

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

A STUDY OF THE SPENDING PRACTICES OF FAMILIES  
KNOWN TO ONE OR MORE OF THE MAJOR SOCIAL  
AGENCIES SERVING FAMILIES IN WINNIPEG

THIS REPORT OF A GROUP RESEARCH PROJECT  
IS SUBMITTED AS PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK  
1964 ✓

Submitted by:

K. F. Black

April, 1964.

Winnipeg, Manitoba.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to members of the Faculty of the University of Manitoba School of Social Work, for interest shown in this project. Special gratitude is extended to Professor Henry Rogers, Faculty Research Advisor, for invaluable advice and guidance which he at all times gave with utmost patience and understanding, and to Doctor Gilbert I. Paul, Instructor in Research Methods, for making available his extensive knowledge of statistics and research methods.

Gratefully acknowledged also, are the cooperation and assistance given by the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department, the Family Court of the Winnipeg Juvenile Court and Family Court, the Province of Manitoba Department of Welfare (Mother's Allowance Branch), and The Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg, in making available their facilities for the gathering of data used in the study.

The writer's deep personal gratitude is extended to William L. Bell, (Mrs.) Lillian M. Blair, M. Stewart Boyce, Marnie C. Carlyle, Valerie J. Cook, Ulysses A. Desrochers, Ernie O. Ens, Edgar W. Epp, Ronald Friesen, (Mrs.) Eleanor S. Fry, Jocelyn M. Haig, Herbert Kasper, Clifford H. McMillan, and Sharon A. McNamara, who, with the writer, formed the research group which met and worked together, sharing information and knowledge in the planning of the study, compilation of data, and analysis of the findings. Appreciation is also expressed to all of the writer's colleagues for help received in the gathering of the data.

## ABSTRACT

This study was carried out in Winnipeg, Manitoba between October, 1963 and May, 1964. It focused on the spending practices of families known to one or more of the five major social agencies serving families in this city, for the purpose of determining the relationship between budget and non-budget spending, and four variables: level of education and training, employment status, amount of income, and length of residence in Winnipeg.

Data was obtained by administration of a schedule in direct interviews with 176 families in a sample chosen from the December, 1963 to January, 1964 caseloads of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department, the Family Court of the Winnipeg Juvenile Court and Family Court, the Province of Manitoba Department of Welfare (Mother's Allowance), and The Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg.

The findings appeared to indicate that the spending practices of a significant number of families served by these agencies were characterized by budget spending, and that there was no significant relationship between these spending practices and level of education and training, employment status, amount of income, or length of residence in Winnipeg.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. BACKGROUND LITERATURE .....	13
III. METHODS .....	23
IV. PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS .....	31
V. CONCLUSIONS .....	36
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	43
APPENDIX A .....	48
APPENDIX B .....	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Spending Practices According to Levels of Education and Training, Shown in Percentage of Families .....	32
2. Spending Practices According to Employment Status, Shown in Percentage of Families .....	33
3. Spending Practices According to Levels of Income, Shown in Percentage of Families .....	34
 Appendix B.	
I. Composition of Sample by Agency Showing Numbers Interviewed and, Where Applicable, Reasons for No Interview .....	54
II. Spending Practices According to Levels of Education and Training, Shown in Number of Families .....	55
III. Spending Practices According to Employment Status, Shown in Number of Families .....	56
IV. Spending Practices According to Levels of Income, Shown in Number of Families .....	57

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The study reported herein, undertaken by a group of students in the Master's Year of the School of Social Work at the University of Manitoba during the Academic year 1963-64, arose out of the concern of the Social Work profession with family functioning in the broadest sense. The activities involved in family functioning are many, and hence more knowledge is needed of these varied yet interrelated patterns of behaviour. Among these areas are those of child rearing practices, kinship patterns and economic practices.

While other groups of students in the same class were studying the former two of these aspects, this study explored the aspect of the economic functioning of families. From its reading and personal experience, the group felt that the prime way in which economic functioning can be perceived and examined is in the area of the family's spending practices - how it uses its available financial resources to provide for its members. From this, then, the purpose of the study reported here was to study the spending practices of the client group served by the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department, the Family Court of the Winnipeg Juvenile and Family Court, the Province of Manitoba Department of Welfare (Mother's Allowance Branch), and The Family Bureau of Greater

Winnipeg.<sup>1</sup>

The importance assumed by money in our society is generally recognized and taken for granted. Efforts to get it and the ways in which it is spent are among the most vital areas of concern in any industrial society. The value placed on materialism influences the ways in which people spend money or experience money problems, and this will influence the ways in which the family fulfills its function of providing necessities for its members. Yet what affect does this cultural value have on those members of our society who for various reasons (including monetary ones) are served by the social agencies in our community? How do these families spend the money available to them?

The group felt that social workers were lacking in a real knowledge of the economic functioning of the families we serve, and that social workers in all fields must be prepared to understand this functioning and the problems related to it. In this way the client can be better helped by our understanding of the social milieu in which he functions. The group felt that examination of spending practices was one way in which this understanding might be promoted. These people, surrounded by the same pressures of materialism and consumption as the non-client group were perhaps less able to handle finances or line

---

<sup>1</sup>Hereinafter referred to collectively as "the major agencies serving families in Winnipeg", or "the Agencies" and individually as C.A.S., C.P.W., F.C., M.A., and F.B. respectively.

up to what they perceived as the "correct" value of our society regarding money. The areas of "use of income" and "spending practices" have been relatively unexplored, and in the context of our changing society are less than meaningful terms. The economic practices themselves need not have been the factor that brought the people to the family agency. A prime assumption regarding the client group studied was that contact of families with major agencies serving families in Winnipeg has been precipitated by some degree of breakdown in family functioning.

The specific focus of this study was the economic practices as reflected in the spending practices of the client group served by one or more of the major agencies serving families in Winnipeg.

With regard to setting, the study was carried out during the period from October 1963 to April 1964, and involved the client group of the major agencies serving families in Winnipeg. It arose out of the general concern of the group and its experience which seemed to indicate that the factors affecting family functioning are largely interdependent and involve all aspects of social functioning, and that spending practices are an important part of this.

The scope of the study was examination of spending practices which were studied in terms of their association with four independent variables - level of education and training, employment status, amount of income and length of residence in Winnipeg.



The spending practices studied included: (1) whether it is planned or impulsive spending, (2) whether it is cash or over-extended credit buying, (3) whether the money is spent on necessities or non-necessities.

There were, of course, obvious limitations. After considerable discussion about this study, the group felt that this area offered a great many variables with which variations in spending practices might be associated, and that with the time limitation involved it would be necessary to choose those variables most valid and readily measurable. For this reason the group selected level of education and training, employment status, amount of income, and length of residence in Winnipeg, regarding these as basic factors in influencing spending practices.

