Lose Their Jobs?", A.V.A. Journal, November, 1978.)

The Displaced Homemaker Center of Western New York, in an effort to reach more rural women, hopes to find funding for a mobile van. Other programs arrange workshops in libraries or other community centers in rural areas.

The fact that the majority of displaced homemaker programs reported that they could serve more displaced homemakers (see Table 4, Section 3) indicates that
special efforts at outreach are important; most programs are well aware of the need. One way to reach a large number of potential clients for displaced homemaker programs is through national organizations. The leaders of the displaced homemaker movement realized this early in their efforts, and were successful in enlisting the aid of many organizations concerned with woman and/or employment. In order to find out more about the past, present and future of organizations vis-a-vis the displaced homemaker, we sent a letter (see Appendix 6-C) to organizations which to our knowledge had supported activities in the past, or whose membership would have a potential interest in aspects of the displaced homemaker problem (see listing, Appendix 6-D). Responses came in too late to be analyzed for this report; the listing and responses will be considered in planning for the national conference in 1981.

Funding. When asked about problems, a typical statement was "Nothing that $50,000 wouldn't cure!" Informants most often mentioned the desirability of special outreach and job development people for whom funding was lacking. They also mentioned the uncertainty of funding from year to year. Even demonstrably successful programs have had to cut back services or cease operation when funding ceases. Program directors such as those in New York State, with funds legislated by the state and linked with the state Department of Labor, feel more secure in being "inside" the system.

As mentioned previously, another common complaint was having to turn away clients ineligible for CETA. The prevalent perception is that Vocational-Education funding is more flexible and that programs can service a wider variety of clients.

The most obvious "cure" for funding problems is the acquisition of multiple financial resources. Current regulations under both CETA and
Vocational-Education were designed to foster coordination and cooperation (see David W. Stevens, *The Coordination of Vocational Education Programs With CETA*, Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1979). Responses of "new" vocational education programs to our mailed request letter did not permit analysis of how much cooperation does exist with CETA. It is significant, however, that of 64 programs with Vocational Education funding, 38 had some other source of support. Those which did not were newer and smaller.

At least one telephone respondent reported that when the program received alternate funding, they "dropped CETA--it was too restrictive". Other complaints we have heard about CETA are that "there's too much red tape" involved in obtaining funds, that "it's too political", and that programs get the news about funding later than expected and then have to spring into action immediately, with no time to hire staff and to plan effectively. These criticisms echo those in a study by the Office of Governmental Affairs, A.A.C.J.C. ("Community and Junior Colleges and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Participation and Recommendations for Improvement," Washington, D.C., 1977). The study concluded that "those that effectively cope with the politics and know or get involved with the manpower planning council are most likely to do well."

It seems obvious that the greater the multiplicity of funding, the better. The bookkeeping procedures must be more complex and careful but the additional services, special projects, larger staff and greater variety of clients which can be accommodated in the existing structure makes up for the inconvenience.

- Training those who advise, counsel, or instruct displaced homemakers. Those who are in a position to help the displaced homemaker move to a personally
satisfying and financially productive job should understand the special problems of the displaced homemaker, should have realistic, up-to-date information on employment and training opportunities, and should be aware of the full range of supportive services in order to help the displaced homemaker set goals and take appropriate next steps.

Currently, people from many different experiential and academic backgrounds provide assistance and counsel to the displaced homemaker. Our research suggests that all could benefit by pre-service or in-service training which would help them to develop additional competencies. In general, advocates to displaced homemakers tend to focus on their own special areas of expertise and may, as a result, neglect other important areas identified above. For example, some who staff displaced homemaker centers have considerable experience in working through the special problems of the target group and see "ex-displaced homemakers" provide excellent peer support. They tend to have a realistic philosophy about helping expressed by such statements as "you can't be everyone's savior", "the more you know the tougher it goes", or "we need to educate displaced homemakers for economic independence". Some have difficulty translating homemaker skills into labor market alternatives. Some who work in educational settings are more aware of the educational and work opportunities, but may be less informed about and sensitive to the needs of the population—e.g., "the resources are here, why doesn't the displaced homemaker just use them", or "I see education as therapy and even if a displaced homemaker gets a degree in education and can't get a teaching job I hope she'll be better off in college than sitting home depressed and meet people and get ideas about what she can do afterward".
In a few instances, advisors may be more concerned with filling available slots in educational programs, rather than expanding career options for the displaced homemaker. Still others, who know the job world and the training world, impose stereotyped views about what is "women's work" on the displaced homemaker or accept rather than challenge the initial occupational choices of the displaced homemaker. In effect, they act to eliminate choices before any exploration is possible.

