

GENERATIONAL LINKS IN THE POVERTY CYCLE

An Analysis of the Significance of Selected Variables,
Education, Occupation and Receipt of Public Assistance,
Seen as Generational Links in the Low-Income Life Style.

by

DONAMAE A. McCARGAR
GILBERT J. McKAY
COLIN S. SHEPPARD
JANET M. WELLS

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

Accepted as conforming to the standard
required for the degree of Master of
Social Work

School of Social Work

The University of British Columbia

1968

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Social Work

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date March 6, 1968

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Social Work

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date March 1, 1968

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Social Work

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date 6/Nov 1968

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Social Work

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date March 4, 1968

ABSTRACT

This study is one of four research projects which examined the National Urban Low-Income Family Evaluation Study (NULIFE). Under the auspices of the Canada Welfare Council, NULIFE examined poverty in three urban areas of Canada.

The purpose of this particular study was to examine the many factors which contribute to generational links in the poverty cycle in metropolitan areas across Canada. There is a vast range of literature and research reports available from the United States on the poverty cycle and its etiology but examination of the factors which followed a familiar pattern seem to occupy a secondary position. It is to be hoped, therefore, that this study will stimulate further enquiries in this area, as well as contribute to knowledge of poverty in Canada.

Examination of the NULIFE data for generational links did not produce any radical conclusions. The research indicated that the selected variables education, occupation and welfare were pertinent to

the inexorable process of poverty. They were examined in separate sections of the report from the point of view that low education, lack of job skills, and dependence on welfare are self-generating, and present the poor with barriers to economic betterment. This study theorized that these critical variables were closely interrelated. For example, education was related to lack of occupational skills, et cetera.

Although it was found that the selected variables were contributors to generational links in the cycle of poverty, such conclusions could only be made tentatively, as the analysis lacked strength. It was therefore not possible to indicate causality as many other cultural determinants of poverty, such as attitudes, values, expectations et cetera, were not available to be tested.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to Dr. J. A. Crane, Associate Professor, Mr. H. Kroeker, Mrs. P. Tanabe, and Mr. L. Bell, Instructors, of the School of Social Work of the University of British Columbia, for their patience, understanding, and guidance during the preparation of this report. We would also like to thank Miss G. Starkey of the University of British Columbia Computing Center for her assistance in the preparation of the data processing programmes that were an integral part of this report. Our sincere thanks are extended to The Canadian Welfare Council which furnished the raw data that was basic to this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Title Page.	i
Abstract.	ii
Acknowledgements.	iv
Table of Contents.	v
Tables in the Text.	vii
Preface to the NULIFE Study.	ix
 Chapter 1. <u>Introduction</u>	
Purpose of Study. General Limitations. Reliability and Validity.	1
 Chapter 2. <u>Methodology</u>	
Statistical Procedures.	6
 Chapter 3. <u>Background to Study</u>	
Literature on the Poor. Explanation of Terms. Concepts.	8
 Chapter 4. <u>Education as a Generational Factor in the Low-Income Life Style</u>	
An analysis of the relationship between the independent variable, education of respondent, and the dependent variable, education of respondent's parent to establish a connection between low educational status of respondents and parents; and a further comparison between low education and other factors in low socio-economic status, such as occupation, dependence on social welfare and tendency to leave school for financial reasons.	17

	Page
Chapter 5. <u>Occupational Status as a Generational Factor</u> <u>in the Low-Income Life Style</u>	
A comparative analysis of the independent variable, the occupational level of the respondent, and a series of dependent variables: the respondent's incidence of unemployment, the occupational level of the respondents' parent, the educational status of the respondent, and the educational level of the respondent's parent, to ascertain if a generational link exists between these factors.	34
Chapter 6. <u>Receipt of Public Financial Assistance</u> <u>as a Generational Factor in the Low</u> <u>Income Life Style</u>	
An examination of the relationship between the independent variable, welfare status of parent, and such dependent variables as education, occupation and welfare status of the respondent in an effort to determine the extent to which parental dependency on public financial assistance affects the life style of the next generation.	52
Chapter 7. <u>Conclusions</u>	67
Bibliography	71

TABLES IN THE TEXT

	Page
Table 1. Size and location of samples.	x
Table 2. Per centage comparison between educational level of respondent and the educational level of the respondent's parent, low-income sample.	21
Table 3. Per centage comparison between educational level of respondent and occupational class of respondent, low-income sample.	25
Table 4. Per centage comparison between educational level of respondent and frequency of dependency on welfare of respondent, low-income sample.	28
Table 5. Per centage comparison between educational level of respondent and respondent's reasons for leaving school, low-income sample.	31
Table 6. Per centage comparison of samples for selected occupational classes.	36
Table 7. Per centage comparison of samples for all occupational classes.	38
Table 8. Incidence of unemployment by occupational class in the low-income sample.	40
Table 9. Numerical relationship between the occupational classes of the respondent's parent and the occupational classes of the respondent, low-income sample.	43
Table 10. Per centage relationship between the occupational classes of the respondent's parent and the occupational classes of the respondent, low-income sample.	44

	Page
Table 11. Per centage comparison of the occupational classes of the respondent's parent and the occupational class of the respondent, low-income sample.	46
Table 12. Per centage comparison of the educational level of the respondent and the occupational class of the respondent, low-income sample.	48
Table 13. Numerical relationship between the educational level of the respondent's parent and the occupational class of the respondent, low-income sample.	50
Table 14. Per centage comparison of the educational level of the respondent's parent and the occupational class of the respondent, low-income sample	51
Table 15. Per centage comparison of receipt of welfare between respondent and respondent's parent, low-income sample.	54
Table 16. Per centage comparison of educational achievement of respondent with receipt of welfare by respondent's parent, low-income sample.	57
Table 17. Per centage comparison of respondents who did and did not complete high school in relation to receipt of welfare by respondents' parents, low-income sample.	59
Table 18. Per centage comparison of occupational status of respondent with receipt of welfare by respondent's parent, low-income sample.	61
Table 19. Per centage comparison of sex of respondent with receipt of welfare by respondent, low-income sample and middle-income comparison sample.	63

PREFACE TO THE NULIFE STUDY: (54)

The NULIFE project is an attempt to study the nature, content and contributing factors of urban poverty in Canada, a problem of great importance to social planners today. The study was sponsored by the Canadian Welfare Council and funded by the Laidlaw Foundation.

It is an attempt to supplement previous research on poverty which was based on small samples of case analysis in specific geographic areas. A random sample of economic households was drawn from low-income areas in Vancouver, Winnipeg and Halifax. The sample unit, an economic household, is defined as a group of persons dependent on a common or pooled income for major items of expense, and living in the same dwelling.

The samples for the 2,600 cases were drawn as follows:

TABLE 2. SIZE AND LOCATION OF SAMPLES

Sample	Vancouver	Winnipeg	Halifax
Low-income area	N = 450	N = 450	N = 270
Low-income area	N = 450	N = 450	N = 270
Middle class "comparison" group 10% of city sample	N = 100	N = 100	N = 60
TOTALS	N = 1,000	N = 1,000	N = 600

The study considered simultaneously several dimensions of poverty such as the economic and employment system, health, welfare, education, housing and social involvement. From the analysis of the data it is hoped that it will be possible to measure current social and economic needs, to evaluate current services in terms of effectiveness, to formulate and implement new policy which is found to be necessary and to suggest areas for further intensive research.

The focus of this study is exclusively urban rather than rural; although both constitute components of the total problem of poverty in Canada, however a great deal of comprehensive research has taken place, supported through the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act, in the rural areas.

Methods of Collecting Data:

To obtain the necessary data for the NULIFE study, data was collected using a personal interview conducted by trained interviewers. The data instrument included a structured schedule and an attitude questionnaire. In order to encompass a large number of dimensions in sufficient depth to facilitate a comprehensive analysis of factors which characterize the life-style of the urban poor, it was necessary to use a lengthy questionnaire. This represents the strength as well as the weakness of the study. The length of the interview varied from 45 minutes to 2 - 1/2 hours, depending upon the size of the

household, with a median length of approximately 1 hour and 30 minutes .
(Interviewee fatigue undoubtedly affected the quality of response.)

However, the size of the sample, its breadth and the fact that it is a national survey, enhance its utility. NULIFE provides a knowledgeable base upon which social policy can be formulated on a national level, taking into account regional differences.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF STUDY

This report examines the NULIFE data for characteristics that could lead to an enhancement of knowledge of the generational links in the cycle of poverty. Attention was focused on the life style of economic households (the respondents) situated in the low-income areas. This study analysed the pertinent characteristics which were theorized as being fundamental contributors to the perpetuation of poverty. Children raised in such households perpetuate poverty when they grow up and pass along to their own offspring a similar style of life which was familiar to them as children. In this way, characteristics which identify poverty conditions are passed on from generation to generation.