The group felt that the exclusion of any of these four variables would jeopardize the validity of our study, and further, that the inclusion of other factors, while these might broaden the scope would not significantly alter the validity of our conclusions. For example, such variables as ethnic origin, age, or size of family were not considered. The group also did not study who in the families decides what money is to be spent, nor did it explore the feelings of the client group, or measure the stress felt by this group. This stress is seen as related to a social system which places a high value on material goods consumption, ownership and status. Examination of these stresses

could tell us, as social workers, a great deal regarding the economic functioning of the client group, but unfortunately is beyond the scope of a descriptive study. (It is therefore assumed that exclusion of these factors did not jeopardize the significance of the study.)

A great deal of thought was given to the formulation of the hypothesis and sub-hypotheses. Arising out of the rationale given for the purpose of the study, the group discussed the fact of impairment of family functioning seen in the client group, and that in many cases experience would seem to indicate that these people were unable to plan for the dispersal of available finances. It was felt that while these people were subjected to the same pressures to spend that we all are - through the mass media - they were unable to plan wisely and budget their money and often simply did not have enough money to procure the things that the mass media say they "should" procure. It was concluded that the spending practices (outlined above) would vary with such things as level of education and training, employment status, amount of income, and length of residence in Winnipeg. The main hypothesis stated: the spending practices of the majority of the families served by the major agencies serving families in Winnipeg will be characterized by non-budget spending.

The sub-hypotheses following this were as follows (note - the word "families" refers to a majority of families known to the agencies):

(1) The spending practices of families with a low level of education are characterized by non-budget spending, and conversely the spending practices of families with a high level of education are characterized by budget spending.

(2) The spending practices of families with irregularity of employment are characterized by non-budget spending, and conversely the spending practices of families with regularity of employment are characterized by budget spending.

(3) The spending practices of families with low amounts of income are characterized by non-budget spending, and conversely the spending practices of families with a high amount of income are characterized by budget spending.

(4) The spending practices of families with short periods of residence in Winnipeg, whose prior residence was rural, will be characterized by non-budget spending; however if such prior residence was urban, the spending practices will be characterized by budget spending, as will the spending practices of those families with long periods of residence in Winnipeg.

With respect to these sub-hypotheses, it was felt that education could provide maturity, self-discipline and ability to delay gratifications as well as knowledge from specific course content. Also, one of the important factors in an industrial society is specialization,<sup>2</sup> and education is a key to this.

---

<sup>2</sup>Harold L. Wilensky and Charles N. Lebeaux, Industrial Society and Social Welfare, (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958), P. 45.

Regularity of employment can mean more stability and regularity of income, and consequently mean that planned spending is easier. Through the satisfaction gained through meeting perceived needs, this can affect other life roles, as carrying over an important life-task is vital to effective social functioning.<sup>3</sup>

"It is generally agreed that lack of basic economic security heightens the stress of parenthood and intensifies relationship problems."<sup>4</sup>

It is often felt through experience that people with low levels of income mismanage their available money, and that lack of money provides additional stresses on the family.

With respect to the last sub-hypothesis, it was felt that a period of adjustment was needed for someone moving from a rural society to an urban one; that differences exist in the economic ways of life in these two settings. The group was not implying that rural people don't budget; merely that it takes a while before someone with a rural background would feel comfortable with urban economic life.

Throughout this study many terms and concepts are used for which clear definitions are needed. The following is a list of these, and unless otherwise stated in specific instances, these definitions apply throughout the report.

---

<sup>3</sup>Helen H. Perlman, Social Casework A Problem-Solving Process, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp 24-25.

<sup>4</sup>Charlotte Tovele, Common Human Needs, (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1957), P. 65.

Spending practices - for the purpose of this study, spending practices will refer to such aspects of spending as: whether spending is planned or impulsive, by cash or over-extended credit, for necessities or non-necessities.

Client group - that group of people served by one or more of the major agencies serving families in Winnipeg.

Family - Two or more people, one of whom is an adult, related by blood or marriage (including common law unions), and constituting a spending unit.

Budget spending - Planned spending - is the process of thinking through goals, estimating costs, and making choices among alternative uses of money for the co-ordination of resources and expenditures on the basic necessities of life. Such a plan covers a definite period of time from one receipt of income to the next regular receipt of income.

Non-budget spending - Unplanned spending in which there is an absence of the process of thinking through goals, estimating costs, and making choices among alternative uses of money for the co-ordination of resources and expenditures on the basic necessities of life, and where consideration is not given to the period of time from one receipt of income to the next regular receipt of income. It is characterized by spending impulsively, and by over extending credit.

Low level of income - this applies to those families in which the total annual income of the family is equal to or less than the income allowable as basic Federal Income Tax exemptions.

High level of income - this applies to those families in which the total annual income of the family is more than the income allowable as basic Federal Income Tax exemptions.

Income was defined in these terms because a family's needs will definitely be influenced depending upon the number of members in the family. (Although it was recognized that the factor of age in family members may cause a slight variation in family's needs, it was not felt that the variation would be significant enough to warrant the extra consideration which would have been necessary to include this factor in the study.) The income tax exemption structure was chosen as the source of division because it appeared to be the most realistic figure for purposes of analysis in our study. The Department of National Revenue allows for an income tax exemption of \$1000 for a spouse (or first dependent child if no spouse is present), \$300 for each dependent child, and \$1100 for the wageearner.<sup>5</sup>

Over-extended credit - occurs when more than 12% of a family's disposable income is tied up in instalment payments. Higher income families (as defined) may safely allow 20% of income to be tied up in debt.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Guide to the TI Short Income Tax Return, 1963.

<sup>6</sup>F. L. Feldman, The Family in a Money World, (New York: FSAA, 1957), P. 148.

Necessities - refers to the basic necessities as itemized by the Province of Manitoba Department of Welfare budget which includes the following: food, clothing, shelter, utilities, fuel, and health care.<sup>7</sup>

Low level of education - where the family head has completed grade VIII or less.

High level of education - where the family head has completed grade IX or more. The arbitrary delineation between high and low levels of education is based on the fact that it is necessary to complete grade IX to meet the entrance requirements for entering most technical training courses.

Regularity of employment - continuous employment for eight months or more in 1963.

Irregularity of employment - less than eight months of employment in 1963, but not of a seasonal nature.

Seasonal employment - employment for a period of six months during the summer season, approximately May 1 through November 1, 1963.

