

B. A. THESIS

THE RELATION OF ETHNICITY AND INCOME TO
KINSHIP INVOLVEMENT AND VOLUNTARY
ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP

W. Pamela Allen

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Median Age and Age Range of Ethnic Groups	19
2. Ethnicity by Income and Age by Percentage	19
3. Median Kinship Involvement Score of Ethnic Groups by Income	21
4. Kinship Involvement Score by Ethnicity and Income	22
5. Percentage Table - Frequency of Seeing Kin by Ethnicity and Income.	25
6. Percentage Table - Clubs Attended by Ethnicity and Income.	26
7. Percentage Table - Union Membership by Ethnicity and Income.	28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
Chapter I. INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
(a) Introduction	
(b) Review of the Literature	
II. METHODOLOGY.	12
(a) McMaster Study	
(1) Area	
(2) Sample	
(3) Technique of Research	
(b) Data Used in This Thesis	
(1) Establishment of Ethnicity	
(2) Income	
III. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	17
(1) Age	
(2) Kinship Involvement Score	
(3) Frequency of Seeing Kin	
(4) Voluntary Association Membership	
(5) Union Membership	
IV. CONCLUSION	30
(1) Summary of Findings	
(2) Discussion of Findings	
(3) Limitations of the Study	
(a) Interview Method	
(b) Sample	
(c) Involvement Score	
(4) Implications for Further Research and Conclusion	
APPENDICES	38
I. Interview Questionnaires	
II. Area Map	
III. Publicity Letters	
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	68

CHAPTER I

THE RELATION OF ETHNICITY AND INCOME TO KINSHIP INVOLVEMENT AND VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP

Introduction and Review of Literature

In his article "Urbanism as a Way of Life" Louis Wirth states;

Being reduced to a stage of virtual impotence as an individual, the urbanite is bound to exert himself by joining with others of similar interest into organized groups to obtain his ends. This results in the enormous multiplication of voluntary organizations directed towards as great a variety of objectives as there are human needs and interests. ... Frequently there is only the most tenuous relationship between the economic position or other basic factors that determine the individual's existence in the urban world and the voluntary groups with which he is affiliated.¹

An opposing view of voluntary association membership has been expressed by Barber when he says;

Voluntary membership is never simply psychological willingness, but rather is always patterned by a complex of social, structural and value considerations.²

It is within the context of these two ideas that this thesis "The Relation of Ethnicity and Income to Kinship Involvement and Voluntary Association Membership" is to be understood.

¹Wirth, L., "Urbanism as a Way of Life", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 44, 1938 P.1-23.

²Barber, B., "Participation and Mass Apathy in Associations", Studies in Leadership. (ed.) Gouldner, Harpers 1950, P. 477-505.

Basic to an understanding of how ethnicity, kinship involvement and income level influence voluntary association membership is an understanding of the functions of the voluntary association. Function is used here in the same way Clyde Kluckhohn, uses the term in Navaho Witchcraft.*

Functions for the Individual

(1) Power Distributing Function

Americans often participate in voluntary associations because they find it difficult or unappealing to enter politics. Through the voluntary association the individual can acquire as much power i.e. the right to make decisions concerning community action, effecting others in the community, as the sum of his free time, ability (psychological and social) and inclination permit him. This type of power is similar to that gained in politics but on a much smaller scale.

This function is also adaptive for the society, for through the voluntary associations the individual frustrated in seeking for power in other areas of society e.g. politics, trade unions or business, finds an area in which to fulfill these inclinations.

(2) The Orienting Function

This function is important for the immigrant for it is through the voluntary association that he is able to gain a partial understanding of the social mechanisms affecting him. They make him aware of the social, political and economic processes functioning

*Note: A given bit of culture is functional insofar as it defines a mode of response which is adaptive from the standpoint of the society and adjustive from the standpoint of the individual. Merton, R. Social Structure and Social Theory. P. 23.

in the society at large.

It has been postulated that this function is also important for the urban working class, for in belonging and working in a "creative" voluntary association some of the members of this class find the satisfaction they do not gain from a monotonous job on a modern production line. This membership could be seen as part of their adjustment to their monotonous work.

This function is also adaptive from the societal standpoint for the voluntary ethnic association aids in maintaining the folkways of the ethnic group.

Functions for the Society

(1) Social Change Function

It may be postulated that the voluntary association is the organization form of a reform movement e.g. The Native Sons of Canada. Its wish to have Canada provided with a national flag and a national anthem. The implementations and realization of reform usually occurs only over a long period of time and therefore this function differs from the others.

(2) Integrating Function

This function was found in Yankee City by Warner,³ for the voluntary associations there, integrated antagonistic structures e.g. church and school, in the community. The voluntary associations played a subordinate role to the structures around which they were organized but were in themselves the necessary means to the maintenance of these structures in the community.

³Warner, L. Social Life of a Modern Community, Vol. I. Yankee City Series, Yale University Press 1959, P. 301-355.

(3) Communication Function

Through the voluntary association the individual learns some of the symbolic modes of communication which must be learned if socialization within the greater society is to take place. This is the part the ethnic and religious associations play for the individual immigrant.

Also with immigrants the voluntary association aids the society to fulfill three other requisites; It describes the cognitive orientations, articulates the goals for the immigrant and thus aid his socialization which is necessary for the society and the individual if they are to function.

The fact that the ethnic minorities after one or two generations of American residence become active in other voluntary associations, i.e. other than ethnic or church associations may be accounted for through the idea of the internalization of these orientations and goals through adequate socialization through other societal institutions and organizations.

The voluntary association fulfills the same functions for other members of the society but is not as evident.

Therefore it can be said that the voluntary association aids the society in meeting four of Levy's functional requisites of a society.

1. Communication
2. Shared cognitive orientations
3. Shared articulated set of goals

⁴Warner, L. Ibid.

⁵Levy, M.J. The Structure of Society. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1952. P. 149-197.

4. Adequate socialization

As can be seen by the above discussion of the function of the Voluntary Association it is difficult to designate a function as either individual or social, for on the most part, the voluntary association is both adaptive from the standpoint of the society and adjustive from the standpoint of the individual.⁶

At this point it may be advantageous to review the literature written on voluntary associations.

Review of the Literature

Many articles have been written and research projects undertaken in order to describe the many factors patterning voluntary association memberships.

Voluntary Associations in this literature are those associations which are usually "democratic" in character i.e. officeholders elected by the memberships, and have a written constitution.

Most of this literature must be considered within the context of Wirth's theory of urbanism as postulated in his "Urbanism as a Way of Life". Here he defines the city as

a relatively large, dense, and permanent settlement of heterogeneous individuals. Large numbers account for individual variability, the relative absence of intimate personal acquaintanceship, the segmentalization of human relations which are largely anonymous, superficial and transitory and associated characteristics..... Heterogeneity tends to break down rigid social structures and to produce... the affiliation of the individuals with a variety of intersecting and tangential social groups with a high rate of membership turnover. The pecuniary nexus tends to displace personal relations,

⁶Rose, A.M. Sociology, The Study of Human Relations; Knopf.

and institutions tend to cater to mass rather than individual requirements. The individual thus becomes effective only as he acts through organized groups.⁷

Much of the more recent literature has questioned whether urban life is as segmented and fraught with "secondary" relationships as Wirth has postulated. From Wirth's article it appears that if the individual does not have a number of memberships in organized groups he may be isolated within the urban setting. However, it has been stated that while voluntary associations result from the structure of American society through a segmentalization of interests on the part of the individual, the social structure itself results in the nuclear family and the extensive influence of occupation upon it.⁸ Therefore it seems reasonable to conceive of a structural strain between family, job and voluntary association membership. Simply put -- within the social structure of the United States the interests of the typical American are defined as highly diversified, however, most emphasis is placed on family and job. It is questionable therefore whether as Wirth implies, the individual without voluntary association memberships is really isolated.

The literature on voluntary associations first questioned the number and spread of voluntary associations within the United States. Then researchers preceeded to show that membership was patterned by such things as class,⁹ sex,¹⁰ religion, degree of

⁷ Wirth, L. Ibid.

⁸ Parsons, T. "The Kinship Structure of the Contemporary United States," American Anthropologist. Vol.48 1957, P. 22-38.

⁹ Reisman, L. "Class, Leisure and Social Participation" American Sociological Review; Vol. 19, 1954, P. 76-84.