Dissemination of information is necessary to help to fill in the "missing pieces" among helpers. For example, the Displaced Homemakers Network conducts national and regional training seminars and conferences for local program staff and its regional coordinators; a few telephone respondents such as The New Mexico state project for displaced homemakers had programs for training people in community service agencies; the NTO Project of the Boston YWCA overcame stereotyped attitudes about "women's work" on the part of referring agencies by direct contact with counselors and easily accessibility to the project via an "open door" policy. Carol Eliason, Director of the Women's Opportunity Center of the A.A.C.J.C. suggests retraining of personnel in a wide variety of organizations which provide services to displaced homemakers such as personnel in federally-funded State Departments of Employment Security, USDA County Agents and Home Demonstration Agents who come in contact with rural displaced homemakers, and personnel of other agencies such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, VISTA, and CETA manpower training offices.

In addition, Dr. Eliason, a program evaluator, suggests certain criteria for staff effectiveness in displaced homemaker programs:

* Staff selection should be based upon skills, competencies and background rather than politics or traditional hierarchical educational credentials.
* Staff should include one or more minority persons to assure sensitive role models.
* Staff should include one or more former displaced homemakers.
* Every staff person (paid and volunteer) should have at least semi-annual evaluations with a written report filed for personnel records.
* Every staff person should be trained in the basic job search and development skills offered to the clients to insure rapport in problem solving.

Widening the options of displaced homemakers. The most important functions of a displaced homemaker program have to do with options—to foster an awareness of options for the future, to assist in the choice among those options, and to aid in fulfillment once the choice has been made. Unfortunately, many obstacles stand in the way of a real freedom of choice and accomplishment. The most serious of these problems were discussed in the section on training and education. Further training and education are often impossible even if, through counseling, the displaced homemaker arrives at a recognition of the importance of these activities in reaching her goals. The reasons are usually financial. Displaced homemakers should have more opportunities to learn and earn at the same time. Programs like the one at the Baltimore Center for Displaced Homemakers have found the funding, initiative and creativity to develop a series of training options: Internships, Tuition Assistance, Self-Employment Assistance, On-the-Job Training and Non-Traditional Training. The Baltimore Center has been established longer than most, but it would be beneficial for many programs to develop training and education options in addition to individual counseling, recognition of transferable skills and job readiness workshops. One of the keys in this endeavor is effective linkage with other community resources, such as Vocational Rehabilitation and the business community. We have
become aware of community resources such as Human Resources Development Institutions, LEAP programs of the National Urban League, and Educational Opportunity Centers. Displaced Homemaker programs must seek out other service providers; they must become brokers and advocates for displaced homemakers. Formation of a community-based advisory committee with representatives of agencies, institutions, businesses, unions and displaced homemakers is another step in the right direction.

One of the biggest problems is the lack of jobs in a stagnant economy, especially in rural areas. Some women may be content with traditional, entry-level jobs; for some, getting and retaining a job with a regular paycheck is the fulfillment of a goal, and this should be recognized. But every woman should be at least encouraged to consider jobs she would not have considered before. Programs which have the facilities to allow women a small amount of hands-on experience in non-traditional work are fortunate; if they do not have the facilities, they should seek them out. Development of good relationships with area businesses is also very important. At the Oakland, California Displaced Homemakers Center, for example, many large employers notify Center personnel of job openings before advertising to the general public. They have become "satisfied customers".

Displaced homemaker programs cannot be all things to all people, however. Most of the program directors we interviewed claimed above a 50% job placement rate, and some said that 90% of "graduates" were placed in jobs or further training. So results, in general, are good.

On the whole, we have found that program leaders are enthusiastic and firm in their dedication and commitment to provide service to displaced homemakers. Perhaps because of the grassroots origins of the movement and because many are
or were displaced homemakers themselves, they are generally concerned about the effectiveness of their programs and eager to make changes for the better.
SECTION 7
SOME CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

The following criteria are extensions of the discussion in the last section, and are based on the same sources. We have attempted to be quite general, leaving room for individual program differences.

A. Multi-source funding.

B. Outreach attempts and service to every segment of the community.

C. Innovative outreach techniques.

D. Advisory committee which includes representatives of community groups (including minority groups), service agencies, business and unions, if possible.

E. Intake service which includes information and referral for immediate individual problems.

F. Flexible programs to meet individual needs. Elements of the program should include personal and skill assessment, career exploration (what the displaced homemaker wants to do and can do) and methods for attaining goals.

G. Element of peer support (in group workshops, etc.).

H. Linkage with other agencies in community to further goals of training, education or job placement.

I. Job development and placement efforts, which include contact with the local business community.

J. Making displaced homemakers aware of non-traditional work option, and preferably efforts toward developing on-the-job training and apprenticeships.

K. Awareness of needs for auxiliary service such as transportation, child care, or health service. Creative approaches to help.
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