The group chose to study the employment status of the family head in terms of regularity of employment, irregularity of employment, seasonal employment, or not in the labor force as this status existed in 1963. The group chose 1963 because

---

<sup>7</sup>Clause 2, Manitoba Regulation 25/62 being a Regulation Under the Social Allowances Act and Part III of the Child Welfare Act, Filed 22 Mar. 62. This clause also includes as basic necessities household and personal needs, special needs and funerals.

the study was concerned with current spending practices, and the possibility of accurate recall would lessen with the passing of time. Stability of employment was not considered due to the fact that in this climate certain jobs are available only during the summer months, and it was felt that this seasonal employment is not necessarily unstable. The client group to be assessed in terms of employment status will include only those who are employable. Consideration of employment frequency was not included in that it was felt this was beyond the scope of this study and would be relatively meaningless unless causal factors were evaluated. It was therefore excluded.

Not in Labour Force - refers to those family heads who stated that they were not available for employment during 1963.

Residence - refers to families domiciled in Winnipeg at the time of the study. A short period of residence is twenty-four months or less. A long period of residence is more than twenty-four months.

Place of origin - refers to the client's view of his previous and effectively influencing domicile. Places of origin are as follows: (1) In Winnipeg, (2) Rural Canada, (3) Urban Canada, (4) Urban, out of Canada, (5) Rural, out of Canada.

Head of family - refers to the person in the family to whom the major portion of the income is paid.

These then are the major definitions used in this report.



Assumptions which underlie the study other than those listed above include the following:

- (1) Declared income is assumed to mean actual income.
- (2) The information received from the respondent with regard to the stated variables will be assumed to be accurate as it relates to the family head.

The methods used for collecting the needed data for this study was that of interviewing. It was felt that the direct interview would be the only way that the needed information could be obtained, as it was unlikely that agency records would include this material to any degree of consistency. Hence agency records were not consulted. A systematic random sample of 369 families from the client group of the agencies was taken, and working in conjunction with the other research groups at the School of Social Work, an interview schedule was completed. (The section of the schedule relating to this study appears in Appendix A.) Standard procedures of interviewing were established and questions worded in ways most readily understandable by the respondents. A pilot study proved helpful in clarifying the schedule and overcoming some early difficulties.

The remainder of this report will deal with the background literature on the topic, methods of analysis and presentation of findings, and conclusions of the study. It is the hope of the group that this study will stimulate further research into the area of the economic aspects of family functioning, and will increase the ability of the profession to serve the clients of social agencies.

## CHAPTER II

### BACKGROUND LITERATURE

As economic functioning is one of the major areas of overall family functioning, it is important that Social Workers be aware of what is involved in the decisions and priorities made by families with respect to spending. Schlesinger points out that in studies of the multi-problem family, economic practices along with child rearing and marital difficulties are the three areas of family malfunctioning.<sup>1</sup> For so important an area, surprisingly little research has been carried out to describe what the spending practices of clients of social agencies really are. Because of the virtual lack of studies drawn up along the lines described in Chapter One of the report, the theoretical background has been drawn from the broader knowledge and literature related to family functioning generally and the economic pressures inherent in our modern technological society.

It is a truism to say that the family, as the basic unit of our society, has responsibilities to house, feed and clothe its members. Throughout the life cycle of the family, differing tasks face it with respect to how its money is used. During the beginning phase of the family, spending and saving behaviour is related to current and future capacity and to social expectations.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>B. Schlesinger, The Multi-Problem Family, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), P. 15.

<sup>2</sup>F. L. Feldman, op. cit. P. 29.

Here the new family works out methods of handling the economic elements in the marriage, and attitudes and feelings toward money are more important than the money itself. During the second, or expanding phase of the family cycle, the needs of the children assume more predominance, and children are very sensitive to parental anxieties about money.<sup>3</sup> It has been determined in studies that it costs a total of three years of net income for a couple to raise a child from birth to eighteen years of age.<sup>4</sup> Obviously, then, less than careful use of available resources can cause a great deal of anxiety.

Feldman mentions three groups of money problems with which people come to social agencies: environmental factors (insufficient income), personality difficulties, and social and cultural pressures.<sup>5</sup> In the latter two groups here are included "the problem of family members who lack knowledge of how to develop a spending plan, who are unable to agree on priorities in purchasing, who are unable to account for the expenditure of their money, who over expend for home or car or furniture or other items, and who have low sales resistance because they are in competition with their neighbours and friends."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., P. 42.

<sup>4</sup>M. C. Elmer, The Sociology of the Family, (Boston: Ginn & co., 1945), P. 247.

<sup>5</sup>F. L. Feldman, op. cit., P. 72.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., PP. 72 - 73.

This type of problem has ramifications for the overall functioning of the family regardless of its stage of development. Economic functioning affects not only the material factors - such as possessions, residence, and diet, but the more intangible factors of type and amount of education for children, relative satisfactions within the roles of the respective members, and attitudes toward the use of money. Dysfunctioning in the area of economic practices can therefore affect the next generation and its use of and attitude toward money; as well as the homeostasis of the present family unit. This tends to be thrown more into focus in families who (often because of difficulty in economic practices) have contact with social agencies.

What then, lies behind the difficulties in economic functioning which many families encounter? Our society has undergone tremendous changes in the last century, or even within the last fifty years, and this has affected the way people utilize their financial resources. "There are new products, new kinds of entertainment, new services coming along constantly. Shop windows, newspapers, magazines, radio, television, movies and travel influence us in wanting more and more. We are literally overwhelmed by the variety of goods and services all around us. Choicemaking is therefore more difficult in our times than in the make-what-you-need economy of pioneer times."<sup>7</sup> Vance Packard, writing of the American scene, says:

---

<sup>7</sup>A. W. Troelstrup, Consumer Problems and Personal Finance, Second Edition, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., 1957), P. 110.

Today, the average citizen of the United States is consuming twice as much in the way of goods and services as the average citizen consumed in the years just before World War II. Nearly two-fifths of the things he owns are things that are not essential to his physical well-being. They are optional or luxury items ... There is general evidence of profusion of material wealth even though there is a substantial residue, numbering millions of families, that remains unquestionably ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed. And the television set may be substituting for adequate food in the family budget.<sup>8</sup>

In the midst of affluence, then, are numbers of families who cannot compete with the general trend to fantastic consumption. There are continual and often seductive stimuli, through the mass media, to consume, to conform, and "success" is equated with the ability to achieve the image presented by the stimuli. The efforts to keep consumption spiralling higher "amount to an unprecedented saturation of American life with pleas, hints and other inducements to buy. The sheer dimensions of current and contemplated selling efforts are becoming a national problem."<sup>9</sup>

The pressures to spend money in certain ways affect different people in varying degrees. However it is increasingly apparent "that money is a significant factor in the social adjustment of individuals and families irrespective of their economic status."<sup>10</sup> Stress and anxiety are created by this, and the vulnerable group is that which is least able to live up to

---

<sup>8</sup>V. Packard, The Waste Makers, (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1960), P. 10.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., P. 215.