¹⁰ Scott, J.C. "Membership and Participation in Voluntary Association." American Sociological Review; Vol.22, P. 315-326.

urbanization within the urban area,¹¹ and family participation.¹² Following the finding that membership was patterned by social class, Dotson questioned whether individuals of the class most lacking in voluntary association memberships, the working class, were socially isolated. His research shows that within this class informal "primary" associations take the place of membership in formal voluntary associations.¹³

Warner in his Yankee City¹⁴ series says

As the class rank increases the proportion of its members who belong to associations also increases; and as the position of a class decreases, the percentage of those who belong to associations decreases.

These were the results of class membership in the associations of Yankee City.

Upper upper class 72%
 Lower lower class 71%
 Upper middle class 64%
 Lower middle class 49%
 Upper lower class 39%
 Lower lower class 22%

Warner also states that as the rank of the class increases the number of individuals belonging to only one association diminishes in each succeeding class. He also found a sex difference by class.

¹¹Greer, S. "Urbanism Reconsidered, A Comparative Study of Local Areas in a Metropolis". American Sociological Review; Vol.21, P. 19-25.

¹²Anderson, W.A. "Family and Individual Social Participation". American Sociological Review; Vol. 8, 1958, P. 420-424.

¹³Dotson, F. "Patterns of Voluntary Association Among Urban Working Class Families". American Sociological Review; Vol.116, 1951, P. 687-693.

¹⁴Warner, L. op. cit.

In the three higher classes more women were members of associations, while in the three lower classes there were more men who were members. This last point may be related to union membership.

Bushee¹⁵ also found women more predominant in voluntary associations.

L. Reisman¹⁶ also makes a statement concerning the relation between class and social participation when he says that "the middle class generally tends to dominate the organizational, intellectual, life and leadership of the community."

In J.C. Scott's¹⁷ study when class and occupation are combined with religion and education, persons in the lower class, in manual occupations, with Roman Catholic religious affiliation had a high percentage of non-affiliation with voluntary organizations. In this study he used the number of voluntary association affiliation as representative of voluntary association participation. He found that with this measure more men than women have association affiliations, although the women had a higher attendance at meetings. He also found that there was no significant difference in the association membership in the four age groups, 10-24, 25-39, 40-54, 55 and over, that he studied. These findings are opposite to those of Axelrod and Freedman's. Interestingly, in Scott's study, length of residence in the community had no significant influence on association membership. However he does not mention the effect ethnicity may have on the last finding.

Another study on the relation of voluntary association to

¹⁵Bushee, F.A. "Social Organization of a Small Town". American Journal of Sociology; 1945.

¹⁶Reisman, op. cit.

¹⁷Scott, J.C. Ibid.

class is that of Mirra Komarovsky¹⁸ done in New York City. Her study shows that participation and membership in voluntary associations is related to class position. For working class men 60% have no organized group affiliation other than a church. The percentage of white collar workers in the same position was 53%. For women 88% of the working class respondents had no affiliation while 63% of white collar women had none. Komarovsky shows that of those people earning under \$3,000 in 1946 (date of publication) the majority were unaffiliated. Also she claims "it is only when we reach the business classes earning \$3,000 and the professional classes that the majority is found to be organized." The extremes of this are shown in relation to the percentage of unskilled workers affiliated, 32% and professional men earning \$5,000 and over, 98%. When the sample was broken into religious groups, the correlation between class and participation still remained. "Within each religious class the higher the economic class the greater the participation."

In concluding her remarks Komarovsky states that "the frequent assumption that the non-participants are necessarily "isolated", "rootless", "barred" from complete realization of personality needs to be examined."¹⁹

This has been undertaken by Floyd Dotson who chose for his research one of the urban lower classes, the working class, who had been shown to be mainly non-affiliated. He found that the children

¹⁸Komarovsky, M. "Voluntary Associations of Urban Dwellers." American Sociological Review; Vol. II, 1946, P. 686-698.

¹⁹Komarovsky, Ibid.

of "native stock or American Born" parents rather than being socially isolated because of lack of membership in formal voluntary associations, were dependent upon kinship and informal groups.²⁰ His study shows that while the working class' involvement in groups is not diffuse there is a high level of interaction with family and informal groups.

The involvement of an individual in a number of significant groups i.e. reference groups, may be perceived as a continuum of involvement. The literature just discussed has shown that the factors of class, income and education etc. have an effect on where the individual falls on this continuum.

Low number of groups ————— High number of groups

It is felt that another factor, ethnicity, will also effect the placing of the individual on this continuum.

Parsons, as already stated, has postulated that with the nuclear family being the most important reference group for the individual in American society, a strain results between it and other reference groups e.g. occupational group in the society. If this is so then it is reasonable to postulate that those individuals with high kinship involvement will have low association membership. The question therefore is; Is there a difference between ethnic groups in their kinship involvement and does this relate at all to their association membership?

Dotson has extended this idea of Parsons' by showing that the working class' main reference groups is the family - in other words the position of members of this class is very low on the

²⁰Dotson, op. cit.

continuum of involvement. Therefore it should be asked; Are both ethnicity and income influencing factors for the relation between kinship involvement and association membership?

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

(a) McMaster Study

i. Area

The data for this thesis was obtained from the McMaster University study of "Life in the City". This study was conducted from May to September of 1962 in an area of the City of Hamilton, known as the "North End" or as census tract number 14. It is a distinct area of the city for it is bounded on two sides by the bay (Hamilton Harbour) and on the other by the Canadian National Railway tracks. The population of this area is predominantly working class and of diverse ethnic background.*

ii. Sample

All households located in the area were numbered in the order they are listed in the 1961 Vernon City Directory, i.e. by Streets in alphabetical order. There were 2208 households listed. Four hundred random numbers, without duplications, were selected, all of which fell between 0001 and 2208. Households bearing these numbers (i.e. the number of the directory) represented the sample. Case numbers from 1 to 100 were assigned to the interviewing staff arbitrarily. Interviews with male respondents were obtained in

*This information was obtained from D. Chandler of the Sociology Department of McMaster University.

the households designated by even case numbers and with female were designated by odd numbers, in all households where both male and female resided. Therefore the sample is of households, not of families, buildings or persons. The interviewers were directed to determine who was the household head and to conduct the interview with either him or his wife. In cases of single persons, by which was meant all those not presently living with a spouse, the interview was conducted with the head of the household, irrespective of sex.

In all 330 of 400 interviews were completed giving a completion rate of 82.5%.

iii. Technique of Research

Interview

The 330 interviews were conducted with an interview schedule or questionnaire consisting of fifty-six questions on various aspects of "life in the city". See Appendix #1 for questionnaire.

The questionnaire was pretested by members of the interviewing staff in areas similar to the sampled area. Following the pretest, the questionnaire was revised by improving the continuity of the questions, removing unworkable questions, sharpening or clarifying the working of some questions and adding new questions. These new questions consisted of questions about income, rent, and number of rooms in dwelling unit, as this information was not available from other sources. It was estimated that to apply the completed questionnaire would take forty-five minutes for women and one hour for men and single persons. Letters of introduction

mailed to respondents are shown in Appendix #2.

Coding

The coding of the complete interviews was done under the direction of Dr. P. Pineo by the interviewing staff. This information was transferred to four decks of International Business Machine punch cards. Two of these decks contain the information used in this thesis.

(b) Data Used in This Thesis

The information from seven questions of the questionnaire was used as the basis for the data for this thesis. These are:

Nativity	Question #5 (c)
Subjective Nationality	Question #7
Kinship Involvement and Frequency of Seeing Kin	Question #30
Income	Question #43
Membership in Voluntary Associations	Question #43 (a,b,c)
Union Membership	Question #44
Age	Question #1

(i) Establishment of Ethnicity

The ethnicity of each respondent was established through the use of questions five and seven. Respondents were considered (a) Canadian (b) United Kingdom (c) Italian (d) French Canadian (e) others if they fulfilled any of the following requirements:

(a) Canadian

1. Those who defined themselves as English, Irish or Scottish but who were born in Canada.
2. Those who defined themselves as Canadian of British descent but who were born in Canada.
3. Canadians with descent consistent with question #6 (parents' nativity) but who were born in Canada.
4. Those who said they were Canadian and who were born in Canada.

(b) United Kingdom

1. Those who said they were Canadians of British descent and who were born in the United Kingdom.
2. Those who said they were English, Irish or Scottish and who were born in the United Kingdom.
3. Those who said they were Canadians (unqualified) and who were from the United Kingdom.
4. Those born in the United Kingdom and who said they were born in the United Kingdom.

(c) Italian

1. Those who said they were (a) naturalized (b) hyphenated form of nationality e.g. Italian-Canadian, but who were born in Italy.
2. Those who said they were Canadian but who were born in Italy.
3. Those who said they were Italian and who were born in Italy.