From a preliminary examination of the literature on the poverty cycle and a test run of the NULIFE data, attention was focused on education, occupation and welfare from which three concepts were formulated providing a framework for this analysis.

From these concepts, null hypotheses were conceived which are examined in separate stages of the study. Education, occupation and welfare were defined as independent variables and their inter-relatedness was tested in each stage.

This study analysed the total sample group of economic households drawn from the low-income areas. It did not purport to have analysed a poverty group as designated by some arbitrary position such as level of income, standard of housing, et cetera.

GENERAL LIMITATIONS

While it had been originally intended to define a poverty group from the low-income sample areas, such a refinement would have severely restricted the already limited quantity of available data. Additionally, statistical procedures were chosen for their suitability of analysing this study's particular data which were at the nominal level. Had a poverty group been factored out by, for example, some level of income, the statistical procedures that were applied would possibly have become invalid. Subsequently, several findings were tested and this was found to be true.

This study did not take into account regional differences. Instead, a basic assumption was made that the sample group from

the 2600 cases would be representative of the living conditions of the individuals and families in Canada living in a poverty area. Such an assumption was not made without an awareness of its limitations. Within a low-income area dwell many people who do not reflect the characteristic norms of the poor in terms of income attitude outlook et cetera. Some of these will be picked up in the sampling process.

Numerous responses were found under the category of "Don't know." Their numbers varied from question to question but were generally higher in responses by the respondent pertaining to his parents. In all cases, . . . the "Don't know" responses were totally disregarded.

The 10 per cent sample group from Vancouver showed 30 per cent had some college education and 18 per cent had five years of college. The 1961 Canada Census figures show that in the City of Vancouver, of the population who are 15 years of age and over and not attending school, 4 per cent have university degrees and 5.5 per cent have some university education. (55) Thus, although the sample group was not representative of the total population, it was nevertheless useful for comparative purposes.

RELIABILITY

The calibre of the data was seriously affected by the accuracy of recall of the respondents to questions pertaining to their parents. Responses to Question 42 (cited below) and others led to serious doubts as to their reliability.

VALIDITY

Analysis of the computer data revealed numerous coding errors. For example, responses were indicated where no question was asked. One very rudimentary question regarding the respondents' occupation received nearly 25 per cent responses of "Don't know" which was obviously a coding error. For the purposes of this report, however, it was assumed that coding errors would not invalidate the findings.

Uncovering generational links necessitated examining questions that revealed similar information pertaining to conditions of both respondents and parents. It was found, however, that such questions were limited in number and many were not of a similar nature, thus presenting a dilemma as to the validity of directly comparing the responses. For example:

Question 42: To respondent regarding his
parent's education:•

"How many years did he attend school?"

Question 9: To respondent regarding his education:•

"Highest school grade attended?"

These questions have different implications. Length of time at school is not necessarily comparable with school grade attended because of the possibility of failure and repeating grades.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

STATISTICAL PROCEDURES

The data gathered by the NULIFE survey were largely qualitative and categorical (nominal). These factors placed limitations on the type of statistical analysis that could be validly performed. In essence the purpose of the study was to either support or refute assumptions that relationships existed between a series of variables. Therefore it was felt that the chi-square procedure, as calculated by the formula $X^2 = \sum \frac{(e - o)^2}{e}$, was the most suitable for the purposes of the study and for the level of data that were available. The level of significance was arbitrarily established at $\alpha = .05$. This level was consistently used throughout the study.

The chi-square, however, did not indicate the direction of the relationship - if it was direct or inverse. When it was felt essential to illustrate this aspect, a per centage distribution was calculated to demonstrate the direction. In addition to not showing

the direction of the relationship, the chi-square did not indicate the strength of the relationship. When it was deemed necessary to illustrate the strength of a relationship, the contingency coefficient was calculated by the formula $C = \sqrt{\frac{X^2}{N + X^2}}$. The theoretical maximum of this coefficient approaches unity only when the number of cells in the contingency table approach infinity. Thus the calculated value of C must always be considered in relation to the theoretical maximum. In some cases the theoretical maximum of C was calculated on the basis of sound statistical techniques; in other cases it was derived by interpolation.

CHAPTER III

BACKGROUND TO STUDY

LITERATURE ON THE POOR

A generational transmission of multiple problems in social functioning among the poor is a concept prevalent today in the literature on poverty. One consequence of prolonged poverty is the breeding of a distinctive life-style or culture shared by the impoverished and transmitted by them from generation to generation through the family's acculturation of its children for the purpose of survival. . . or, poverty, it is purported, breeds poverty. For those ensnared in the self-perpetuating poverty cycle, it is virtually impossible to attain the standards and goals of the middle-class community - goals albeit shared by the poverty group. Martin Rein (44) criticizes the poverty cycle or "culture of poverty" thesis which stresses the apathy of the poor and their inability to respond to opportunities in that, he states, it neglects to recognize that the level of living contributes to the development of character.

Proponents of the "culture of poverty" hypothesis, Rein implies, attempt to treat the pathology of the poor rather than to provide the necessary social utilities. Further, Rein maintains that pathological society withholds the utilities which would break the poverty cycle because, in fact, society desires to retain a poverty group. This provocative theory nested within Mr. Rein's examination, criticisms and research on poverty provided this study with a very necessary balanced view of the problem associated with examining poverty conditions.

A good perception of the child-rearing patterns of the poor is presented by Catherine Chilman in her book "Growing Up Poor" (3). She refers to the compelling relationship between the child-rearing patterns of the poor and the perpetuation of poverty. For a child ". . . to escape effectively from the many faceted frustrations that beset the very poor, he must escape as a whole person, not just as an efficient and employed cog in the economic complex." (3, p.2.) The aims of this study were to uncover the many factors most relevant to the escape process.

Lola Ireland's book "Low-Income Life Styles" provided a succinct discussion of family patterns of the poor, proved to be an invaluable guide and gave an indication of many features of generational

links which were relevant to the analysis of the NULIFE data. (11)

The writings of Oscar Lewis and his view of poverty were particularly applicable to the analysis (12). The following statement on the "culture of poverty" very cogently summarizes the dilemma that this report attempted to analyse. ". . . it is a way of life remarkably stable and persistent, passed down from generation to generation along family lines. The culture of poverty has its own modalities and distinctive social and psychological consequences for its members." (12, p. 24)

Literature and research papers pertaining to the three independent variables of education, occupation and welfare varied in quantity.

A great deal has been written by social scientists and educators in recent years regarding the fact that children from low-income families fail to achieve as high standards as children from middle-class families in our traditional educational system. There is much in recent literature to explain this phenomenon, and some authors suggest that because low-income families have completely different values and expectations, they fail to prepare their children for school in the way that middle-class families do. (11) (28)

"The parental patterns more characteristic of the very poor, in reference to education achievement, seem to be oriented toward an anticipation of failure and a distrust of middle-class institutions such as the schools. Constriction in experience, reliance on a physical rather than a verbal style, a rigid rather than flexible approach, preference for concrete rather than abstract thinking, reliance on personal attributes rather than on training or skills, a tendency toward magical rather than scientific thinking: these values and attitudes provide poor preparation and support for many of the children of the very poor as they struggle to meet the demands of the middle class school." (3, p. 45)

Previous research has established that there is a direct generational link in occupational status. Rogoff's classical study established that, regardless of the economic or social rewards, "the most likely occupational destiny of all the sons was the occupation of their fathers." (19, p. 106). She also established that even where sons do not follow the specific occupation of their fathers, they select occupations that are at roughly the same social class level. These findings were substantiated by studies carried out by the National Opinion Research Center (53) and by the research of R. Centers. (25)

Poverty, or a state of being poor, is frequently measured in economic terms and defined as a subsistence level of income.

Sidney E. Zimbalist in "Drawing the Poverty Line" defines the poor as "those who have a sufficiently regular though bare income. . .

whose means may be sufficient but are barely sufficient for decent independent life." (52, p. 20) Since public financial assistance is

similarly defined as subsistence living, the terms poverty and welfare are often interchanged, by inference at least, in the

literature. Moreover, since it is recognized in social work practice

as well as in the literature that not all individuals on low-income

fall within the category of "the poor", recent research studies

designed to separate and examine the characteristics of those in

receipt of public financial assistance from non-recipients of welfare,

provide a further step forward in the endeavours of those concerned

with developing effective measures to alleviate the poverty cycle.

Robert C. Stone and Frederic T. Schlamp in a preliminary paper

entitled "Characteristics Associated with Receipt or Non-receipt

of Financial Aid from Welfare Agencies" attempt to determine

whether families dependent on public financial assistance are

different from or similar to other low-income families in life

style. (50) Leonard Schneiderman in "Value Orientation Prefer-

ences of Chronic Relief Recipients" similarly attempts to test

whether persons chronically impoverished share a distinctive pattern of living. (48)

EXPLANATION OF TERMS

It was believed that the many variables associated with poverty viz. low education, economic insecurity, demoralization et cetera would be well represented within the low-income areas. Thus it was felt that this study could profess to have examined generational links in a poverty area.