<sup>10</sup>F. T. Feldman, op. cit., P. iii.

its perceived notions of societal values because of limited financial resources. Not only is this group threatened by this disparity between perceived values and reality expectations, but, as will be mentioned later, is most likely to resort to measures which will inevitably only increase dysfunctioning in economic areas.

While as mentioned in Chapter I, the stress felt by the client group studied is beyond the scope of the study, it is a vital factor in the background material around this study. Helen N. Perlman states that stress arising out of an individual's sense of need is greater now than ever before. She goes on to say that,

The fact is that in our present stage of technological and psychological development, nobody - but nobody - considers subsistence living to be enough to meet his needs. Sometimes we consider it to be enough for somebody else, but never for ourselves. Nor does the client on relief consider it to be enough for himself. He may feel it is all he deserves, or know it is all he can hope for. But underneath this seethes the feeling that there is a very great disparity between what he wants, and thinks he wants, and what society gives him. He is left again with the sense of being a second class member of the community; again feelings of frustration and helplessness may undermine the sense of adequacy and security which is easier to his self-dependence.<sup>11</sup>

While the client group studied include families who represent higher levels of income than recipients of public assistance, many of the same pressures apply. The families, because of their contact with an agency, reflect some defect in

---

<sup>11</sup>H. M. Leyendecker, quoted in: Problems and Policy in Public Assistance, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955), pp. 154 - 55.

family functioning, and economic resources often play a part here, even if indirectly. "The presence or absence of financial resources not only affects the degree of physical well-being of the family members, but also the quality of their personal relationships. It also influences the attitudes that an individual develops about money and its use which, in turn, play a part in determining his role in society and the nature of his relationship with his fellow men."<sup>12</sup> This relates to the factors of economic functioning mentioned above.

The milieu in which the client lives, and in which the family as a unit functions therefore is vital to an understanding of family functioning. The values of ownership, and the desire for vertical mobility create a great deal of anxiety in families who show dysfunctioning in their contact with social agencies. B. Veitch, in an unpublished Masters' thesis for the School of Social Work at the University of Toronto in 1962 spoke of multi-problem families thus:

"Many of their values are essentially middle-class values. That they hold these values, but fail to achieve middle-class standards, has been apparent. However (in the study) we see that they largely identify with middle class standards which they see as desirable, but which they have been frustrated in achieving."<sup>13</sup>

That this frustration (indeed any type of anxiety) can cause problems within the family unit is obvious. Problems can

---

<sup>12</sup>F. L. Feldman, op. cit., P. 17.

<sup>13</sup>Quoted in B. Schlesinger, op. cit., P. 28.

also be activated or aggravated by the responses families make to economic demands (real or perceived). This brings up the general area of spending practices. Basically there are three different types of spending patterns. Families can spend their total income, spend part and save part, or spend more than total income.<sup>14</sup> In determining which of these patterns a family is going to use, another new or different outlook and a change in social attitudes is evident. This is the increase in the use of credit.

The tradition that saving and paying cash for purchases are essential to sound family economy and to self-respect is succumbing to the growing habit of credit, fostered by such popular devices as charge accounts and installment buying. The gospel that once prescribed cutting one's expenditures to fit one's purse is confronted by the new good words that the way to 'get out of the red' is to push one's income up another peg and that 'you've got to spend money nowadays in order to earn it' ... doing without, nowadays, is just a 'tough break', to be avoided by using easy credit that turns wishes into horses overnight and telescopes the future into the present.<sup>15</sup>

This new phenomenon has reached amazing proportions in recent years. Gabriel Kolko, using the Economic Report of the President - 1958, says "The rise of consumer installment credit is one of the most important keys to understanding increases in

---

<sup>14</sup>F. L. Feldman, op. cit., P. 8.

<sup>15</sup>M. C. Elmer, op. cit., PP 233 - 34.



the nations standard of living since World War II, outstanding installment credit amounted to 3.7 per cent of national personal income in 1929, 4.5 per cent in 1935, and 3.5 per cent of national personal income in 1947; it rose to 9.9 per cent in 1957."<sup>16</sup> Several writers have pointed out that the incidence of installment debt is closely related to income. A study by Weeks reported that "to acquire major items, lower income families are much more likely than high income families to buy on time."<sup>17</sup> Kolko reports that the highest incidence of installment debt occurs in the income classes closest to the maintenance level established by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, and that "the lowest income - tenth is by far the most committed (to consumer debt) in relation to income, a reflection of its need to exploit credit in order to keep body and soul together."<sup>18</sup> As this happens, the family mortgages more of its already insecure future to the repayment of these debts, and raises more probability of anxieties and unmet needs within the family unit.

---

<sup>16</sup>G. Kolko, Wealth and Power in America, An Analysis of Social Class and Income Distribution, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962), P. 105.

<sup>17</sup>H. Ashley Weeks, Family Spending Patterns and Health Care, (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), P. 21.

<sup>18</sup>G. Kolko, op. cit., PP 105 - 106.

Because of this growing use of consumer credit, and such other factors as periodic employment, "a built-in feature of our business cycle economy,"<sup>19</sup> Kolko reports that the majority of the population of the United States is faced with insecurity - an economic fact of life.<sup>20</sup> That this economic insecurity is very often related to such things as education and employment is reported by Lampman, when he says "about two-thirds of low income families are headed by persons with no education beyond grammar school. Less than one half of all family heads has such low educational attainment ... It is certainly an independent cause of low income status."<sup>21</sup> He then states "one of the most remarkable characteristics of the low income family heads is the low degree of participation in employment. We estimate that one-third of all low income persons are in consumer units headed by a person in nonemployed status."<sup>22</sup>

From this it can be seen that these interrelated problems have a bearing on how a family functions economically in our consumption-gearred, status-conscious society. (While a large percentage of the literature is based on research carried on in the United States, our societies are sufficiently similar to project the trends indicated while not the actual figures.

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., P. 78.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., P. 129

<sup>21</sup>R. J. Lampman, The Low Income Population and Economic Growth, (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959), P. 9.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., P. 10.

Where the pressures are most apparent throughout the literature are in the lower income sections of the population. Their abilities to maintain their families at the level to which they aspire is limited. Packard states that "the growing barrier, based on education, between people of the limited-success class and those in the semi-upper class evidently has been making wrecks of some of the lower level people without college education, who still believe in the Americans Dream of unlimited opportunities."<sup>23</sup> Sudden loss of income increases the possibility of overwhelming debt and further frustration.