(d) French Canadian

1. Those who said they were French Canadian and who were born in Quebec.

2. Those who said they were French Canadian.

(e) Others

This is a residual category of all those for whom (a) nationality could not be established and (b) for whom the sample size was very small. This category consists of those born in Eastern Europe mainly, but also of some Americans, Germans, Japanese-Canadians, and some Portugese.

ii. Income

Income level was established through the use of Question #43 and Taxation Statistics published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for the year 1959, (the latest of their type available). These statistics show the Distributions of Net Taxable Income for the City of Hamilton for 1958. The median income for the city was 3897.7 and therefore \$4,000 was taken as the median income for the sample.*

*Note: Coding categories did not allow for the income data to be divided at the absolute median 3897.7.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Ethnicity and income level established in the preceding manner, are the the two main independent variables of this thesis. Each ethnic category was taken and divided at the median into the two income levels.**

Using these two variables the sample is as follows.

	<u>Below \$4,000</u>		<u>Above \$4,000</u>	
Canadian	67	(41)	73	(53)
United Kingdom	36	(70)	11	(24)
French Canadian	12	(20)	8	(10)
Italian	30	(2)	28	(1)
Others	23	(33)	20	(11)
TOTAL	157	(52)	TOTAL 140	(10)

Age is being considered for it may be related to one of the dependent variables, voluntary association membership, e.g. older, retired men may not retain union membership. The Median age of the total sample is 42 years. For the median age of each ethnic group and the range of age of each ethnic group. See table #1.

As can be seen from this table, the United Kingdom group and the Other group are the oldest, median ages being 58 and 59 respectively. The United Kingdom group's age range is also the

**Those for whom income level could not be established are not considered in the analysis.

highest in the age scale -- from 35 to 71 and above. The French Canadian group has the lowest median age, 36 and also has the age range lowest in the scale, from below 20 to 65.

The influence of the age variable can be seen in its relation to income by table #2 -- Ethnicity by Income and Age. In the income category of below \$4,000, 92% of the sample of the United Kingdom group falls above 45 years of age. In the above \$4,000 category the percentage above 45 years of age is not as high but is the highest of all the ethnic groups. Therefore, it can be stated that with holding the income variable constant, the United Kingdom group has the highest percentage above 45 years of all five ethnic groups.

As stated previously, the French Canadian group can be seen by table #1 to have the lowest median age of the ethnic groups. This finding is also relevant when income is considered. In Table #2, in the below \$4,000 income category, the French Canadian group has a high percentage, 75%, below 45 years of age -- the highest of all groups. In the above \$4,000 income category, they also have a high percentage below 45 years old. Therefore, it can also be stated that with holding income constant, the French Canadian group has a high percentage below 45 years old.

With the Italian group, the most interesting finding is that in Table #2 in the above \$4,000 income category, 92.8% of the sample are below 45 years old. In the below \$4,000 income category, this group is evenly split between the two age categories. Therefore, in the higher income category the Italians have a high percentage below 45 -- they are a relatively young group.

TABLE #1

MEDIAN AGE AND AGE RANGE OF
ETHNIC GROUPS

Ethnicity	No.	Median Age	Age Range
Canadian	139	39.2	Below 20 - 71 plus
United Kingdom	36	58	35 - 71 plus
French Canadian	20	36	Below 20 - 65
Italian	56	38	21 - 71 plus
Other	43	59	21 - 71 plus

TABLE #2 PERCENTAGE

ETHNICITY BY INCOME AND AGE

Below \$4,000				Above \$4,000			
Ethnicity	No.	Below 45	Above 45	Ethnicity	No.	Below 45	Above 45
Canadian	67	60.6	39.4	Canadian	73	64.4	35.6
United Kingdom	25	8	92	United Kingdom	11	36.4	63.6
French	12	75	25	French	8	87.5	12.5
Italian	30	50	50	Italian	28	92.8	7.2
Other	23	39.2	60.8	Other	20	60	40
TOTAL	157			TOTAL	140		

(ii) Kinship Involvement Score*

See Table #3 for the Median Kinship Involvement Score of each ethnic and income group. In the Income category below \$4,000 the Canadian and Italian Involvement Scores are the highest whereas in the above \$4,000 income category, only the Canadian group has a high median involvement score -- II.

The French Canadian group, in the below \$4,000 income category has a very low involvement score 1.5 --- the lowest of all the ethnic groups. With the above \$4,000 income category, however, this group does not have a very much lower median involvement score than the other groups.

In Table #4 Kinship Involvement Score by Ethnicity and Income, in the below \$4,000 category, the Canadian and Italian groups have the lowest percentage of non-involvement, although the Canadian and United Kingdom groups percentages differ only slightly. This can be seen to have a relation to the high median involvement scores of these two groups, in the same income category. Also this table shows, the French Canadian and Other groups have the highest percentage of non-involvement. This can also be related to the low median Kinship Involvement scores of these two groups.

In Table #4 if the above \$4,000 income category is considered, it is seen that again the Canadian and Italian groups have the lowest non-involvement percentages and by Table #3 the highest median kinship involvement scores.

*See Table #4 for explanation of Involvement Score.

The Other group can also be seen to have the highest percentage of non-involvement, and this can again be related to the group median involvement score, 0 of Table #3.

The French Canadian group has 0% of non-involvement and, however, its level of involvement remains low, as 62.5% have an Involvement score of from 1 - 6.

TABLE #3

MEDIAN KINSHIP INVOLVEMENT SCORE
OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY INCOME

Ethnic Group	Below \$4,000	Above \$4,000
Canadian	10.1	11
United Kingdom	8.0	6
French	1.5	5.8
Italian	11.2	6.3
Other	2.0	0

TABLE #4 PERCENTAGE TABLE

KINSHIP INVOLVEMENT SCORE BY ETHNICITY AND INCOME

CATEGORIES COLLAPSED

Below \$4,000			Canadian	United Kingdom	French	Italian	Other	*
			N=67	N=25	N=12	N=30	N=23	
	0	0	7.4	8	41.6	3.3	43.5	
6 for each family seen once a week or more.	1-2	1						
	3-4	2	26.9	28	16.6	26.5	21.7	
	5-6	3						
3 for each seen less than once a week but at least once a month.	7-8	4						
	9-10	5	26.9	36	8.3	29.9	21.7	
	11-12	6						
1 for each seen less than once a month but not never.	13-14	7						
	15-16	8	17.8	24	8.3	19.9	0	
	17-18	9						
0 never.	19 or more	x	20.9	4	25	20	13.4	
<u>Above \$4,000</u>			N=73	N=11	N=8	N=28	N=20	
	0	0	11	18.2	0	10.7	40	55*
6 for each family seen once a week or more.	1-2	1						
	3-4	2	23.3	27.2	62.5	42.9	4.0	
	5-6	3						
3 for each seen less than once a week but at least once a month.	7-8	4						
	9-10	5	23.2	0	12.5	17.8	24	
	11-12	6						
1 for each seen less than once a month but not never.	13-14	7						
	15-16	8	19.2	18.2	12.5	14.3	4	
	17-18	9						
0 never.	19 or more	x	23.3	36.4	12.5	14.3	4	

*Non-involvement score.

(iii) Frequency of Seeing Kin.

Table #5 contains Frequency of Seeing Kin by Ethnicity and Income.

Although this table shows some variations, the most noticeable finding is the high frequency of seeing kin for all the ethnic groups in the two income categories. The highest percentages for each ethnic group fall in the everyday -- once a week category.

In the below \$4,000 income category, the lowest percentages of seeing kin -- once a week every day, are those of the French Canadian and Other groups, 50% and 48% respectively. The highest percentage is that of the Italian group, 83.4%.

In the above \$4,000 income category, the Other group also has the lowest percentage (45%) for seeing kin most frequently i.e. every day, once a week, and the Italian group again has the highest, 78.6%.

When considering the relation of income to the percentage of these groups seeing their kin frequently, it can be seen that the percentage rises from 50% to 75% for the French Canadian, while it drops slightly for the Italian, (from 83.4% to 78.6%) and Other (from 48% to 45%) groups.

If Kinship Involvement Score and Frequency of Seeing Kin are considered together, it can be seen that those groups French Canadian and Other, which have the highest non-involvement scores, also have the lowest percentage for seeing kin frequently, for the below \$4,000 income category. Also the Italian group, with the lowest non-involvement score has the highest percentage of seeing kin frequently. The relationship between these two variables

(involvement score and frequency of seeing kin) still remains when the above \$4,000 income category is considered. Here, the French Canadian group, whose involvement score in this category is higher than in the below \$4,000 income category, also has a higher percentage in the high frequency of seeing kin category than is found in the below \$4,000 income division.