Poverty was thought of as "life conditions of the poor." They are many in number. The poor not only suffer from economic hardship but conditions of their housing, health, education, job skills et cetera separate them from achieving the goals of the majority of society. Concomitant factors are the attitudes and values of the poor from which has arisen in contemporary literature the concept of the "culture of the poor." Helplessness, isolation, apathy and anomie illustrate the feelings of the poor which serve to enhance their alienation from the more affluent members of society.

Generational Links were interpreted as meaning common characteristics that are revealed from generation to generation. One can ask (1) do characteristics exist within economic households

of a poverty area which delineate poverty areas from other areas? and (2) how are these characteristics passed along? The first question is the purpose of this research. The second can be partially answered if it is assumed that the common characteristics which identify the poor give rise to a unique life-style. This life-style is transmitted through the teaching and training of the child by the parents. Attitudes, values, expectations, and outlook peculiar to the poor are transmitted from parent to child thus ensuring that the "culture of the poor" remains part of society. Additionally, generational links applicable to the perpetuation of poverty embodies a demographic variable assuming that the child's development is affected by the social groups, neighbourhood and locality where the child is raised.

Culture of the Poor is defined by Oscar Lewis as ". . . a design for living which is passed down from generation to generation. In applying this concept of culture to the understanding of poverty I want to draw attention to the fact that poverty in modern nations is not only a state of economic deprivation, of disorganization, or of the absence of something. It is also something positive in the sense that it has a structure, a rationale, and defense mechanisms without which the poor could hardly carry on." (12, p. 23) This statement

on the 'culture of the poor' points to the survival value of their life style with the generational link between parent and child aiding the preservation of the culture from extinction. It can thus be seen as a defense against a severe environment which calls for a completely different mode of adjustment.

CONCEPTS

From the independent variables of education, occupation and welfare identified earlier, three concepts were developed. They led to the formulation of null hypotheses tested independently in the following stages of this report. The three concepts were thought of as:-

- 1) A low level of education is the norm for a low-income area which tends to be transmitted longitudinally from parent to child. Child-rearing patterns contribute to school failure as the children of the poor are not equipped to cope with middle-class oriented schools. Inevitably, school failure leads to employment problems and often an inability to find work in a society demanding ever-increasing higher educational standards.
- 2) In Canadian society, a primary determinant of income is occupation and thus, in studying the characteristics of the low income sample, occupational status of this group was examined. Their occupational level is centered in areas of semi-skilled and unskilled categories of jobs making them susceptible through redundancy, lay off, and lack of jobs to frequent unemployment. Concomitant income insecurity is perpetuated along family lines.

- 3) Recipients of welfare, purportedly deficient in education and occupational skills, are least likely to achieve or maintain economic independence, and therefore are most likely to require public financial assistance from time to time or indefinitely. Consequently, they must adjust to a subsistence level yet try to cope or compete with institutions geared to a middle-class modality. Since it is an unrealistic, if not virtually impossible, task for them to break the bonds of the poverty cycle either latitudinally or longitudinally, the tendency is for a generational transmission of life style to prevail within the poverty cycle.

CHAPTER IV

EDUCATION AS A GENERATIONAL FACTOR IN THE LOW-INCOME LIFE STYLE

Elizabeth Herzog states that education is one of the most crucial factors in the problem of poverty. "Sometimes it almost seems as if all the other differences flowed from that one, so overwhelming are its apparent results in the lives and thoughts and feelings of the poor." (32, p. 382). And she further states that education is still the most useful single indicator of socioeconomic status.

Although parents in low-income areas appear to have high expectations regarding their children's education, and express the desire that their children continue in school, they are unable to put these wishes into action because of their limited knowledge of the qualities needed to compete in the school system.

Low-income families are unable to give their children the necessary stimulation and "achievement motivation" that is almost automatically a part of the middle-class child-rearing pattern. (47) (35) (41). The children are unable to compete in our schools, which are primarily middle-class institutions (18). Patricia Sexton found that in low-income areas, schools and teaching staff are of the poorest standards and the drop-out rate is markedly higher. (22)

Failure at school leads to inability to compete for employment in our highly competitive and specialized economic system, and this fixes the individual irrevocably in low income status.

It was expected, therefore, that in analysing the data there would be found to be a direct relation between education of respondents and their parents. That is, if the parents attained only a low education, their children would tend to attain a low level also. It was further anticipated that there would be a relationship between low level of education and other indicators of low socio-economic status, such as occupation in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, frequent dependence on public assistance and the necessity for respondents to leave school for financial reasons. In other words, those with little education themselves would tend to have children

following the familial pattern of low achievement. This, then, would be linked to other characteristics of the low-income group, such as, relatively lower paid jobs, more frequent need for social assistance, and the necessity for education to be discontinued because of lack of funds.

Ornati quotes the University of Michigan Survey Research Center as having found that the lack of "education of the father was the most powerful predictor of low income for the son." (14, p. 67)

As the categories for education of respondent and respondent's parent were not equivalent on the questionnaire, in drawing up the tables, it was necessary to amalgamate these into four general headings: "None, " "Elementary, " "High School, " and "College." This made for greater ease of comparison, but undoubtedly some of the finer shades of difference were lost.

It had originally been planned to analyse the relationship between education of respondent and other items on the questionnaire, such as race, language spoken in the home and attitudes toward the school. However, it was decided that, although this would give a fuller picture of the general characteristics and life styles of persons in a low-income area, it would not greatly add to our

knowledge of characteristics which are passed on from one generation to another.

In future studies, it would prove interesting to have material on attitudes and values for both respondent and parent so that these factors could be related to performance in the schools. This would give greater depth to the study.

Although it would have been helpful to compare levels of education between sample group and comparison group, as has been noted in the Introduction, the discrepancy was so great between level of education of the comparison group and the statistics given in the 1961 Canada Census figures that it was decided not to include this. (55)

The first table to be examined is a comparison between the educational level of respondent and parent and, in view of the foregoing analysis of the literature on this subject, it was expected that there would be a positive relationship between these two variables. However, a null hypothesis was formulated, that is, that there would be no relationship between educational level of respondent and parent.

TABLE 2 Per centage comparison between educational level of respondent and the educational level of the respondent's parent, low-income sample.*

N = 1187

EDUCATION (RESPONDENT)	EDUCATION (PARENT)			
	None	Elementary	High School	College
None	11.80% (26)	1.84% (12)	1.57% (4)	0.00% (0)
Elementary	67.75% (149)	56.30% (366)	30.59% (78)	30.65% (19)
High School	19.09% (42)	38.78% (252)	61.96% (158)	43.38% (30)
College	1.36% (3)	3.08% (20)	5.88% (15)	20.97% (13)
Total	100.00% (220)	100.00% (650)	100.00% (255)	100.00% (62)

*Figures in brackets indicate numerical values.

The chi-square for this table is 212.124, which is considerably beyond the critical chi-square value of 16.919, at the established level of significance. The contingency co-efficient for

this table is 0.39, compared to the maximum possible C value for a 4 x 4 table, which is 0.866. This shows that the relationship is of moderate strength.

The null hypothesis can therefore be rejected and the alternate hypothesis - that there is a relationship between the level of education of parents and children - can be accepted.

This table clearly illustrates that the lower the education of parents, the lower the education of children and conversely, the higher the education of parents, the higher the education of children.

It shows that 79.55 per cent of the children of parents with no education attended elementary school or were not educated and that 58.14 per cent of the children who attended elementary school fell into the same category, while only 31.16 per cent of those children whose parents attended high school achieved less education than their parents.

On the other hand, 61.96 per cent of the children of parents with high school education (considered minimum requirement for many jobs) achieved this level themselves. In contrast, 38.78 per cent of the children whose parents had attended elementary

school only achieved this level, while of those whose parents were uneducated, 19.09 per cent achieved a high school education.

It appears to have been established that those respondents whose parents had little education will have little education themselves and, thus, lack of achievement in education will be transmitted from one generation to another.

To have made this connection is not in any way to have offered any explanation of why this might be so. The literature in the social sciences indicates that many complex factors may be in operation here, but it is not within the scope of this study to explore these in any depth.

Traditional educationalists have often assumed that the poor performance of children in low-income areas was the result of poor intellectual endowment, but there has been much recent questioning of this idea. Irelan quotes a study of children in Harlem, which indicated that the I.Q. ratings for these children dropped after a period of elementary education, which may mean that the educational system itself is more at fault than had previously been supposed. (11, p. 35)

The close connection between education and occupational status in our competitive society is a generally accepted idea. In a highly developed economic system such as ours, most jobs require a certain basic education and some specialized skills. Therefore, it was anticipated that a relationship would be found between educational level of the respondent and his occupational status.

Using the null hypothesis, it was theorized that there would be no relationship between these two variables.