The pressures are felt by other income groups to, and increasing concern is being felt by economists, sociologists, and psychologists about these problems. Feldman says that "the present concern ... is not only with those who lack sufficient income with which to meet their daily needs. It also embraces those who are unable to manage on their income because of social or psychological problems or who use their money irrationally."<sup>24</sup>

This has been a survey of the background material relating to the economic factors in family functioning. It was out of this theoretical framework that the specific focus mentioned in Chapter I was drawn.

---

<sup>23</sup>V. Packard, The Status Seekers, (Montreal: Pocket Books of Canada Ltd., 1961), P. 230.

<sup>24</sup>F. L. Feldman, op. cit., P. 22.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS

The general method used in carrying out this study involved direct interviewing of a systematic random sample of the client group of the Agencies listed above. A prepared schedule (see Appendix A) was used for this purpose. The schedule was a combined one, with sections relating to each of the three aspects of family functioning under study by the class. Each student was given approximately seven names to interview.

The size of the sample was 369 families as this represented the maximum number that the combined research groups mentioned in Chapter I could study with the limitations of time available to them. It was decided that the sample size was not only adequate for the purpose of the study but that a combined schedule for all three groups dealing with various aspects of family functioning would enable the use of a sample group larger than if each group drew its own random sample.

Of the total sample of 369, 193 schedules were not completed. These were not administered, and hence were eliminated from the sample because of the reasons outlined in Table I (see Appendix B.).

The actual number interviewed then, was 176. While this figure represents a significant reduction from the original sample size of 369, it was decided that it was still large enough to represent a valid sample group for study.

Each family of the sample was notified by letter or by a telephone call from the agency serving it prior to administration of the schedule to inform them of the intention to interview. There were differences here, in that some letters were sent from the School of Social Work, University of Manitoba, some directly from the agencies. There appeared to be no influence here on the willingness to cooperate of the persons to whom the letters were sent. A limitation would be that the actual sample is weighted in the lower income groups, as almost 65% of the actual sample as outlined in Table I is from C.P.W.D. or M.A. The major limitation arising out of the use of this sample is that it can be projected only to the client group of the agencies under study and not to the community at large or to groups within communities outside Winnipeg.

The schedule was arrived at through a series of meetings at which the fifteen members of the research group discussed the problem under study. Actual questions were chosen by group consensus as to their relation to the hypothesis and the variables decided upon. The schedule when completed was tested by a pilot study of 45 families drawn as a random sample.

After evaluating the results of the pilot study, the research group decided that the information relating to the purchase of necessities or non-necessities was unreliable and confusing to both researcher and respondent. The questions had been asked to measure the spending preferences of the respondent. The schedule listed fourteen consumer items which included six necessity and eight non-necessity items. The respondent was required to state the order in which it was his habit to purchase these items. From the pilot study it seemed that the respondent was allowed to answer according to what would likely be approved by welfare agencies or society expectations generally rather than his actual preferences. On the basis of this the schedule was changed specifically in the section relating to spending practices. The final form of the schedule relating to this study appears in Appendix A. A second pilot study of the revised schedule was not carried out because of time limitations, but this would no doubt have been worthwhile.

Each section of the schedule related to one of the variables being tested (level of education and training, amount of income, employment status, and length of residence) with the last section on spending practices related to the main hypothesis of the study. Introductory remarks preceding some of the sections served as an aid to both the interviewer and respondent in understanding the section following. These remarks were hence a guide, and this served to standardize the administration of the various

parts of the schedule. Briefing sessions for all the research groups studying aspects of family functioning were held to further standardize administration.

In the first four sections of the schedule, the questions related to specific information on each of the four variables. The first section of the schedule was related to level of education and training. These questions were placed first because it was felt that they were the most easily answered and would provide the least threat to the respondent. The grade "completed" (as opposed to grade "attended") was specifically requested because eligibility requirements for training institutes usually include a specific complete level of academic achievement. It was felt that "other training" would generally be covered by those mentioned on the schedule, and by reading this list would explain to the respondent what was meant by "additional training."

The section related to employment sought to determine two things: whether or not the respondent was to be included in the labour market, or in other words was "available for employment"; and if so, if this was regular, seasonal, or irregular as related to our definitions in Chapter I. A negative answer to the first question (2(a)) precluded the necessity for continuing. A negative answer to both 2 (b) and 2 (c) indicated irregular employment.

The third section, related to income, determined who was the head of the household ("To whom is the major source of income paid?"), and placed the respondent into either the high or low income level as outlined in Chapter I.

The section related to residence was asked to determine the length of time the respondent had lived in Winnipeg and what they considered their background to be. This was broken down into rural or urban Canada and rural or urban outside of Canada, and if residence was for less than 25 months, prior residence was established. This related to the rationale and definition outlined in Chapter I. This section also determined the actual length of residence in Winnipeg of the respondent.

As mentioned above, the section on spending practices was changed after the pilot study to offer a series of questions which would elicit more direct responses and reduce the emotional implications present in the first schedule. In the revised schedule, questions were asked in the general categories of shelter, utilities, food, clothing, and medical insurance, all of which were defined as necessities; and vehicle ownership, possession of a television set or telephone, purchase of liquor, taking of vacations, and usual methods of travel, all of which were considered non-necessities. This delineation between necessities and non-necessities is related to the definition of necessities which appears in Chapter I. The respondent was given a choice of answers. These responses were classified under budget or non-budget type of spending, as well as this, the answer "sometimes" was included as a possible answer to some questions as it was felt that this could be a less threatening response than "always" or "never". For the purpose of



this study and for the plan of analysis, an answer of "sometimes" was considered a non-budget response.

For our plan of analysis, the questions in the spending practices section of the schedule which indicated budgetting for necessities were those concerning shelter, utilities, food and clothing. The questions which indicated budgetting for non-necessities were those relating to telephone, vehicle ownership, television, liquor and usual mode of travel.

Several limitations on the use of the schedule related to the plan of analysis must be noted here. Several questions in the schedule were not included in the plan of analysis for several reasons and were therefore eliminated from the study. These limitations were as follows:

1. Question 5(e), "Do you carry full medical coverage?" and "were you able to pay for this yourself?", was not considered in the analysis. It was found that a large proportion of the sample tested was enrolled on one of the welfare programs, and that their medical coverage is paid for them automatically. This therefore invalidated their responses. Aside from this the question did not include whether or not those who were paying for coverage themselves were able to meet the payments.
2. Question 5(i), "Do you ever take a vacation trip?" and "Do you ever entertain friends (have parties)?", was not considered in the analysis as it was felt it was not an indication of budget or non-budget spending.