If the groups have a low non-involvement score (or high involvement score) they also have a high frequency of seeing their kin. Those with high non-involvement scores (or low involvement scores) have also a low frequency of seeing kin. Income can be seen to be a slight influence as shown by the French Canadian data. Therefore, it appears that the kinship involvement score and the frequency of seeing score are measuring the same thing -- level and degree of interaction with family. These two scores must be considered in relation to income, ethnicity and association membership.

(iv) Voluntary Association Membership

Table #6 gives the Clubs attended by Ethnicity and Income.

In both income categories, over 50% of each ethnic group do not attend any associations or clubs, even once a year. Therefore they have no voluntary association affiliations. In the below \$4,000 income category, the Italian group has the highest non-affiliation percentage, 93.3% while the United Kingdom group has the lowest, 64%.

In the above \$4,000 category, the Italians still have the highest non-affiliation percentage, 78.6% but it has dropped 15% from the previous 93.3%. In this income category, the Canadian group has the lowest percentage of non-affiliation, 49.1% and the

TABLE #5

PERCENTAGE TABLE - FREQUENCY OF SEEING KIN
BY ETHNICITY AND INCOME

	Canadian N=67	United Kingdom N=25	French N=12	Italian N=30	Other N=23
Below \$4,000					
Once a year or less.	1.5	0	0	3.3	8.7
A few times a month - more than once a year.	20.9	20	8.3	10	4.3
Every day - once a week	70.1	72	50	83.4	48.0
*NA	7.5	8	41.7	3.3	39.0
Above \$4,000					
	N=73	N=11	N=8	N=28	N=20
Once a year or less.	1.4	0	12.5	3.6	0
A few times a month - more than once a year.	16.4	18.2	12.5	7.1	15
Every day - once a week	69.8	63.6	75	78.6	45
*NA	12.4	18.2		10.7	40

United Kingdom has the second highest, 63.6% as compared with the highest -- Italian, 78.6%.

The relation of income to affiliation can clearly be seen for the two income categories, because the percentage of non-affiliation of all five groups drops from above 64% - 93% in the below \$4,000 category, to 49.1% - 78.6% in the above \$4,000 income category.

When affiliation is considered it can be seen that in both income categories the Canadian and the United Kingdom groups have the most diversified affiliation with the other groups, French

*Not applicable, no answer.

TABLE #6 PERCENTAGE TABLE

CLUBS ATTENDED BY ETHNICITY AND INCOME

	Canadian	United Kingdom	French	Italian	Other
Below \$4,000	N=67	N=25	N=12	N=30	N=23
None, not now, only attends less than once a year.	76.1	64	75	93.3	82.6
Attends once a year:					
Athletics, sports club.	1.5				
Lodge	10.4	8			
Church Association	4.5	24	8.3		13.4
Ethnic Association	1.5			6.7	4.0
Home and School			8.3		
Veterans' Messes	4.5	4			
Charity, Civic		4			
Reject	2.9	12			
Above \$4,000	N=73	N=11	N=8	N=28	N=20
None, not now, only attends less than once a year.	49.1	63.6	50	78.6	55
Attends once a year:					
Athletics, sports club.	9.6			3.6	
Lodge	15.1	18.2	12.5		
Church Association	12.3	18.2	12.5	3.6	5
Ethnic Association	1.3		12.5	14.2	35
Home and School	5.5				
Veterans, Messes	6.9	9.1			
Charity, Civic	2.7	9.1			
Reject	13.7	9.1	12.5		5

Canadian, Italian, and Other, being spread mainly between church and ethnic associations. When income categories are considered it can be seen that there is greater diversification of affiliation on the part of the Italian and Other groups, in the the above \$4,000 category than in the below \$4,000 category.

(v) Union Membership

Union Membership by Ethnicity and Income is given in Table #7.

Here the relation of income to membership is apparent for, for all five groups, in the above \$4,000 income category have above 54% membership while in the below \$4,000 category, they have 43.3% and below membership. The Italian group can be seen to have the highest percentage of union membership in the below \$4,000 while the Other group has the highest percentage in the above \$4,000 category.

If we consider kinship Involvement Table #4, Frequency of Seeing Table #5 and Association Membership Table #6, the Italian group has the lowest non-involvement, the highest percentage of club non-affiliation for both income categories. The Other group has one of the highest non-involvement scores, the lowest percentage of high frequency of seeing kin and one of the highest percentages of club non-affiliation.

If we consider Income in relation to these other variables, we find that in the below \$4,000 category the French Canadian group has a high percentage of non-involvement, a low percentage of seeing kin frequently and a high club non-affiliation. However, in the above \$4,000 category, the French Canadian group has a very low

TABLE #7 PERCENTAGE TABLE

UNION MEMBERSHIP BY ETHNICITY AND INCOME

		Canadian	United Kingdom	French	Italian	Other
Below \$4,000		N=17	N=25	N=12	N=30	N=23
Yes	1	32.8	34	16.6	43.3	26.1
No	2	37.7	12	58.3	40.0	47.8
Professional Association	3	0				
	*					
Reject		29.6	56	25	16.6	26.8
Above \$4,000		N=73	N=11	N=8	N=28	N=20
Yes	1	54.8	54.5	62.5	64.3	80
No	2	39.1	36.4	37.5	25	20
Professional Association	3	1.4	9.1			
Reject*		4.1			10.7	

level of non-involvement - 0, have a high percentage of high frequency of seeing kin and has a rather low percentage of club non-affiliation, 50%. Therefore, income appears to have a great influence on the kinship involvement and association membership of the French Canadian group.

When we consider the Anglo-Saxon group i.e. the Canadian and United Kingdom groups together, it is noticeable that this group has a low kinship non-involvement score and a high percentage of high frequency of seeing kin in both income categories. It is only when we relate club affiliation or association to these two factors that income level becomes important for part of this group, i.e. the United Kingdom. The Canadian group follow the same trend as the French Canadian re a large drop in club non-affiliation, from the

*Not applicable, no answer.

below \$4,000 category to the above \$4,000 category -- this finding is supported by previous literature. However, the United Kingdom group's percentage of non-affiliation hardly drops at all.

These findings are discussed and explained in the concluding chapter.

CHAPTER #4

CONCLUSION

I Summary of Findings

(a) Italian group have;

1. high percentage of kinship involvement.
2. high percentage of high frequency of seeing kin.
3. high percentage of club non-affiliation.

(b) Other group have;

1. high percentage of kinship non-involvement.
2. low percentage of high frequency of seeing kin.
3. high percentage of club non-affiliation.

(c) French Canadian group have;

(1) Below \$4,000

1. high percentage of kinship non-involvement.
2. low percentage of high frequency of seeing kin.
3. high percentage of club non-affiliation.

(2) Above \$4,000

1. high percentage of kinship involvement.
2. high percentage of high frequency of seeing kin.
3. high percentage of club non-affiliation.

(d) Anglo-Saxon

1. Income does not affect either Canadian or United Kingdom groups, kinship involvement.
2. Income does affect Canadian association membership.

In this summary two findings are shown clearly;

(1) There is an ethnic variation in voluntary association and kinship involvement. This is either positive i.e. Italian group, or negative i.e. Other group.

(2) Income also appears to have an effect on finding number one, i.e. French Canadian.

It is interesting to note that income appears to be related to those groups most integrated into the Canadian society, i.e. those groups with the largest diversification of membership in the voluntary associations - those who belong to associations other than ethnic or church associations.

II Discussion of Findings

Answers to the questions posed in the introductory chapter (a) Is there a difference between ethnic groups in their kinship involvement, and does this relate at all to their association membership? (b) Are both ethnicity and income influencing factors for the relation between kinship involvement and association membership?, will be attempted with the aid of this summary of findings.

As can be seen in this summary the Italian group with its high percentage of kinship involvement has a very low percentage of club affiliations. Income appears to have no influence on this relationship. Previous literature has shown that ethnic groups new to this society, usually have membership only in their own ethnic clubs,¹⁹ if they have membership at all. This is shown by this data for by Table #6 it can be seen that if the Italian group

¹⁹Warner, L. op. cit.

has membership in any clubs or associations, it is mainly in church and ethnic organizations. How this aids the individual has been mentioned previously in the introduction.*

The Other group could be said to be our "isolate" group in this study. This group appears to have few family ties and no club affiliation -- in our terms the members of this group would be placed very low on the continuum of involvement. This may be explained by the age factor, as this group has the highest median age of any of the five groups. With increasing age, children depart forming their own nuclear families²⁰ and this could have an effect on kinship involvement. Also membership in clubs decreases with age and therefore this finding that this group has a high percentage of non-affiliation is not surprising. Also Table #6 shows that this group is active only in church and ethnic associations, not associations such as Home and School which could be expected from a younger group where the family is still young and in school. Income has no influence upon these findings for this group. This may again be related to age -- for with increasing age, it can be postulated, comes a set pattern of family and formal group interaction.