TABLE 3 Per centage comparison between educational level of respondent and occupational class of respondent, low-income sample.*

N = 1389

EDUCATION (RESPONDENT)	OCCUPATION (RESPONDENT)			
	Labourer	Blue Collar	White Collar	Totals
None	72.40% (21)	17.20% (5)	10.40% (3)	100.00% (29)
Elementary	55.10% (402)	38.40% (280)	6.50% (47)	100.00% (729)
High School	32.08% (187)	45.28% (264)	22.64% (132)	100.00% (583)
College	12.50% (6)	25.00 (12)	62.50% (30)	100.00% (48)

*Figures in brackets indicate numerical values.

The calculated chi-square value of 193.66 is very much beyond the critical value of 12.59. Thus it was established that there was a significant relationship between these variables. The contingency co-efficient is 0.35, compared to an interpolated theoretical maximum of 0.837, which shows the relationship is of

moderate strength.

The null hypothesis can be rejected and the alternate hypothesis can be accepted - that there is a relationship between level of occupation and education.

It can be clearly seen from the table that there is a high correlation between the respondent's low education and the tendency to have labouring jobs. Of those respondents with no education, 72.4 per cent had labouring jobs; of those with elementary school, 55.1 per cent had labouring jobs; and of those with high school, only 32.08 per cent had labouring jobs.

Obviously, those who have failed to acquire a basic education were more likely to be employed in less skilled, lower-paid jobs. "It is a simple statistical fact that low educational attainment is closely associated with low income. Available figures, for instance, reveal that every school year completed brings measurable dividends." (14, p. 62)

In the first table, it was found that low education of parents tends to be related to low education of children. It has now been shown that there is a connection between low educational achievement in respondents and low occupational status, which is

usually associated with low income. Thus, one could infer that low occupation, which is associated with low education, might also follow a generational pattern.

In the next table, education of respondent is compared to dependency on social welfare, another indicator of low socioeconomic status. It was expected that there would be a relationship between these variables. It is usually those with little education and special training who are most readily laid off in times of recession and economic hardship and who suffer from chronic insecurity regarding jobs. It is these unskilled workers who make up the majority of the public assistance caseloads.

The null hypothesis was used: that there would be no relationship between level of education and the frequency of respondents' dependency on social welfare.

TABLE 4 Per centage comparison between educational level of respondent and frequency of dependency on welfare of respondent, low-income sample.*

N = 1305

EDUCATION (RESPONDENT)	WELFARE (RESPONDENT)			
	Never	Once	Two +	Total
None	69.23% (54)	24.35% (19)	6.42% (5)	100.00% (78)
Elementary	60.75% (26)	21.42% (256)	17.83% (43)	100.00% (325)
High School	68.12% (562)	19.75% (163)	12.13% (100)	100.00% (825)
College	72.73% (56)	20.78% (16)	6.49% (5)	100.00% (77)

*Figures in brackets indicate numerical values.

The chi-square for this table was 25.05, which is well in excess of 12.592, which is the critical chi-square value at the predetermined level of significance. The contingency co-efficient, showing the strength of the relationship, was calculated to be 0.106. The interpolated theoretical maximum for a table of this size was found to be 0.837. Thus, the relationship can be said to be relatively weak.

The null hypothesis is therefore rejected and the alternate accepted.

Examination of the tables reveals that of the respondents who had elementary school only, 21.42 per cent had been on social assistance once, and 17.83 per cent had been on social assistance more than once, a total of 39.25 per cent.

This was in contrast to the high school group, 19.75 per cent of whom had been on social assistance once, and 12.13 per cent of whom had been on social assistance more than once, a total of 31.88 per cent.

We can conclude that the lower the education, the more frequently on social assistance; and conversely, the higher the level of education, the less frequently on social assistance.

For further discussion regarding the validity of the questions on respondent's and parent's dependency on social assistance, reference is made to Chapter 6.

In Table 5, education of respondent is compared to the question on the questionnaire regarding respondent's reasons for leaving school.

Several studies have pointed out that there is a much higher drop-out rate in schools in low-income areas (22). One estimate drawn from census data in the United States indicates that 70 per cent of the drop-outs come from families with incomes under \$5,000 per year. (13, p. 12)

For this reason, it was assumed that there would be a high correlation between education (which has now been shown to be closely associated with socio-economic status) and the frequency of leaving school for financial reasons.

The null hypothesis was formed; that there would be no relationship between education and financial reasons for leaving school.

The categories "None" and "Elementary" were amalgamated for this table, in order to obtain a valid chi-square value.

TABLE 5 Per centage comparison between educational level of respondent and respondent's reasons for leaving school, low income sample.*

N = 1915

REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL (RESPONDENT)				
EDUCATION (RESPONDENT)	Financial	Performance	Other	Total
Elementary	55.12% (641)	12.55% (146)	32.34% (376)	100.00% (1163)
High School	43.75% (312)	14.73% (105)	41.52% (296)	100.00% (713)
College	25.64% (10)	10.24% (4)	64.12% (25)	100.00% (39)

*Figures in brackets indicate numerical values.

The chi-square for this table is 36.631, which is well above the critical value of 9.488, at this study's level of significance. Although the relationship is significant, the contingency co-efficient value of 0.204 (the theoretical maximum C value is 0.816) indicates that the relationship is relatively weak.

Thus, the null hypothesis can be rejected, and the alternate, that there is a relationship between level of education and reasons for leaving school, can be accepted.

The tables show that of those who left school at the elementary level, 55.12 per cent did so for financial reasons. Of those who left at the high school level, 43.75 per cent did so for financial reasons.

It does appear from these tables that there is a slight relationship between education and financial reasons for leaving school. At the lower levels of the educational scale, a greater per centage of those leaving school did so for financial reasons.

The number of respondents who left school before completing elementary school is 641, which represents 26.79 per cent of the total sample group. This appears to be quite high.

Perhaps the most important element in the problem of school drop-outs is the incidence, rather than the particular time when a given child leaves the school system.

In this section, in examining the data on education, it has been found that there is quite a strong indication that the lower the education of the parents, the lower the education of the children.

This was in line with what had been anticipated from our review of the literature. That is, the parents who themselves are disadvantaged are less likely to be able to provide the necessary stimulation and encouragement for their children to succeed in the school system and tend to leave school early.

As education is the key to so many other aspects of life in North American society, this would appear to be a most strong determining factor in the lives of these individuals.

Education was then compared to occupation, to frequency of dependency on social welfare, and to financial reasons for leaving school. Although there was only a moderate relationship between the level of education and these other variables, there was an indication that all these characteristics co-existed in the low-income group.

CHAPTER V

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AS A GENERATIONAL FACTOR IN THE LOW-INCOME LIFE STYLE

Occupation was selected for examination for two reasons. First: from an anthropological point of view, occupation forms an important aspect of the concept of sub-cultures. Different value systems are associated with different levels of social stratification and conversely different stratas are associated with different value systems. Occupational levels are one of the key indicators of individuals' position in the social system and therefore they are associated with their own value orientations. Second: different occupations, because of their perceived varying worth to society, are ascribed different monetary rewards. Those occupations that are perceived to be of lesser value receive little pecuniary reward, thus creating the financial facet of the phenomenon of poverty. Not only does the monetary reward vary in amount but also it differs in its nature. Low income tends to be sporadic while high

income is received on a more regular, predictable basis.

The NULIFE survey analysed occupational status by establishing three main occupation groups: "White Collar, " "Blue Collar, " and "Labourer. " The distinction between these groups was made on the basis of the nature of the gainful employment. The survey anticipated that not all the respondents would be gainfully employed and therefore four ancillary categories "Housewife, " "Student, " "Student and working, " and "Under five years of age" - were established to classify the balance of the sample. Those respondents who had retired were classified by the nature of their major employment prior to retirement. The primary interest of this study was those respondents who were, at the time of the survey, or who had been, prior to the survey, involved in the labour market on a full time basis. Thus, for the most part, those respondents in the four auxilliary categories were not considered by this study. In the one instance that they were considered, they were amalgamated and dealt with under the category "Other. "

An early assumption of this study was that the three main occupational categories were hierarchically arranged by income; that "White Collar" respondents would receive more

income than those in the "Blue Collar" class and that the "Blue Collar" class would receive more than the "Labourers." If this contention were true, it was expected that there would be a marked difference between the distribution of occupations in the low-income sample and in the comparison sample. It was expected that in the comparison sample well over one-third of the population would come from the "White Collar" group, approximately one-third would come from the "Blue Collar" group and less than one-third would be in the "Labourer" group. The converse was anticipated in the low-income sample. The following table sets forth the percentage distribution.

TABLE 6 Per centage comparison of samples for selected occupational classes.*

N = 1663

SAMPLES	OCCUPATION (RESPONDENT)			
	White Collar	Blue Collar	Labourer	Total
Comparison Sample	72.82% (150)	24.27% (50)	2.91% (6)	100.00% (206)
Low-Income Sample	15.17% (221)	40.08% (584)	44.75% (652)	100.00% (1457)

*Figures in brackets indicate numerical values.