3. Question 5, "Have you ever had to move because you were not able to pay the rent?", was not considered in the analysis as it was found it did not provide the information that was wanted. It was worded so that it could indicate either budget or non-budget spending. For example, if the respondent answered in the affirmative as they moved because of a change in income level, they might have moved because they knew they couldn't afford the rent. This would show budget spending although on the surface the answer could be taken to indicate non-budgetting.

On the basis of the analysis of the schedule outlined above, the main classification and cross-classification were established. The answers were classified according to budget or non-budget spending. These areas of budget or non-budget spending were further broken down into the following categories:

1. Over-all budget spending.
2. Budgetting for necessities but not for non-necessities.
3. Budgetting for non-necessities but not for necessities.
4. Over-all non-budget spending.

If the respondent gave a negative answer to two or more of the questions which concerned necessities, and one or more of the questions concerning non-necessities, he was considered an over-all non-budget spender. If he answered two or more questions negatively of those relating to necessities, but had all positive

answers to the questions on non-necessities, he was considered a budgeter for non-necessities but not necessities. Negative answers to one or more of the questions concerning non-necessities and positive answers to less than two questions on necessities indicated budget spending for necessities but not non-necessities. Respondents who gave no negative answers were considered over-all budget spenders.

The questions on the schedule from 5(j) to the end of the section on spending practices served as a check on the former questions and were classified with each of the four categories. Any discrepancies which turned up will be dealt with in the analysis in Chapter IV. If no discrepancy was found, then this check verified that the respondent was in that particular category of the classification.

The cross-classification was done between the four categories and the four variables of education, employment, income and residence. Data showing the comparison of each of the independent variables with the four categories of spending practices was tabulated showing both numbers and percentage of families. The exception to this was the variable of length of residence in Winnipeg, which was not tabulated because of insufficient data. The presentation of the findings appears in the following chapter.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

A total of 176 completed schedules was obtained; three of these were incomplete and not included in the analysis. The balance, 173 schedules, fell into two groups; one numbering 32, and the other 141. The group numbering 32 was removed from the detailed analysis because the responses to questions in the schedule were inconsistent - one section of the responses indicated one thing, and another section of responses indicated the opposite, so rendering any comparative appraisal difficult. (In these cases the responses to questions in the first part of the schedule indicated a pattern similar to the responses given by the group of 141.)

The findings based on the 141 schedules in which questions were answered consistently indicated the following spending patterns: 16% were over-all non-budgeters, 11% budgeted for non-necessities only, 9% budgeted for necessities only, and 64% were over-all budgeters. As almost two-thirds were over-all budgeters, the main hypothesis appeared not to be supported.

With respect to spending practices according to level of education and training: for each educational level the percentage according to spending practices was calculated. These findings are reported in Table I. (For totals given in actual figures, see Table II, Appendix B.)

TABLE 1

SPENDING PRACTICES ACCORDING TO LEVELS OF  
EDUCATION AND TRAINING SHOWN  
IN PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES

EDUCATION	TOTAL	Low Level No Other Training	Low Level With Other Training	High Level No Other Training	High Level With Other Training
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Over-All Non-Budget	16.0 <sup>a</sup>	16.0	8.0	19.0	13.0
Budget for Non- Essentials Only	11.0	13.0	8.0	11.0	9.0
Budget for Essentials Only	9.0	11.0	8.0	6.0	9.0
Over-All Budget	64.0	60.0	75.0	64.0	70.0

(a) Percentages may not total 100.0 due to rounding.

The reader will notice that there appears to be no association between spending practices and level of education.

With respect to spending practices according to employment status: for each category of employment the percentage of respondents according to spending practices was calculated. The percentage of respondents not in the labour force was also calculated, although this group was not considered in the analysis. These findings are reported in Table 2. (For totals given in actual figures, see Table III, Appendix B.)

TABLE 2

SPENDING PRACTICES ACCORDING TO  
EMPLOYMENT STATUS SHOWN IN  
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES

EMPLOYMENT	TOTAL	Not In Labor Force	Irregularly Employed	Seasonally Employed	Regularly Employed
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Over-All Non-Budget	16.0	15.0	19.0	0.0	15.0
Budget for Non- Essentials Only	11.0	9.0	8.0	50.0	15.0
Budget for Essentials Only	9.0	7.0	8.0	0.0	13.0
Over-All Budget	64.0	68.0	65.0	50.0	58.0

The reader will notice that there appears to be no association between employment status and spending practices. Only two respondents were seasonally employed, and this is surprising because the interviewing was carried out during the winter when a higher number of seasonally employed people would perhaps be expected to appear.

With respect to spending practices according to levels of income: for each income level the percentage of respondents according to spending practices was calculated. These findings are reported in Table 3. (For totals given in actual figures see Table IV, Appendix B.)

TABLE 3

SPENDING PRACTICES ACCORDING TO  
LEVELS OF INCOME SHOWN IN  
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES

INCOME	TOTAL	LOW -- LEVEL	HIGH -- LEVEL
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Over-All Non-Budget	16.0	16.0	14.0
Budget for Non- Essentials Only	11.0	10.0	18.0
Budget for Essentials Only	9.0	11.0	4.0
Over-All Budget	64.0	64.0	64.0

The reader will notice that there appears to be no association between levels of income and spending practices.

It was originally hypothesized that long periods of residence would influence budget spending in a positive way. The findings indicated that only two heads of families had residence in Winnipeg of less than twenty-four months, and that the average period of residence in Winnipeg was twenty years. This may suggest a reason why 64%, or the majority of the client group, could be classified as budget spenders. Previous residence was not considered because of the small number who had less than twenty four months residence.

The data presented in the tables relating spending practices to education, employment and income, indicate that these variables seem to have little influence on the spending practices of the client group of the agencies. Further interpretation of the findings will be given in Chapter V.



## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS

This study sought to describe the spending practices of the client group served by the major agencies serving families in Winnipeg, focussing on the hypothesis: The spending practices of the majority of the families served by the major agencies serving families in Winnipeg will be characterized by non-budget spending. This aspect of family functioning was studied because it was considered that economic practices comprise an important part of family and societal adjustment, and that increased knowledge of the people we serve could result in better use of ourselves as professional social workers.

The group studied the association of spending practices with four independent variables which made up our sub-hypotheses which stated:

1. The spending practices of families with a low level of education are characterized by non-budget spending, and conversely, the spending practices of families with a high level of education are characterized by budget spending.
2. The spending practices of families with irregularity of employment are characterized by non-budget spending, and conversely, the spending practices of families with regularity of employment are characterized by budget spending.