The French Canadian can be seen to be the group for whom income has the most influence on kinship involvement. Income does not appear to have a great influence on club affiliation. This may be explained through demographic factors. In the total Hamilton

²⁰Parsons, T. op. cit.

*In the discussion of the functions of voluntary associations.

population of 273,991 the French Canadian form only 4.2%.²¹ With this small percentage of the ethnic group in the city there may not have been the population necessary for the maintenance of organized groups. However, it can be seen by Table #6 that 8.3% of the sample below \$4,000 income category are active in Home and School. This can be explained through the fact of the French Canadian school just outside the North End area of the city.

Previous literature has shown how French Canadians migrate out of Quebec in search of work,²² when they are young. This may explain the influence income has on kinship involvement for with increasing income for the respondent more of the respondent's family may migrate to this city in search of work. Therefore the rise in kinship involvement in the upper income category.

For both Anglo-Saxon groups, Canadian and United Kingdom the influence of income on kinship involvement is negligible. However, the influence of this variable can be seen to affect the association membership of the Canadian group. With a rise in the income categories comes a rise in the percentage of association membership. Previous literature for American born, supports this finding.²³

Income does not, however, influence the association membership of the United Kingdom group. This may be explained in the same way as the Other group was -- through the age variable. The United Kingdom group has the second highest median age -- and as

²¹ Census Data, 1961, Advance Report No. AD-7, Catalogue No. 92-521, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa.

²² Miner, H. St. Denis -- A French Canadian Parish, University of Chicago Press, 1939. P. 238.

²³ Komarovsky, M. Ibid.

already stated with age comes a set pattern for family and group interaction which is unlikely to be influenced by income.

While the findings of this study are interesting the study itself has a number of limitations.

Limitations of the Study

(i) The Interview Method.

One of the main questions concerning the interview method of collecting data is the question of interviewer bias. Although, as has been already stated the interviewer received interviewer training, little of this problem seems to have been overcome as

One interviewer may not penetrate the mask of refusal which a potential respondent offers. Another will be given a cordial reception. One interviewer will meet with cliché answers, moderate in tenor and logical in structure, from a certain respondent. Another may find that the same respondent is quite violent in his answers and in his emotion pays little attention to logic. These differences may be extreme cases but all may be encountered.²⁴

In this study all of these problems were encountered in the collection of the data. In the interviewer staff there was both a sex and ethnic split. Although the sex split was in the long run controlled for through the assignment of cases, it is questionable whether this is so concerning the ethnic split. Also because some of the interviewers were fluent in languages other than English, e.g. Italian, Polish, Russian and Ukranian, they naturally were assigned to these cases. How much influence this had on the answers of the respondents speaking these languages must be questioned. Also the effect of the accent of some of these interviewers must be considered when the respondent's ethnicity is other than that of the interviewer.

²⁴Goode and Hatt, Methods in Social Research, McGraw-Hill, 1952. P. 185.

The only way to control for this interviewer bias in relation to accent would be to break down the data by interviewer. Because of the size of the sample this was impossible. Therefore, it is felt that this limits the validity of the results especially as ethnicity is one of the main variables of the study.

(ii) Sample

This is another limitation of the study. In the McMaster Study the area was sampled by households, as discussed in the chapter on Methodology. The establishment of a "household" was done through Vernon's City Directory. Is their definition of a household the same as ours? It is often difficult to establish when a number of people of the same extended family are living in the same dwelling unit, whether they are of one household or of a number. What do you take as the criteria of separate eating facilities? This was poorly defined and therefore the enumeration of separate "household" was poorly defined. This has a direct effect on who the respondent was.

Another problem concerning the sample, was its size. In this study, by the time the ethnic and income breakdowns were made, the numbers in some categories were extremely small, so small that it is impossible to attempt a statistical analysis of them other than finding the median age and median kinship involvement scores of each ethnic group. To say that 50% of an ethnic group in a certain income category reacts a certain way in relation to a variable is rather ridiculous when the sample is of eight respondents, i.e. French Canadian. It is very likely that some of these results are not generalizable because of the size of the sample.

(iii) Involvement Score

This Score also places another limitation upon the study. With this score it is impossible to discover its make-up. e.g. does the respondent see one family once a week or two families twice a month? Does the respondent see one family once a week or six families once a year? It was hoped that with the aid of Frequency of Seeing Kin variable some of these problems surrounding the Involvement Score would be eased. For this study it would be impossible to gain anything through using only the Involvement Score.*

Implications for Further Research

With these limitations in mind, this study has the following implications for further research. These findings need to be supported, first of all, through the use of a much larger sample. With a larger sample, the trends found in relation to the kinship involvement and association membership of the ethnic groups could be given a statistical basis. Also the ethnic breakdown in relation to type of association membership could be of interest to those concerned with the assimilation or adjustment of various ethnic minorities, to the different types of urban communities. These findings could then be considered in relation to the idea of the degree of urbanization within the urban area, as discussed in previous literature.**

It is felt that within its limitations this study has been successful in showing that ethnicity and income have an influence

*See Table #5 for contents of Involvement Score.

**Guer, S. Op. Cit.

on Kinship Involvement and Association Membership. Not only does ethnicity influence the type of association the individual affiliates with, but also it influences the propensity to affiliate on the part of individuals of the different ethnic groups irrespective of income level.

APPENDIX #1

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRES

Case Number _____

Completed: Yes _____ No _____

Disposition: Assigned to _____ Date _____ Returned _____
 _____ Date _____ Returned _____
 _____ Date _____ Returned _____
 _____ Date _____ Returned _____

Name _____

Address _____

Interview: Man _____ Wife _____ Single _____

Family composition _____

RECORD OF CALLS:

Time	Date	Interviewer	Outcome	Remarks

NOTE: ATTACH THIS SHEET TO COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE,
 ATTACH THIS SHEET TO REPORT OF NON-INTERVIEW

3. A. Do you, and those who live around here, think of this part of the city as a neighbourhood? (RECORD VERBATIM COMMENTS AND REACTIONS)

- B. IF YES: Why is that? (In what respects?)

What would you say its boundaries are?

What do you call the neighbourhood? (Do you have a name for it?)

- C. IF NO TO PART A: What keeps it from being a neighbourhood?

4. Are the people who live around here all pretty much alike in the amount of money they have and the way they live? (What are they like?) (How are they different?) (What sort of people are they?)

5. A. How long have you lived in this house/apartment? _____

- B. Where else in the Hamilton area have you lived? (Get addresses to the nearest intersection) When was that? (How long did you live there?)

Address	Years there

6. A. Where were your parents born?

Mother: Province _____ Country _____

Father: Province _____ Country _____

B. Where were your grandparents born?

Mother's mother: Prov. _____ Country _____

Mother's father: Prov. _____ Country _____

Father's mother: Prov. _____ Country _____

Father's father: Prov. _____ Country _____

7. If someone asked you your nationality, what would you say?

8. A. Where was your wife/husband born? City _____
 Province _____ Country _____

B. How long did she/he live in _____ (PLACE OF BIRTH)?
 Where did she/he live next? (ENTER IN CHART BELOW)

Place	Years there	Size
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

9. A. IF RESPONDENT BORN OUTSIDE CANADA, OR SPENT MORE THAN 5 YEARS OUTSIDE CANADA: Are you a Canadian citizen?

- Yes 1
- No 2
- Other (SPECIFY) 3

B. Do you intend to stay in Canada?

- Yes 1
- No 2*
- Indefinite .. 3*

*IF NO OR INDEFINITE: Where do you want to go?

10. A. IF MOVED TO HAMILTON AFTER AGE 16: Did you have friends or relatives, or any members of your family, already here in Hamilton when you came? (Who?)

B. Why did you decide to come here? (Why did you come at that particular time?)

C. When you first came, did you intend to stay?

11. A. ASK ALL: What religion do you consider yourself to be?
(If Protestant or Jewish, ask for denomination).

B. Is your wife/husband of the same religion as you? (If not, ask what?)

C. How often do you go to church? _____ times per _____

How about your wife/husband? _____ times per _____

D. What church do you usually go to? _____

12. A. At the present time, are you (is your husband) working, looking for a job, or not working but not looking for a job?

Working 1*
Not Working 2**
Not looking 3***

*B. IF WORKING: What kind of work do you (does he) do?

What kind of business or company do you (does he) work for?

Where is it located?