In a very cursory and rudimentary way, this distribution substantiates the assumption that there is a monetary hierarchy; that "White Collar" workers do receive more income than "Blue Collar" workers and that "Blue Collar" workers receive more than "Labourers."

Following an initial perusal of the data it was noted that, in the low-income sample, there appeared to be a disproportionate number of respondents in the four ancillary categories. It was decided to calculate a percentage distribution including these respondents. For this analysis the four categories were amalgamated under the title "Other." A similar percentage distribution was calculated for the comparison group and the following table presents the two distributions.

TABLE 7 Per centage comparison of samples for all occupational classes.*

N = 2642

SAMPLES	OCCUPATION (RESPONDENT)				
	White Collar	Blue Collar	Labourer	Other	Total
Comparison Sample	60.24% (150)	20.08% (50)	2.41% (6)	17.27% (43)	100.00% (249)
Low-Income Sample	9.24% (221)	24.40% (584)	27.25% (652)	39.11% (936)	100.00% (2393)

*Figures in brackets indicate numerical values.

It is noted in this table that in the "Other" category, the per centage of respondents in the low-income group is more than double the percentage in the comparison group (39.11 per cent and 17.27 per cent respectively). This group of people, mainly housewives and students, was beyond the scope of this study but its relative size indicates that it could be worthy of further examination in a future study.

Having established that a monetary hierarchy existed, it was decided to analyse the low-income sample to determine the nature of the income. As stated previously, it is commonly

assumed that individuals in the lowest socio-economic class have a more irregular income than do their counterparts in the higher classes. The NULIFE survey asked respondents whether they had been unemployed "Occasionally," "Frequently," or "Never," in the past ten years. These terms, however, were not specifically defined by the survey -- their interpretation was left to the respondent. This lack of definition left the validity and reliability of the findings open to question but it was assumed that individual discrepancies in interpretation counter-balanced so that the end product of the survey was a uniform definition of the terms. It was thought that the incidence of unemployment would indicate the nature of the income; that "Never unemployed" would indicate a regular income, that "Occasionally unemployed" would indicate a somewhat sporadic income, and that "Frequently unemployed" would indicate a very sporadic income. If the above assumptions were true, it was expected that the "Labourer" class would have a greater incidence of unemployment than the other two classes and that the "White Collar" class would have a higher incidence of being never unemployed than the other two classes.

TABLE 8 Incidence of unemployment by occupational class,
low-income sample.*

N = 1370

INCIDENCE OF UNEMPLOYMENT
(RESPONDENT)

OCCUPATION (RESPONDENT)	Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Total
White Collar	60.89% (123)	36.63% (74)	2.48% (5)	100.00% (202)
Blue Collar	46.07% (252)	46.43% (254)	7.50% (41)	100.00% (547)
Labourer	36.07% (224)	54.11% (336)	9.82% (61)	100.00% (621)

*Figures in brackets indicate numerical values.

The preceeding table bore out the expectations that were previously stated. It was therefore assumed that the "Labourer" class, with 9.82 per cent of its membership stating frequent unemployment, would have had a far more irregular income than either the "Blue Collar" or "White Collar" classes. It was also assumed that the "Blue Collar" class, with 7.50 per cent of its membership stating frequent unemployment, had a more irregular income than the "White Collar" class, which had only 2.48 per cent of its membership in this category.

Having in part established that a hierarchical arrangement of occupational classes existed, this study proceeded to analyse some of the generational features of occupational classes. As indicated in the introduction, previous research in the United States had established that occupations and occupational classes were directly transmitted from parents to children. It was therefore one of the purposes of this study to discover if the same relationship existed in data gathered from Canadian sources.

In attempting to compare the occupational level of respondents and their parents it was discovered that the data gathered by the NULIFE survey were not obtained in identical categories. As was previously stated, the data pertaining to the respondents were in "White Collar," "Blue Collar" and "Labourer" categories. In this portion of the study the auxiliary categories were eliminated. The parental occupational data gathered by the survey had been categorized in the same form as was used in the 1961 Canada Census figures. These categories were 1) "Managerial, Professional, and Technical;" 2) "Clerical and Sales;" 3) "Services and Recreation;" 4) "Transport and Communication;" 5) "Craftsmen, Production process and related workers;" 6) "Labourers;" 7) "Farmers;" and 8) "Student."

It was assumed that categories 1 and 2 could be amalgamated to form the rough equivalent of the "White Collar" class; that categories 3, 4 and 5 would approximately equate with the "Blue Collar" class; and that categories 6 and 7 were of the same level as the "Labouring" class. The "Student" category was disregarded. It was realized that some overlapping would occur but it was thought that this would tend to cross-cancel so that the total product would be equatable. This error, however, seriously jeopardized the validity of any findings.

Although the initial assumption was that there would be a strong generational link between the respondents' and the respondents parents' occupational levels, the hypothesis was formulated that there was no generational relationship between these two variables. The formulating of this hypothesis automatically established the alternative hypothesis; that a generational link existed in occupations. If the original hypothesis was true, then the distribution of the population in the various categories would be due to the general occupational distribution of the population, or it could be due to a chance skewedness of the sample. The factor of chance skewedness was controlled by the establishment of the level of significance.

An examination of the data produced the following table.

TABLE 9 Numerical relationship between the occupational classes of the respondent's parent and the occupational classes of the respondent, low-income sample.

N = 1057

OCCUPATION (RESPONDENT)	OCCUPATION (PARENT)			Total
	White Collar	Blue Collar	Labourer	
White Collar	46	81	42	169
Blue Collar	60	214	145	419
Labourer	45	237	187	469
Total	149	532	374	1057

The calculated chi-square value for these variables was 35.298.

This was significantly in excess of the critical value of 9.488 and thus the original hypothesis was rejected with a 95 per cent surety that the distribution was not due to chance. In rejecting the original hypothesis the alternative hypothesis, that there was a relationship between the two variables, was automatically accepted.

The chi-square did not reveal whether the relationship was direct or inverse. To determine this, a total per centage distribution of the variables was calculated.

TABLE 10 Per centage relationship between the occupational classes of the respondent's parent and the occupational classes of the respondent, low-income sample.

OCCUPATION (RESPONDENT)	OCCUPATION (PARENT)		
	White	Blue	Labourer
White Collar	4.35%	7.66%	3.97%
Blue Collar	5.68%	20.25%	13.72%
Labourer	4.26%	22.42%	17.69%

TOTAL = 100.00%

This table indicated that there was a direct relationship only for parents who were designated as labourers. In the other two parental categories there appeared to be inverse relationship.

Since the relationship was not universally direct and since the chi-square does not indicate the strength of any relationship, it was felt that it would be useful to determine the degree of the relationship. The contingency coefficient was therefore

determined to indicate the strength of the relationship. The C value was found to be 0.180. The theoretical maximum obtainable value for C in a contingency table of this size is 0.816; thus, it can be readily seen that the relationship is relatively weak.

Table 5 also showed that there was considerable vertical mobility in the low-income sample. A total of 57.71 per cent of the respondents had moved to occupations that were in a different socio-economic class from those occupations of their parents -- only 42.29 per cent had remained in the same socio-economic class as their parents. Of the total sample 32.36 per cent showed downward vertical mobility whereas only 25.35 per cent showed upward mobility.

It was decided that this concept of vertical mobility was worthy of further investigation and it was decided to probe mobility from the viewpoint of the occupational level of the respondents. Thus a per centage distribution of each respondent occupational class was calculated.

TABLE 11 Per centage comparison of the occupational classes of the respondent's parent and the occupational class of the respondent, low-income sample.

OCCUPATION (RESPONDENT)	OCCUPATION (PARENT)			
	White Collar	Blue Collar	Labourer	Total
White Collar	27.22%	47.93%	24.85%	100.00%
Blue Collar	14.32%	51.07%	34.61%	100.00%
Labourer	9.60%	50.53%	39.87%	100.00%

This table showed that 60.13 per cent of the respondents who were in the "Labourer" class had parents who were either from the "White Collar" or the "Blue Collar" classes. Since "Labourer" was the lowest class in the occupational hierarchy, all of this 60.13 per cent of the class were downwardly mobile. The table further showed that, of the "Blue Collar" respondents, 14.32 per cent came from "White Collar" backgrounds and were therefore downwardly mobile while 34.61 per cent had "Labourer" backgrounds and were thus upwardly mobile. Of the "White Collar" respondents 72.78 per cent had come from lower-class backgrounds and were therefore upwardly mobile. It was most striking that the greatest mobility occurred at the two opposite ends of the occupational continuum.