3. The spending practices of families with low amounts of income are characterized by non-budget spending, and conversely, the spending practices of families with a high amount of income are characterized by budget spending.
4. The spending practices of families with short periods of residence in Winnipeg, whose prior residence was rural, will be characterized by non-budget spending, however if such prior residence was urban, the spending practices will be characterized by budget spending, as will the spending practices of those families with long periods of residence in Winnipeg.

As the findings as presented in Chapter IV indicate that approximately two-thirds of the completed schedules showed spending practices that could be characterized by budget spending, the main hypothesis was not supported. While interpretation of these findings must be limited due to the lack of statistical significance, several things can be said. First of all, the efficacy of casework assistance for these people cannot be discounted, and might be a positive influence upon the ways in which the client group manage their economic affairs. However no analysis of findings by agency was attempted.

Also, the measurement of current spending practices was attempted, and it must be remembered that for the clients of public assistance agencies, there is at least implicit instructions as to how money is to be spent.

A major qualification on the findings involves the schedule used to test the hypothesis and sub-hypothesis (see Appendix A). While the findings might tend to suggest that the hypothesis alone was incorrect, the schedule should be examined to see if it really was designed to show what it was intended to show. For example, as outlined in Chapter III, the question concerning ability to budget for rent was eliminated from analysis because of its ambiguity. Similarly with respect to food and clothing (both essential items) a negative answer was possible only if the respondent showed an inability to budget for credit payments on these items. Findings indicated that the respondents budgeted for credit purchases but the schedule did not measure ability to budget for cash payments of food or clothing. This might have affected the way in which data was analyzed for inclusion into one of the categories of budget or non-budget spending. In the question regarding repossession and garnisheed wages, no time limit was imposed, and hence the measurement of current spending practices (or practices within a specific time period such as twelve months) was rendered impossible. It would appear as if the schedule attempted to measure too many factors - and had limited application to our specific focus.

The findings do indicate that the schedule had reliability. In the three tables presented in Chapter IV, reasonably consistent responses are noticeable. With only two exceptions not less than 58% nor more than 70% of respondents in the various

categories were characterized by over-all budget spending. This is consistent with 64% over-all budget spenders indicated by the total completed schedules. Similarly with over-all non-budget spending, with the same two exceptions, the same consistency occurs - variations being from 13% to 19% compared with 18% in the total completed schedules.

The sub-hypothesis, the spending practices of families with a low level of education are characterized by non-budget spending, and conversely, the spending practices of families with a high level of education are characterized by budget spending, was not substantiated, and no association was seen between level of education and spending practices. With respect to this sub-hypothesis however, several additional findings can be noted. 49.6% of the completed schedules showed a low level of education with no other training (see Table 1, p. 32) and this might be important to remember in working with the client group generally. Conversely, the number with a high level of education, both with and without additional training, amounts to 41.8% of the completed schedules and this too is a high percentage. However the study did not attempt to measure respondents as to the reason for their being known to the agency and no attempt was made to establish relationships between variables (for example the number with low level of education who also had low income, irregular employment status, etc.).

The sub-hypothesis, the spending practices of families with irregularity of employment are characterized by non-budget spending, and conversely, the spending practices of families with regularity of employment are characterized by budget spending, was not substantiated, as no association was shown between employment status and spending practices. Mention was made in Chapter IV of the fact that only two respondents were seasonally employed, although the schedule was administered during the time of year when seasonal unemployment would be at its peak. The extremely long and temperate autumn in 1963 might be part of the reason for this, coupled with the extensive winter works projects being carried out in this region. Mr. G.G. Myers of the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department stated that the decrease in numbers of welfare recipients during late 1963 was due to winter works projects, C.M.H.A. projects in the Winnipeg area and departmental reorganization.<sup>1</sup> In February 1964, a Winnipeg newspaper reported that the prairie region has the lowest rate of unemployment in Canada during 1963.<sup>2</sup>

The sub-hypothesis, the spending practices of families with low amounts of income are characterized by non-budget spending, and conversely, the spending practices of families with a high amount of income are characterized by budget spending was not substantiated, as there was no association shown between amount of income and spending practices. An additional finding

---

<sup>1</sup> The Winnipeg Tribune, Winnipeg: January 28, 1964.  
<sup>2</sup> Ibid., February 26, 1964.

here was that 113, or 80% of completed schedules showed low amounts of income, while as shown in Table I (Appendix B), 65% of respondents were from public assistance agencies. This would indicate that 15% of respondents, while having low amounts of income, were able to manage economically without assistance from a financial agency. In this case the findings indicating ability to budget might be important, as poor spending practices might necessitate outside assistance for these marginal families.

The sub-hypothesis, the spending practices of families with short periods of residence in Winnipeg, whose prior residence was rural, will be characterized by non-budget spending, however if such prior residence was urban, the spending practices will be characterized by budget spending, as will the spending practices of families with long periods of residence in Winnipeg, was not substantiated, in that only two family heads had residence less than twenty-four months.

While the hypothesis and sub-hypothesis studied were not substantiated, several findings of interest have been noted. Almost 50% of the client group studied were found to have low levels of education, and 80% to have low levels of income. Mention was made of the surprisingly low number of seasonally employed people. It is felt that further study could be advantageous in the areas shown here - areas that showed findings which were not anticipated at the beginning of the study. The whole area of credit buying and the extent and use of credit by the client group would also be a fruitful one for study.

It is felt that the study did show that knowledge of the economic practices of the families with whom the agencies deal is incomplete, and that misconceptions of this group are very evident. Further study could lead to more complete understanding and hence to better service - the goal of every agency through which any client group is reached.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

- Andrews, Benjamin R. Economics of the Household. New York: Macmillan Company, 1935.
- Angell, R. C. The Family Encounters the Depression. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1936.
- Anshen, Ruth N. The Family: Its Function and Destiny. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Baber, Ray E. Marriage and the Family. Toronto: McGraw - Hill Book Company, 1953.
- Blood, Robert O. Jr., and Wolfe, David. Husbands and Wives. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.
- Buell, Bradley, et al. Community Planning for Human Services. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Cavan, Ruth S., and Ranck, Katherine H. The Family and the Depression. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Clark, Lincoln H. Consumer Behavior. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.
- David, M. H. Family Composition and Consumption. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company, 1962.
- Davis, Allison. The Family in a Democratic Society. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.
- Duvall, Evelyn M. Family Development. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1957.
- Elmer, M. C. The Sociology of the Family. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1945.
- Feldman, Frances L. The Family in a Money World. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1957.
- Geismar, Ludwig L., and Ayres, Beverly. Measuring Family Functioning. St. Paul: Community Chest and Council, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1960.
- Gordon, Leland J. Economics for the Consumer. New York: American Book Company, 1950.