How long have you (has he) held this job?

How many weeks during the past year were you (was he) without work because of unemployment or layoff?

- **C. IF NOT WORKING, OR NOT WORKING AND NOT LOOKING:
 What kind of work did you (he) do on your (his) last job?
 What kind of business or company did you (he) work for?
 Where was it located?
 How long did you (he) hold that job?
 How long have you (has he) been without work?

- ***D. IF NOT WORKING AND NOT LOOKING FOR A JOB? How does it happen
 you're (he's) not looking for work -- are you (is he) retired,
 unable to work because of poor health, or is there some other
 reason? (SPECIFY)

Retired	1
Poor health	2
Other _____	3

13. A. ASK ALL MEN AND SINGLE WOMEN: How satisfied are (were) you with
 your present (last) job? Would you say you were very satisfied,
 satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Very satisfied	1
Satisfied	2
Somewhat dissatisfied	3
Very dissatisfied	4

- B. What kinds of things do (did) you wish were different about your
 job and the place you work/ed (your kind of work)? What about
 your work don't (didn't) you especially like? (What else?)

14. A. ASK ALL, IF WORKING: What are your (his) job/career plans for the
 future? Do you (does he) intend to keep this job (stay where you
 are) as long as you (he) can, are you thinking about making a change,
 or do you definitely plan to change?

Keep same job	1
Thinking of change	2*
Definitely change	3*

*IF CHANGE: What sort of change do you (does he) have in mind?

B. ASK ALL, IF LOOKING FOR JOB: What kind of work are you (is he) looking for?

Occupation _____ Industry _____

ASK MEN AND SINGLE WOMEN ONLY: How are you going about looking for a job?
(Probe: Is there any likelihood you'll have to move to find a job?
Do you think you might have to move to find a cheaper place to live?)

15. A. What kind of work did your father do when you were growing up?

Occupation _____ Industry _____

B. How far did you father go in school? _____

C. What kind of work did your grandfathers do?

Mother's father: Occ. _____ Ind. _____

Father's father: Occ. _____ Ind. _____

16. A. What was the last grade of regular school you attended?

_____ Did you complete this grade? _____

B. How old were you when you stopped going to school? _____

C. ASK ALL, EXCEPT THOSE WITH COLLEGE DEGREE: Why did you leave school at that time -- was it all the schooling you wanted, were you discouraged because you were getting poor grades, did you dislike school, or were there other reasons?

All schooling wanted1
Poor grades.....2
Disliked school.....3
Other (Specify).....4

17. A. ASK MEN AND SINGLE WOMEN ONLY: MARRIED WOMEN SKIP TO Q. 22:

What was the first job you had, either part-time or full-time, after your 16th birthday?

Occupation _____ Industry _____

B. How old were you when you started on that job?

C. Was it part-time or full-time? Part-time..1
 Full-time.....2
 Full, temporary.....3

D. How long did you work at that job?

E. Where were you living then?

18. What other jobs did you have for at least three months while you lived in _____ (Place named in Part E above)?

IF ANSWER TO PART E ABOVE IS HAMILTON, ASK THIS QUESTION (18) AND THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 21.

ASK FOR EACH JOB: How long did you work there? When was that? Why did you leave that job?

Occupation	Industry	Years	Length	Reasons for leaving

Were there any periods of unemployment while you were there? (ADD TO LIST)

19. ASK IF RESPONDENT HAS MADE MORE THAN 1 MOVE. ASK IN TERMS OF TOP PRIORITY MOVE, AS IN SPECIFICATIONS:

What jobs did you have in _____? (Destination of top priority move). What was the first job you got there? Etc.

Occupation	Industry	Years	Length	Reasons for leaving

Were there any periods of unemployment while you were there? (ADD TO LIST)

- 20. A. How long after you arrived in Hamilton did you get your first job?
- B. What kinds of jobs did you want to get when you first came?
- C. How did you go about getting a job? (Who helped?)
- D. What was the first job you got here? (ADD TO CHART BELOW)
- E. What other jobs have you held here?

Occupation	Industry	Years	Length	Reasons for leaving

Have you had any periods of unemployment since you've been in Hamilton?
(ADD TO LIST)

- 21. A. If you were a boy starting over again, and could get whatever training you needed, what kind of occupation or business would you go into?
- B. IF DIFFERENT FROM PRESENT OCCUPATION: What kept you from getting into that kind of work?

22. A. ASK ALL: Does your wife (do you) work for pay?

B. IF YES: What does she (do you) do?

Occupation _____ Industry _____

How many hours a week does she (do you) work? _____

What other jobs has she (have you) had in her (your) lifetime?

C. IF NO: Has she (have you) ever worked since you've been married?

When was that?

What was the job she (you) worked at longest?

23. ASK ALL MEN AND WOMEN WHO WORK: If you suddenly didn't have to work, how would you feel? (PAUSE, AND RECORD ALL COMMENTS)

Do you think it would change your way of living? (How?) (Do you think you might move?)

24. A. ASK ALL: I guess there are some newcomers moving into this part of the city. Have you noticed any difference in the sort of people who are moving in? (What differences?) (Have you noticed if they are of different nationalities?) (RECORD VERBATIM ALL COMMENTS AND NOTE PARENTHETICALLY ALL REACTIONS AND EXPRESSIONS, ETC.)

B. IF RESPONDENT HAS NOTICED NEWCOMERS: On the whole, do you think the newcomers are making any difference to the area? (What difference?)

C. Do they seem to fit in all right?

D. Do the people you know in the area pretty much agree with you on this? (IF NO: What do they feel?)

E. IF RESPONDENT HAS NOT NOTICED NEWCOMERS IN OWN AREA: In parts of the city where there are newcomers, do they seem to be making any difference to the neighbourhoods? (What difference?)

25. A. Would you say that the people living around here are friendly to newcomers? In what way?

B. Are there any ways in which newcomers are at a disadvantage? (How?)

26. If a newcomer asked you how to make friends in this area what would you tell him to do? Where could he go to make friends?

27. A. Do you know any family which has recently moved out of the area? (IF YES) Why did they move?

B. Have you ever thought you might move out? (What is it that made you think this?) (How about the other members of your family, how do they feel?)

28. A. ASK ALL: Have you ever lived in an apartment/house? (WHICHEVER NOT LIVED IN NOW)

B. What do you like best about living in this particular house/apartment?

C. What do you like least about living in this particular house/apartment? (How could it be improved?)

D. On the whole, do you prefer living in a house or in an apartment?

House.....	1
Apartment.....	2
Don't know.....	3

E. Have you ever thought of living in an (OPPOSITE)? (Do you have any definite plans to move?)

29. A. Do you own or rent this house/apartment? Own..... 1 **
Rent..... 2 *

*IF RENT: Was it furnished when you moved in?

Have you ever wanted to own? (What would be the advantages to you?)

**IF OWN: Do you have a mortgage? Is it more than half paid?

No mortgage.....	1
More than half paid	2
Less than half paid	3

30. A. Do you own a car? No.. 1 Yes..... 2*

B. *IF YES: What year and make is it? Year _____ Make _____
Who drives in the family? (Anyone else?)

B MONTHLY RENT \$

C NUMBER OF ROOMS

C. IF YES (CONT'D): Do you have any problem parking around here?
(What is the problem?)

D. IF NOT ANSWERED ABOVE: Where do you usually park?

E. Would you tell me which of the following sorts of things you use the car for? Tell me if you use the car always, sometimes, or never.
How about for:

	<u>Always</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Never</u>
<u>IF WORK:</u> Work?	1	2	3
Shopping?	1	2	3
To get the children to sch'l	1	2	3
To go to club or lodge meetings	1	2	3
For pleasure	1	2	3

F. ASK IF RESPONDENT'S FAMILY HAS NO CAR: Would you tell me how you travel for the following purposes:

	<u>Bus</u>	<u>Walk</u>	<u>Get ride</u>	<u>Other</u>
To go to work (IF WORK)	1	2	3	4
For shopping	1	2	3	4
To get the children to school	1	2	3	4
To go to club or lodge meetings	1	2	3	4
When you go visiting	1	2	3	4

Do you have any relatives, or members of your family, living in the Hamilton area? Where do they live (TO NEAREST INTERSECTION) How often do you see them?

<u>Relationship</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Frequency of seeing</u>
		_____ times per _____
		_____ times per _____
		_____ times per _____
		_____ times per _____
		_____ times per _____

A. Do you see your relatives, or members of your family, who live outside the immediate neighbourhood (more than a few blocks from you) as often as you wish?

B. Do you go to visit them, or do they come to visit you? Would you say they come here most often, that you go there most often, or is it about half and half?