It was an assumption of this study that different occupations require different amounts of education. Thus, since occupation is a significant determinant of socio-economic status, education is a prominent factor in the process of vertical social mobility. If the previous assumption was true, then it was expected that there would be a statistical relationship between these variables. This would be expected even when there was a high level of generalization, when occupations were amalgamated into broad classes and when educational achievement was also amalgamated into broad categories. In another section of this study it was established that the expected relationship existed. A further analysis of these variables was carried out to discover the direction of the relationship. A per centage distribution of each occupational class was calculated. The following table illustrates this distribution.

TABLE 12 Per centage comparison of the educational level of the respondent and the occupational class of the respondent, low-income sample.

OCCUPATION (RESPONDENT)	EDUCATION (RESPONDENT)				Total
	None	Elementary	Secondary	College	
White Collar	1.42%	22.17%	62.26%	14.15%	100.00%
Blue Collar	0.89%	49.91%	47.06%	2.14%	100.00%
Labourer	3.41%	65.26%	30.36%	0.97%	100.00%

The most striking aspect of this table was the readily apparent direct relationship between these two variables. Whereas a staggering 65.26 per cent of the "Labourer" class had only elementary schooling, only 22.17 per cent of the "White Collar" class had the same level of education. The relationship is even more striking at the opposite end of the educational continuum. Of the "White Collar" class 14.15 per cent had a college level education whereas in the "Labourer" class only 0.97 per cent had a college education. These selected figures realistically portray the nature of this distribution.

It is a commonly held assumption of Canadian society that education is free and available to all, however, it is well documented that different social classes, because of different child rearing practices, different value orientations, and different financial capacities, have unequal access to education (9) (34). These studies indicate that access to education is directly related to the position in the social hierarchy. It was established by this study that the education of an individual is directly related to the educational level of his parent. It has also been established that there was a direct relationship between occupation levels and levels of education. Since these were established, it was assumed that there would be a generational link between the occupational level of the respondents and their parent's level of education.

To test this assumption the hypothesis was formulated that there would be no relationship between the two variables. The following table illustrates the coincidence of the variables.

TABLE 13 Numerical relationship between the educational level of the respondent's parent and the occupational class of the respondent, low-income sample.

N = 740

OCCUPATION (RESPONDENT)	EDUCATION (PARENT)			
	None	Elementary	Secondary	College
White Collar	14	58	43	11
Blue Collar	46	167	65	16
Labourer	63	193	56	8

The chi-square value for this table was determined to be 22.370. The critical chiesquare value in this instance was 12.592 and thus the hypothesis was rejected. In rejecting this hypothesis the corollary that there is a relationship was accepted.

To illustrate the direction of relationship the percentage distribution in each occupational class was calculated. The following table presents these findings.

TABLE 14 Per centage comparison of the educational level of the respondent's parent and the occupational class of the respondent, low-income sample.

OCCUPATION (RESPONDENT)	EDUCATION (PARENT)				Total
	None	Elementary	Secondary	College	
White Collar	11.11%	46.03%	34.13%	8.73%	100.00%
Blue Collar	15.65%	56.80%	22.11%	5.44%	100.00%
Labourer	19.69%	60.31%	17.50%	2.50%	100.00%

It is readily apparent from this table that the relationship is direct; that people of high socio-economic status had better educated parents than did people of lower socio-economic status.

To determine the strength of relationship the contingency coefficient was calculated for this table. The C value was determined to be 0.174. The theoretical maximum contingency coefficient for a table of this size was interpolated to be 0.837. Thus it can be seen that the relationship is very weak.

It has thus been established that there is a direct but relatively weak hierarchical relationship between occupational levels and the parental educational level.

CHAPTER VI

RECEIPT OF PUBLIC FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AS A GENERATIONAL FACTOR IN THE LOW-INCOME LIFE STYLE

The dependent variable, welfare status of parents, was tested against education, occupation and welfare status of respondents in an attempt to demonstrate a generational link in the poverty cycle. Although welfare status in its narrow sense, and as used in this study, refers to receipt of public financial assistance, the concepts involved in a broader definition are implicit and should be considered throughout the analysis. In Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary welfare is variously defined as "1. the condition of faring well; . . . (or) prosperity; 2. . . . organized efforts by a community or organization to improve the social and economic condition of a group or class." In the North American culture the granting of public financial assistance is intended to enable people to improve their social and economic standard, to subsist if not to prosper.

The essential issue explored here is "Do the offspring of welfare recipients achieve less adequately in terms of education, occupation and financial independence than the offspring of parents never in receipt of welfare?" Stone and Schlamp (50) support the theory of inferior achievement among welfare recipients, especially as related to education, occupation and motivation for change. If, in fact, the life style of those in receipt of welfare differs from that of non-recipients, it is important to determine whether or not the pattern of welfare dependence is transmitted from generation to generation in order to develop effective rehabilitative and/or coping methods.

For the purpose of this analysis and report of the NULIFE data the independent variable, welfare status of parents, was tested against the welfare status of the respondents by formulating the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between respondents having been in receipt of welfare and their parents having been in receipt of welfare. In the NULIFE study the categories for parents on welfare include "Never, " "Once, " "Two to three times" and "Often;" in the following table the latter two categories have been amalgamated as "Twice plus." The NULIFE categories for respondents' welfare status include "Never, " "Once, " "Two to three times, " "Four to five times" and "Six or more times;" in this study the latter three categories have again been amalgamated as "Twice plus." The table below depicts the welfare pattern of 1850 respondents in the low-income

sample area in relation to parental welfare pattern. It is important to keep in mind, however, that the NULIFE data does not provide information as to the current welfare status of respondents and/or parents.

TABLE 15 Per centage comparison of receipt of welfare between respondent and respondent's parent, low-income sample.*

N = 1850

WELFARE (PARENT)	WELFARE (RESPONDENT)			
	Never	One	Twice Plus	Total
Never	67.95% (1113)	20.21% (331)	11.84% (194)	100.00% (1638)
Once	50.98% (52)	32.35% (33)	16.67% (17)	100.00% (102)
Twice	32.73% (36)	25.45% (28)	41.82% (46)	100.00% (110)

* Figures in brackets indicate numerical values.

For this table the calculated chi-square value was 64.100. The critical value of chi-square at the pre-determined level of significance was 9.488. Thus, as the calculated chi-square value

exceeded the critical chi-square value, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted, that is, that there is a significant relationship between respondents having been in receipt of welfare and their parents having been in receipt of welfare. The contingency coefficient was found to be 0.183. The theoretical maximum for this size table was 0.816. This indicates that although a relationship was established, the degree was weak.

The figures in this table tend to support the hypothesis of a generational link in that approximately 68 per cent of the respondents whose parents were never on welfare were themselves never on welfare and approximately 42 per cent of respondents whose parents were on welfare two or more times were themselves on welfare two or more times. As might be anticipated in support of the generational link, almost 95 per cent of those tabulated in the comparison area (233 out of 260) whose parents were never on welfare were themselves never on welfare.

Although the application of the chi-square proves the mathematical relationship of figures in this table, certain other questions concerning validity of findings must be raised. What does the term "welfare" include in the NULIFE data? What does "on welfare once" mean - one cheque issued or one period of ten years? Did

structured welfare exist in the era of parental need? How aware were respondents of parental welfare benefits? Were respondents' answers coloured by shame or guilt?

In the next table the independent variable, welfare status of parents, is tested against the educational achievement of 1841 respondents in the low-income sample area with a view to exploring a generational pattern. The null hypothesis was formulated that there is no significant relationship between the level of education of respondents and parents having been in receipt of public financial assistance. Some adjustments have been made from the NULIFE data concerning the various categories of education of respondents as follows: elementary grades one to four and five to eight have been combined; high school years one, two to three and four to five have been combined; college years one to two, three to four and five or more have been combined. Similarly, the categories pertaining to frequency of parents receiving welfare ("Once, " "Two to three" and "Often") have been amalgamated as "Once plus."

For this table the calculated chi-square value was 16.539. The critical value of chi-square at the pre-determined level of significance was 7.815. Thus, on the basis that the calculated chi-square value exceeded the critical chi-square value, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted, that is, that

TABLE 16

Per centage comparison of educational achievement of respondent with receipt of welfare by respondent's parent, low-income sample.*

N = 1841

WELFARE (PARENT)	EDUCATION (RESPONDENT)				Total
	None	Elementary	High School	College	
Never	3.69% (60)	55.65% (906)	36.91% (601)	3.75% (61)	100.00% (1628)
Once Plus	0.47% (1)	53.52% (114)	45.54% (97)	0.47% (1)	100.00% (213)

*Figures in brackets indicate numerical values.

there is a significant relationship between respondents' level of education and parents having been in receipt of welfare. The contingency co-efficient was found to be 0.094. The interpolated theoretical maximum C value for this size table was 0.811. Hence, although this indicates a relationship was established, the degree was weak.

In a study entitled "School Performance of Children in Families Receiving Public Assistance in Canada," (39) Dr. Mukhtar A. Malik proposes the theory, supported by data, that school performance and receipt of financial assistance are related and that children whose families are in receipt of assistance have a poorer school performance

record than other children. Further, his paper shows evidence that the educational achievement of parents is followed by their children despite the fact that parents' aspirations for their children may be higher. Thus Dr. Malik supports the contention that goals and values of parents are transmitted to their children.

In keeping with the hypothesis of a generational link between welfare status of parents and educational achievement of respondents based on the NULIFE data, it could be expected that respondents whose parents were never in receipt of welfare would have achieved a higher educational level. This is, in fact, supported by the per centage of those respondents who attained years four to five in high school in relation to parental welfare status. However, in view of the fact that there is a minimum school-leaving age and that "social passes" carry a number of students into high school, the most significant area for observation concerned those who continued their education beyond the legal school-leaving age. In the following table, therefore, the drop-out rate is considered by examining the number who left high school prior to graduation. For the purpose of this study, it was assumed that respondents who achieved the level of four to five years in high school were graduates. In this table, the category of one year in high school has been amalgamated with two to three years in high school.

TABLE 17

Per centage comparison of respondents who did and did not complete high school in relation to receipt of welfare by respondents' parents, low-income sample.

WELFARE (PARENT)	EDUCATION (RESPONDENT)	
	High School	
	1 - 3 years	4 - 5 years
Never	28.02%	10.34%
Once Plus	38.18%	7.07%

There is a significant drop in per centage (31.61) in regard to respondents whose parents have been in receipt of welfare between those entering high school and those completing high school in contrast to the 17.68 per cent drop-out rate among respondents whose parents have never been on welfare. How can the economic factor affecting school drop-outs be alleviated? Robert Lampman states that "Few children, even those below average ability, who were not born and raised in poverty actually end up in poverty as adults" and suggests that "If poor children had the same opportunities, including pre-school training. . . as the non-poor . . . the rate of escape from poverty would be higher." (37, p. 237)

One inference from the foregoing discussion on education would seem obvious, that is, if the educational achievement of the poor is inferior then the level of occupational achievement will also be inferior. Occupationally, those with limited education are most often restricted to simpler, manual kinds of work. R.A. Jenness in "Poverty in a Growing Economy" (33) makes the further important point that the real income of the unskilled worker will not change much from the time he enters the labour force until the time he leaves forty years later, yet his needs will vary considerably especially in relation to the critical life periods - the first twenty years after marriage (greatest family responsibility) and the twilight years (lowest income). If educational achievement and occupational status are related and educational achievement reflects a generational link, then it is reasonable to consider the factor of a generational link in the occupational area.

In this study, however, the null hypothesis was formulated that there is no significant relationship between occupational level of respondents and parents having been on welfare. The categories listed under occupation in the NULIFE data which have been eliminated in the following table are: "Under five years, " "Student, " "Housewife, " and "Student and working, " leaving 1144 respondents in the low-income sample area. Again, the frequency of parents on welfare has been amalgamated to "Twice plus. "

TABLE 18 Per centage comparison of occupational status of respondent with receipt of welfare by respondent's parent, low-income sample.*

N = 1144

WELFARE (RESPONDENT)	OCCUPATION (RESPONDENT)			
	White Collar	Blue Collar	Labourer	Total
Never	14.92% (151)	40.91% (414)	44.17% (447)	100.00% (1012)
Once	10.96% (8)	39.73% (29)	49.31% (36)	100.00% (73)
Twice Plus	16.95% (10)	22.03% (13)	61.02% (36)	100.00% (59)

*Figures in brackets indicate numerical value

For this table, the calculated chi-square value was 9.636. The critical value of chi-square at the pre-determined level of significance was 9.488. Thus, since the calculated chi-square value exceeded the critical chi-square value, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted, that is, that there is a significant relationship between the occupational status of respondents and parents having been in receipt of welfare. The contingency co-efficient was found to be 0.091. The theoretical maximum for this size of table was 0.816. This indicates that although a relationship was established, the degree was weak.

In terms of per centage distribution, the table demonstrates the expected result that there is a generational link or influence between respondents' occupational status and parents' welfare status in that the highest concentration (61.02 per cent) of respondents in the low status (labouring) employment category are offspring of parents who have been in receipt of welfare two or more times. To strengthen the significance of the hypothesis, it could be expected that the highest concentration of those in high status (white collar) employment would have had parents who had never been in receipt of public welfare. However, such is not the case since a higher per centage of respondents (16.95) whose parents were in receipt of welfare two or more times had white collar employment than had respondents (14.92 per cent) whose parents had never been on welfare. Conclusions are further diluted by the fact that approximately 75 per cent of parents in the sample area and approximately 75 per cent of parents in the comparison area were never on welfare so that in both the sample and comparison areas, the high per centage of labourers whose parents were in receipt of welfare two or more times represents a very small number of persons.

Walter Miller (42) has developed a thesis of occupational enculturation whereby he proffers that as long as society continues to require labouring and low-skilled jobs, a child-rearing pattern will

develop that is suited to training individuals to hold these jobs. The female-based child rearing unit, Miller maintains, is a prime source of low-skilled labourers.

Although not itself depicting a generational link, an examination of a table considering sex of the respondent (head of household) in relation to receipt of financial assistance by the respondent contains an interesting reference to the present household make-up in both the sample and comparison areas as well as important portends of the future.

In the following table, the NULIFE categories for respondents' welfare status ("Once," "Two or three times," "Four or five times," and "Six or more times") have been amalgamated as "Once plus."

TABLE 19 Per centage comparison of sex of respondent with receipt of welfare by respondent, low-income sample and middle-income comparison sample."

N = 2256, low-income sample
N = 244, middle-income sample

WELFARE (RESPONDENT)	SEX (RESPONDENT)			
	Low-income Sample		Middle-Income Sample	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Never	69.42% (1219)	46.64% (239)	94.71% (197)	88.89% (32)
Once Plus	30.58% (537)	53.14% (261)	5.29% (11)	11.11% (4)
Total	100.00% (1756)	100.00% (500)	100.00% (208)	100.00% (36)

*Figures in brackets indicate numerical values.

The foregoing table illustrates that almost one-quarter (22.94 per cent) of the economic units in the low-income sample area are female-centered as compared to approximately one-seventh (14.75 per cent) in the middle income comparison area. This finding is in line with Elizabeth Herzog's observation that ". . . the family structure and sex patterns of the poor differ from those of the non-poor. There is evidence that not only separation and divorce vary in frequency in inverse proportion to income but that family size also varies inversely with income. There is evidence, too, that families headed by women are far more frequent among the poor. . . ." (32, p. 396)

The table above also shows that only 11.11 per cent of the female respondents (household heads) in the comparison area have been in receipt of financial assistance whereas 53.14 per cent of female respondents in the sample area have been in receipt of welfare. It might be presumed that the females in the comparison area have better education and training and are thus better equipped to be financially independent. Another supposition could be that the female heads of households in the comparison are more likely to be in receipt of financial support from an absent spouse than those in the low-income sample area.

In many instances, the NULIFE data, and hence the conclusions, may be questioned in terms of the ambiguity and broadness of some of

the questions, the lack of uniformity between questions applied to the respondents and those applied to the parents, and the number of "Don't know" responses (especially in regard to respondents' knowledge of parental welfare status). Too, the lack of completeness of the data provided has made it difficult to give unreserved support to a hypothesis of the generational link in the poverty cycle in the area of receipt of welfare.

Findings in this report indicated a generational trend which would support a further hypothesis that a multiplicity or combination of certain variables (education, occupation and financial assistance as examined in this segment of the study) tends to breed a culture of poverty which is transmitted from generation to generation. As Stone and Schlamp point out " . . . social, economic, pathological and health factors coalesce in the life style of the long-term assistance families. . . these handicapping characteristics are associated with welfare dependence not as separate individual factors but in some interrelated fashion." (50.p.7)

Although it is acknowledged that poverty affects many more people than those who receive help from welfare agencies, the focus in this study was directed to some of the characteristics concerning respondents whose parents may or may not have been in receipt of welfare in an effort to examine the validity of the claims in the literature and in current research that one concomitant of economic

poverty (in this case, designated by receipt of welfare by parents) is an inherited poverty of opportunity by respondents, thus perpetuating the poverty cycle.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

The overall purpose of this study was to substantiate or refute the contention that some generational links existed in the "culture of poverty" as exemplified by the study of a low-income sample. It was felt that, while the sample did not provide a true representation of the "culture," it, in part, illustrated some of the characteristics of that "culture." The main variables that were selected for study were education, occupation, and receipt of public assistance (welfare). These were examined from the viewpoint of the respondent's circumstances and from the standpoint of the respondent's parent's circumstances.