They come here most often.....	1
You go there most often	2
About half and half	3

C. Did any of them ever live in this immediate area (within a few blocks of here?) When was that? (LIST BELOW)

3. A. How many families or single individuals who live in this immediate neighbourhood (within a few blocks of here) would you say were good friends?

B. ASK MEN AND SINGLE WOMEN ONLY: Do any of them work with you? (How many?)

4. Of these friends, think of the family or single individual in this area that you would consider your best friend. Would you tell me how long you have known them (him/her)?

How did you first meet?

How often do you see them? _____ times per _____.

Where do you see them most often?

5. How many families or single individuals who live elsewhere in the Hamilton area would you classify as good friends?

6. Of these, now, think of your closest friend -- one who does not live in this part of the city. Would you tell me how long you have known them?

How did you first meet?

How often do you see them? _____ times per _____.

Where do you see them most often?

Where do they live? (TO NEAREST INTERSECTION)

7. Would you say you visit with friends more or less often than with relatives?

Friends more often..... 1
 Friends less often..... 2
 About the same..... 3

8. Are your friends in this area about the same age as you are, younger than you, older than you, or do they vary in age?

Same age..... 1
 Younger..... 2
 Older 3
 Vary 4

39. A. ASK MEN AND SINGLE WOMEN ONLY: What about the people you work with
-- how many of them do you spend time with outside the job?
- B. What sorts of things do you do together?
- C. How many of the people you work with live around here?
- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| All or almost all..... | 1 |
| More than half..... | 2 |
| Less than half..... | 3 |
| A few..... | 4 |
| None..... | 5 |
40. A. ASK ALL:
How about you and your neighbours? How often do you visit with or
stop and talk with people who live within a few blocks of you? Would
you say you talk with them almost every day, a few times a week, once
in a while, or almost never?
- | | |
|------------------------|----|
| Almost every day..... | 1* |
| A few times a week.... | 2* |
| Once in a while..... | 3* |
| Almost never..... | 4 |
- B.* IF AT ALL (1, 2 OR 3 ABOVE): How many different families do you stop
and talk with this way? _____.
- 41.-ASK A THROUGH D BELOW ABOUT ALL BUT RESPONDENT'S OWN ETHNIC GROUP!
- A. How would you feel about living in a neighbourhood in which there were
a lot of French-Canadians? (Why do you say that?) (What do you think
it would be like?)
- B. How about one which was largely Polish? (Why do you say that?)
(What do you think it would be like?)
- C. How about one with a lot of Italians? (Why do you say that?) (What
do you think it would be like?)

D. How about one with a lot of Ukrainians? (Why do you say that?)
(What do you think it would be like?)

E. ASK ALL: How would you feel about living in a neighbourhood where almost everyone was of the same nationality as you are? (Why do you say that?)

42.-A. ASK WOMEN AND SINGLE MEN ONLY: Now, let's see. Where do you usually go to buy groceries and meat? (GET STORE NAME).

Is that an (ETHNIC) store?

B. What are some of the reasons you go there, instead of (a supermarket) (a smaller grocery)? (PROBE DIRECTLY ON ALL NOT MENTIONED: Is the service any different? Does the size matter to you? Is there a difference in the kinds of things you can buy there? Anything else?)

C. Do you have a bill or do you pay cash? _____.

D. For other things besides groceries, what sorts of stores do you shop in? We mean things like clothes, furniture and gifts. (GET LOCATION OF STORES AS WELL AS TYPE).

E. Do you have to do a lot of travelling to do your shopping?

F. What do you think would make shopping easier for you? (Is there anything about the location of the stores that could be better?) (Is there any particular type of store you'd like?)

43 ASK ALL, INCOME

43. A. ASK ALL: What clubs or lodges do you belong to? (ASK FOR EACH: How often does it meet? How often do you attend?)

Are any of these connected with the church?

- B. Does anyone else in your family belong to clubs like these? (PROBE AS ABOVE) Are any of these connected with the church?

- C. Do you (does your husband) belong to a labour union? (How often do you go to meetings?)

44. A. IF CANADIAN CITIZEN (CHECK Q. 9A, P.4): Did you vote in the last city election?

Yes.....1

No.....2

- B. Have you ever voted in a federal election? Yes...1
No.....2

- C. If there were a federal election today, how do you think you'd vote?

Conservative.....1

Liberal.....2

NDP.....3

Social Credit.....4

Other (SPECIFY)

.....5

45. A. If someone asked you to classify your family, would you say it was upper class, middle class, working class, or lower class?

Upper.....1

Middle.....2*

Working....3*

Lower.....4

- B. *IF MIDDLE OR WORKING: Why do you say that?

46. A. Have any of your children finished school yet? (CHECK FACE SHEET). How far did each go? (LIST SEPARATELY) Why did they leave school at that time?

- B. How far did your wife/husband go in school? _____ grade

47. A. I'm going to read out a list of some of the things people do with their spare time. Would you tell me whether you do each of these, and if so, how often -- that is, every day, a few times a week, once a week, or less than once a week. (RECORD COMMENTS BELOW EACH)

	Every Day	Few Times a Week	Once a Week	Less than Once/Wk	Never
	1	2	3	4	5
Watching television					
Reading a book or magazine	1	2	3	4	5
Playing card games	1	2	3	4	5
Visiting or having visitors	1	2	3	4	5
Listening to records or the radio	1	2	3	4	5
Having drinks at home	1	2	3	4	5
Going out for drinks	1	2	3	4	5
Going to movies	1	2	3	4	5
Going to watch sports	1	2	3	4	5
Playing in athletic games	1	2	3	4	5
Working at a hobby	1	2	3	4	5
Gardening	1	2	3	4	5
Going to the park	1	2	3	4	5
<u>MEN ONLY:</u> Fixing up the house/apt.	1	2	3	4	5
Working on the car	1	2	3	4	5
Part-time work	1	2	3	4	5
Other _____	1	2	3	4	5

B. Do you find you have enough things to do in your spare time in the summer?

C. How about the winter?

48. A. Do you usually get away for a summer vacation?

B. Where did you go (what did you do) last summer?

49. A. Sooner or later everyone gets into a situation where they need help or advice. Try to think of some of the times when you've talked things over. Who did you talk to? (Anyone else?)

B. Have you ever gone to a lawyer for advice?

What was his nationality?

50. Taking everything into consideration would you say that this past year has been a happy one? Would you say it has been a very happy year, fairly happy, about average, fairly unhappy or very unhappy? (RECORD ALL VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS)

Very happy.....1

Fairly happy.....2

About average.....3

Fairly unhappy.....4

Very unhappy.....5

51. A. Again, thinking about the past year, would you say your family has been in good health? (Have there been any serious illnesses?) (Who was that?)

B. Do you have a family doctor?

What is his nationality?

C. About how long is it since you've had a chest x-ray?

52. A. We're interested in what the children living around here do when they play. (Taking the children one at a time) would you tell me what their most important activities are? (Even if you don't have children, I'm interested in your impressions.) (PROBE: Where do they _____?)

B. IF CHILDREN: How much time do you spend with your children? What sorts of things do you do together (ASK FOR WOMEN: as a family?)?

C. Do you have any problem with the children getting into trouble? (What sort of trouble?)

53. A. Do you think this part of the city is a good place to bring up children?
- B. What do you think might make it (even) easier? (What sort of changes should there be in the area? How about the house/apartment?)

C. Is it a good place for teen-agers?

54. A. What do you think about the schools around here? How good a job are they doing? (Even though you don't have children I'd like to hear your impressions.)

B. How could they do a better (an even better) job?

C. IF CHILDREN IN SCHOOL: What school do your children attend?

55. A. ASK ALL: Have you ever heard the term urban redevelopment or urban renewal?
 Yes..... 1
 No.....2*

*IF NO, SKIP TO PART D

B. What do you think it is all about? (What is involved?)

How did you learn this?

C. Is any going on in Hamilton? (ASK ONLY IF NOT MENTIONED ABOVE)

Yes..... 1
 No 2*

*IF NO, SKIP TO PART D

C. ASK ALL WHO KNOW OF NORTH-END PROJECT: What are they going to do?

How will it affect you?

Are you in favor of this? (Why? or Why not?)

SKIP TO QUESTION 56.

D. ASK ALL WHO DON'T KNOW OF NORTH-END PROJECT: Do you think there are some things the city should do to improve this neighbourhood? (What?)

E. If changes were made by the government in this part of the city and you had to move, where do you think you would go? Why would you go there?

56. ASK ALL: A. The last question is, what do you like least about living here? (Anything else?)

B. And on the whole, what do you like best about living in this part of the city? (Any other things in particular?)

TIME INTERVIEW ENDED: _____ A.M. _____ P.M.