It was found that a relatively strong generational link existed between the level of educational achievement of both respondents and their parents -- high education by the parents seemed to coincide with high academic achievement by the respondents. Conversely, low parental

educational achievement appeared to be closely connected with low educational achievement by the respondent. There was not the same degree of coincidence between the occupational levels of the respondents and their parents. High occupational status, to some degree, coincided with high occupational status; likewise, low occupational status coincided with low occupational status. There appeared to be more vertical occupational mobility than vertical educational mobility. Although the coincidence of parents receiving public assistance and respondents receiving assistance was statistically significant, the relationship between these two variables, like the generational relationship of occupational levels, was weak.

Several other indirect generational relationships were examined by this study. Each respondent's educational level was compared with his parent's occupational status. This relationship was found to be moderately strong. Likewise, a moderately strong relationship was found to exist when each respondent's level of education was compared with his occupational status. As it is commonly believed, the extent of the respondent's education was found to be directly related to the incidence of the respondent's having received public assistance. However, this relationship was found to be weak. The incidence of the respondent's parent having received public assistance was related to the extent of the respondent's education as well as to the respondent's

occupational status. In both cases, the relationship was statistically significant; however, in the latter case the critical and calculated chi-square values were so close that the statistical significance of the association was questionable. In both cases, the degree of relationship was weak.

In addition to the above variables, this study also examined three incidental variables; the incidence of unemployment among the respondents, the reasons that the respondents left school and the sex of the respondents. These were related respectively to the respondent's occupational status, the respondent's level of education and the incidence of receipt of public assistance among the respondents. In the first comparison, a direct relationship was found to exist between occupational status and incidence of unemployment. In the second comparison, it was found that over 50 per cent of those who left school in the elementary grades did so for financial reasons. In the third instance, a comparison was made between the low-income sample and the comparison sample. It was found that there was a higher percentage of female-centered households in the latter sample but it was also discovered that in these households, there was a far higher incidence of public assistance in the low-income sample than in the comparison sample.

In summary, the variables that were selected showed a statistically significant relationship. However, this relationship was

not strong. Future studies should bear in mind that parental attitudes, values, child-rearing practices, and general "life-style" are instrumental in the transmission of characteristics from one generation to another. Thus, future efforts should concentrate on obtaining more varied data from both parents and respondents. A careful analysis of the causal generational factors in the cycle of poverty could provide more adequate information for the development and implementation of plans to interrupt the cycle of poverty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

1. Barber, Bernard. Social Stratification. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1957.
2. Berelson, Bernard and Steiner, Gary A. Human Behaviour - An Inventory of Scientific Findings, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World Inc. 1964.
3. Chilman, Catherine S. Growing Up Poor. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1964.
4. Davis, Allison and Havinghurst, Robert J. "Social Class and Color Differences in Child Rearing" in Stein, Herman D. and Cloward, Richard A. (eds.) Social Perspectives on Behavior, New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1958.
5. Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Methods for the Behavioural Sciences, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.
6. Goldstein, Harris. Research Standards and Methods of Social Workers.
7. Gordon, Margaret S. Poverty in America. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1965.
8. Harrington, Michael. The Other America. Britain: Penguin Books Ltd., 1963.
9. Hollingshead, A.B. Elmtown's Youth. New York: John Wiley, 1949.
10. Hyman, Herbert H. "The Value Systems of Different Classes," in Stein, Herman D. and Cloward, Richard A. (eds.) Social Perspectives on Behaviour, Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1958.

11. Irelan, Lola M. Low-Income Life Styles, Washington, D. C. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966.
12. Lewis, Oscar. The Children of Sanchez, New York: Random House, 1961.
13. Miller, S. M. and Saleem, Betty L. School Dropouts: A Commentary, New York, Syracuse University, 1964.
14. Ornati, Oscar. Poverty Amid Affluence, New York. The Twentieth Century Fund, 1966.
15. Polansky, Norman. Social Work Research, Chicago, Illinois. University of Chicago Press, 1960.
16. Porter, John. The Vertical Mosaic, Toronto. University of Toronto Press, 1965.
17. Rainwater, Lee. And the Poor get Children, Chicago. Quadrangle Books, 1960.
18. Riessman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child, New York, Harpers, 1962.
19. Rogoff, Natalie. Recent Trends in Occupational Mobility, Glencoe, Ill. Free Press, 1953.
20. Siegel, Sidney. Non Parametric State for the Behavioural Sciences. New York: McGraw Hill, 1956.
21. Schreiber, Daniel. The School Dropout. National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1964.
22. Sexton, Patricia. Education and Income. New York. The Viking Press, 1965.
23. Shoshtak, Arthur B. and Gomberg, William. New Perspectives on Poverty, New Jersey; Prentice-Hall, 1965.

ARTICLES

24. Bell, Wendell. "Anomie, Social Isolation and the Class Structure," Sociometry, Vol. XX, No. 2, June 1957.
25. Centers, Richard. "Occupational Mobility of Urban Occupational Strata," American Sociological Review, Vol. XIII 1948.
26. Chilman, C. S., "Child-Rearing and Family Relationship Patterns of the Very Poor," Welfare in Review, Vol. III, No. 1, January, 1965.
27. Cohn, Albert K. and Hodges, A. M. Jr. "Characteristics of the Lower-Blue-Collar Class," Social Problems, Vol. X, No. 4, Spring, 1963.
28. Coll, Blanche. "Deprivation in Childhood: Its Relation to the Cycle of Poverty," Welfare in Review, Vol. III, No. 3, 1965.
29. Dotson, Floyd. "Patterns of Voluntary Association Among Urban Working Class Families," American Sociological Review, Vol. XVI, October, 1951.
30. Doyle, Robert U. "The Poor in Canadian Cities," in Catholic Charities Council of Canada Bulletin, Ottawa Vol. V, No. July, 1967.
31. Empey, Lamar T. "Social Class and Occupational Aspirations: A Comparison of Absolute and Relative Measurement," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXI, 1956.
32. Herzog, Elizabeth. "Some Assumptions About the Poor," Social Service Review, Vol. XXXVII. No. 4, December, 1963.
33. Jenness, R. A. "Poverty in a Growing Economy," Canadian Welfare, Ottawa, November-December, 1966.
34. Kahl, Joseph. "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. XXIII, 1953.

35. Kohn, Melvin L. "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships: An Interpretation," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXVIII January, 1963.
36. Kumove, Leon. "Nobody Starves," Social Welfare, Vol. XLII, No. 5, September-October, 1966.
37. Lampman, Robert as cited in Jenness, R.A. "Poverty in a Growing Economy," Canadian Welfare, Ottawa, November-December, 1966.
38. Lerner, Sam H. "Effects of Desertion on Family Life," Social Casework, Vol. XXXV, January, 1954.
39. Malik, Mukhtar, A. School Performance of Children in Families Receiving Public Assistance in Canada, the Canadian Welfare Council, 1966.
40. Miller, S. M. and Riessman, Frank. "The Working Class Sub-culture: A New View," Social Problems, Vol. IX, No. 1, Summer 1961, p. 86-97.
41. Miller, Walter B. "Implications of Urban Lower-Class Culture for Social Work," Social Service Review, Vol. XXXVII, No. 3, p. 219-236.
42. Miller, Walter B. Introduction in Sidney E. Bernard. Fatherless Families: Their Economic and Social Adjustment (Brandeis University, Papers in Social Welfare, No. 7. 1964).
43. Orshansky, Mollie. "Recounting the Poor - A Five Year Review" Social Security Bulletin, Vol. XXIX No. 4, April 1966, p. 20-37.
44. Rein, Martin, "Social Science and the Elimination of Poverty," American Institute of Planners Journal, Vol. XXXIII, No. 3, May, 1967.
45. Reissman, Leonard. "Class, Leisure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, Vol. XIX, February, 1954. p. 76-84.

46. Rodman, Hyman. "The Lower-class Value Stretch, " Social Forces, Vol. XLII, No. 2, December 1963, p. 205-215.
47. Rosen, Bernard C. "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psycho-cultural Dimension of Social Stratification, " American Sociological Review, Vol. XXI, 1956, p. 203-211.
48. Schneiderman, Leonard. "Value Orientation Preferences of Chronic Relief Recipients, " in Social Work, National Association, Vol. IX, No. 3, July, 1964.
49. Steigman, Joseph E. "The Deserted Family, " Social Casework, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 4, April 1957, p. 167-171.
50. Stone, Robert C. and Schlamp, Fredric T. "Characteristics Associated with Receipt or Nonreceipt of Financial Aid from Welfare Agencies, Welfare in Review, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, July, 1965.
51. Thurz, Dr. Daniel. "Social Aspects of Poverty, " in Meeting Poverty, Special Planning Secretariat, Privy Council Office, Ottawa, Canada.
52. Zimbalist, Sidney E. "Drawing the Poverty Line, " Social Work, National Association of Social Workers, New York, Vol. IX, No. 3, July, 1964.

OTHER

53. National Opinion Research Centre, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation, " Public Opinion News, 9, 1947, p. 3-13.
54. National Urban Low-income Family Evaluation, Research Manual, Canadian Welfare Council, Ottawa, 1967.
55. Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961 Census of Canada.