TO BE FILLED OUT BY INTERVIEWER IMMEDIATELY AFTER INTERVIEW:

1. Length of interview: _____ hrs. _____ mins. Date _____

2. Was anyone else present during the interview? Who?
For how long? Did this affect the interview in any way? How?

Were there any other conditions present that may have affected the interview?

3. How cooperative was the respondent during most of the interview?

4. A. At the beginning, what appeared to be respondent's attitude toward being interviewed?

B. What differences, if any, did you see in the respondent's attitude once the interview got well under way?

5. What subjects, if any, did respondent refuse to discuss fully or seem sensitive about?

6. Did respondent give any indication of his attitude toward ethnic relations on any questions other than 24, 25, 26, 27 and 41?

7. Was there any indication that the respondent had heard of the survey from talking to neighbours, or in any way besides our letter?

STRUCTURE AND DWELLING UNIT

8. Type of Structure:

9. Outside construction material

- Single-family, detached 1
- Single-Family, attached2
- Over store.....3
- Apartment building.....4*

- Brick or masonry..... 1
- Stucco 2
- Wood or overlaid wood 3
- Mixed.....4
- Other 5

*Number of units _____


10. Overall condition of structure:

- Dilapidated 1
- Badly kept outside 2
- Badly kept inside 3
- Old but well kept up 4
- Very good 5

SIGNATURE OF INTERVIEWER _____

APPENDIX #2

AREA MAP



B.C.
AUG. 62.

APPENDIX #3

PUBLICITY LETTERS

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
University College
Hamilton, Ontario

Department of Sociology

Students in the Department of Sociology at McMaster University are interested in finding out how typical families in Hamilton feel about a number of things, such as their jobs, their community, their housing, and so on. In order to find out these things, they are asking several hundred people to talk with them. They are choosing the people to interview from the Hamilton City Directory. They go through the Directory picking out every tenth name. The persons whose names are picked in this way are then asked for an interview. It is in this way that your name has been chosen and we hope that you will consent to talk with one of our students who will call on you within the next few weeks.

As the Professor in charge of this Department, let me assure you that these students are to be trusted. Everything you say to them will be treated as confidential. The interviewers will be glad to answer any questions about this study you may want to ask.

We hope that you will co-operate with us in this study and help us get to know more about the everyday life of our city.

Yours sincerely,

Frank G. Vallee, Associate
Professor,
Chairman of the Department.

FGV/odf

L'UNIVERSITÀ di McMASTER

Hamilton, Ontario

Facoltà di Sociologia

5 Luglio 1962

Distinti Signori:

Gli studenti della facoltà di sociologia dell'Università di McMaster sono interessati nel conoscere i sentimenti delle tipiche famiglie di Hamilton su diversi soggetti come per esempio il loro lavoro, la loro comunità, i loro alloggi e via parlando.

Per mettersi al corrente di queste cose, gli studenti vogliono rivolgersi a parecchie centinaia di persone affinché essi possano parlare con le stesse.

Le persone da intervistare sono scelte dall'elenco telefonico di Hamilton, sfogliando la guida telefonica ogni decimo nome sarà scelto.

Vogliamo sperare che tutti coloro i cui nomi saranno sorteggiati in questa maniera, acconsentiranno di parlare con uno dei nostri studenti che vi visiterà fra poche settimane.

Come professore che dirige questa facoltà vi voglio assicurare che questi studenti sono fidatissimi. Tutto quello che voi direte a loro sarà trattato come confidenziale.

Gli intervistatori saranno lieti di rispondere a qualunque domanda che voi vogliate porgere a riguardo a questo progetto.

Vogliamo sperare che voi collaboriate con noi in questo progetto e che ci aiutate a conoscere meglio la vita comune della nostra città.

Con distinti saluti,

Professore Frank G. Vallée,
Presidente della Facoltà
di Sociologia.

FGV/odf

REFUSAL LETTER

Dear _____,

An interviewer from our department has recently called on you in connection with our survey of Life in the City. I should like to urge your co-operation.

Let me reassure you that everything you say will be completely confidential. No one but the interviewer and the directors of the study will ever know what you said. Once the interview is turned in to the office, and checked off our list of households, the name and address are no longer used by us. The only reason that we ask your name is to keep records of our sample until the interviewing is finished.

Our interviewers have all had extensive training for their job. THEY WILL NOT TRY TO SELL YOU ANYTHING. All they ask is a small amount of your time, and your opinions on various questions. The questions they are concerned with what it is like to live in a large city such as Hamilton. The only way we can know this is to ask the people who live here.

We have chosen every tenth name listed in the city directory. This sample represents a cross-section of all the people who live in the area. It is, therefore, very important that we interview all the people in our sample: if any are left out, the whole study becomes less representative of what people really feel. For this reason, we cannot interview only those people who are most enthusiastic about being interviewed, for they may not feel the same way about many issues as those who are more cautious before consenting to give us their opinions.

Another of our interviewers, -----, will be calling on you again in the near future. He (she) will be able to interview you at any time which is most convenient for you. He (she) will be happy to answer any further questions you might have.

I think you will find the interview both interesting and enjoyable. May I thank you in advance for your co-operation.

Sincerely yours,

FGV.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anderson, R.T. and Anderson, G. "Voluntary Association and Urbanization: A Diachronic Analysis" A.J.S. Vol. 65, 1959.
2. Anderson, W.A. "Family and Individual Social Participation" A.S.R. Vol. 8, 1958. P.420-424.
3. Axelrod, M. and Freedman, R. "Who Belongs to What in a Great Metropolis", General Readings in Sociology.
4. Barber, B. "Participation and Mass Apathy in Associations", Studies in Leadership. ed. Gouldner, Harper 1950. P.477-505.
5. Bell, W. and Boat, M.D., "Urban Neighbourhoods and Informal Social Relations", A.J.S. Vol. 44, 1957. P.391-397.
6. Bell, W. and Force, M.T. "Urban Neighbourhood types and Participation in Formal Associations", A.S.R. Vol. 21, P.25-34.
7. Caplow, T. and Forman, R., "Neighbourhood Interaction in a Homogenous Community", A.S.R. Vol. 15, P.357-366.
8. Dotson, F. "Patterns of Voluntary Association Among Urban Working Class Families", A.S.R. Vol. 16, 1951. P.687-693.
9. Foskett, J.M. "Social Structure and Social Participation", A.S.R. Vol. 20, P.431-438.
10. Goodchild, J.D. and Harding, J. "Formal Organizations and Informal Activities", Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 16, 1960.
11. Greer, S. "Urbanism Reconsidered: A Comparative Study of Local Areas in a Metropolis.", A.S.R., Vol. 21, 1956. P.19-25.
12. Havingshurst, R.J. and Fergenbaum, K. "Leisure and Life Style", A.J.S. Vol. 64, 1959.
13. Komarovsky, M. "Voluntary Associations of Urban Dwellers", A.S.R., Vol. 11, 1946. P.686-698.

14. Mead, M. "Patterns of Leisure in Contemporary American Culture", *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 1957.
15. Mather, W.G. "Income and Social Participation", *A.S.R.* Vol.6, P.380-382.
16. Parson, T. "The Kinship Structure of the Contemporary United States", *American Anthropologist*. Vol. 48, 1943. P.22-38. 1957.
17. Reissman, L. "Class, Leisure and Social Participation", *A.S.R.* Vol. 19, 1954. P.76-84.
18. Scott, J.C. "Membership and Participation in Voluntary Associations", *A.S.R.* Vol. 22, P.315-326.
19. Smith, J., Form, W.H., Stone, G. "Local Intimacy in a Middle Sized City". *A.J.S.* Vol.60, 1954. P.276-284.
20. Wirth, L. "Urbanism as a Way of Life", *A.J.S.* Vol. 44, 1938. P. 1-23.
21. Zimmer, B.G. "Participation of Migrants in Urban Structure", *A.S.R.* Vol. 20, 1955. P.218-224.

BOOKS

1. Gouldner, Studies in Leadership. Harper and Brothers, 1950.
2. Goode and Hatt, Methods in Social Research. McGraw-Hill, 1952.
3. Larrabee, Eric. Mass Leisure. Glencoe Free Press, 1960.
4. Levy, M.J. The Structure of Society. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1952.
5. Miner, H. St. Denis, A French Canadian Parish. University of Chicago Press, 1939.
6. Rose, A.M. Sociology. The Study of Human Relations. Knopf, 1956.
7. Warner, Yankee City Series. (The Social Life of a Modern Community). Vol. 1. Yale University Press, 1959.