- Groves, Ernest R. The Family and Its Relationships. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1953.
- Hill, Reuben. Families Under Stress. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Hoeflin, Ruth M. Essentials of Family Living. New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Hyman, H., et al. Interviewing in Social Research. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Kolko, Gabriel. Wealth and Power in America: An Analysis of Social Class and Income Distribution. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publisher, 1962.
- Koos, E. L. Families in Trouble. New York: King's Crown Press, 1946.
- Kyrk, Hazel. The Family in the American Economy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Legasse, Jean H. The People of Indian Ancestry in Manitoba. Vol. II. Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, 1959.
- Leyendecker, Hilary M. Problems and Policy in Public Assistance. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.
- Nickell, Paulena. Management in Family Living. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Packard, Vance. The Status Seekers. Montreal: Pocket Books of Canada, Ltd., 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Waste Makers. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1960.
- Tepping, Hugo E. Standard of Living: the Concept and its Place in Economics. Helsingfors, Finland: Centraltryckeriet, 1953.
- Perlman, Helen H. Social Casework: A Problem-Solving Process. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Roney, Joy L. Family Casework in the Interest of Children. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1958.

- Samuelson, Paul A. Economics: An Introductory Analysis. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw - Hill Book Co., Inc., 1951.
- Schlesinger, Benjamin. The Multi-Problem Family. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.
- Sussman, Marvin B. Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.
- Towle, Charlotte. Common Human Needs. New York: American Association of Social Workers, 1953.
- Troelstrup, Arch W. Consumer Problems and Personal Finance. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw - Hill Book Company Inc., 1957.
- Weeks, H. Ashley. Family Spending Patterns and Health Care. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Wilensky, Harold L., and Lebeaux, Charles N. Industrial Society and Social Welfare. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958.
- Williams, Robin M. American Society. 2nd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
- Winch, Robert F., McGinnis, Robert, and Carringer, Herbert P. Selected Studies in Marriage and the Family. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1953.
- Winch, Robert F. The Modern Family. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952.
- Woods, Sister Frances Jerome. The American Family System. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

- Boehm, Werner W. "The Nature of Social Work," Social Work, Vol. III, No. 2 (April, 1958), pp. 10 - 18.
- Bowman, M. J. "Educational Shortage and Excess," The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, Vol. XXIX, No. 4 (November, 1963).
- Brady, Dorothy S. "The Use of Statistical Procedures in the Derivation of Family Budgets," Social Service Review, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 (June, 1949), pp. 141-157.
- Calnan, Wilfred M. "Employment, Unemployment and Education," Public Welfare, Vol. XXI, No. 1 (Jan, 1963), pp 21 - 27.

- Hill, Reuben. "The American Family: Problem or Solution?", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LIII, No. 2, pp. 125 - 130.
- Grattan, H. "Buying on Time: Where Do You Stop?", Harper's Magazine, Vol. VCLXII, April 1956.
- Kenkel, William F. "Influence Differentiation in Family Decision Making," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. XLII, pp 18 - 25.
- Loeb, Martin B. "Social Class and the American Social System," Journal of Social Work, Vol. VI, No. 2 (April, 1961) pp. 12 - 18.
- Meyer, Carol H. "Individualizing the Multi-Problem Family," Social Casework, Vol. LXIV, No. 5 (May, 1963), pp 267-272.
- Miller, Walter B. "Implications of Urban Lower Class Culture for Social Work," Social Service Review, Vol. XXXIII, No. 3 (Sept, 1959), pp. 219 - 236.
- Mitchell, W. C. "The Background Art of Spending Money," American Economic Review, Vol. II, (1912), pp. 269 - 281.
- Morgan, John S. "What Do You Mean, A Good Income?", Canadian Welfare, Vol. XXXIX, No. 3 (May - June, 1963), pp. 105-107.
- Munns, V. B. "Unemployment - Its Impact on Family Life," The Social Worker, Vol. XXIII, No. 4 (April, 1955) pp. 3 - 6.
- Roney, Joy L. "Special Stresses on Low - income Families," Social Casework, Vol. XXXIX, (1958), pp. 150 - 156.
- Svare, Ivor. "Client Attitudes Toward Financial Assistance: a Cultural Variant," Social Service Review, Vol. XXX, No. 2 (June, 1956), pp. 136 - 146.
- Towle, Charlotte. "Economic Aspects of the Reunited Family," Social Service Review, Vol. XX, No. 3 (September, 1946), pp. 343 - 353.
- Taylor, M. G., et al. "An Integrated Approach to Welfare," The Canadian Welfare Council, Ottawa: 1963, (pamphlet).
- MacDonald, Dwight. "Our Invisible Poor," New York: Sidney Hillman Foundation Reprint Dept., 1963 Copyright - New Yorker Magazine, 1963 (pamphlet).
- The Winnipeg Free Press, December 28, 1963.
- The Winnipeg Tribune, January 16, 1964.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

- Canada. Department of National Revenue, Taxation Division, 1963 T1 Short Income Tax Return and Guide.
- Canada. Worker's Handbook on Unemployment Insurance. 16th ed. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1961.
- Canada. Canada Year Book. Handbook and Library Division, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1963.
- Canada. City Family Expenditure, 1955. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1957, (Reference Paper No. 83).
- Canada. Twentieth Annual Report. Royal Canadian Air Force Benevolent Fund, Ottawa: 1963.
- International. Methods of Family Living Studies. Geneva: International Labor Office, 1949.
- Province of Manitoba. "Time Sale Agreement Act," Statutes of Manitoba, Chapter 76, 1962. (Amendment to the Act) Statutes of Manitoba, Chapter 87, 1963.
- Province of Manitoba. Manitoba Regulation 25/62 (Clause 2) Being a Regulation under the Social Allowance Act and Part III of the Child Welfare Act.
- Province of Ontario. Legislature of Ontario Debates Official Report, Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature, Friday, April 26, 1963. Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1963.
- United States. Lammman, Robert J. The Low Income Population and Economic Growth. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959.
- United States. The American Family, a Factual Background. National Conference on Family Life, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1948.
- United States. Family Spending and Saving at Different Income Levels. (Bulletin 723). Department of Labor Statistics, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1948.
- United States. Urban - Rural Differences. (Bulletin 723). Department of Labor Statistics, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1948.

APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE

ECONOMIC PRACTICES

1. Education

Mother

Father

(a) What is the highest grade completed at school?

(a) What is the highest grade completed at school?

0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11  
12,13

0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11  
12,13

CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

(b) Have you had any other training? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

(b) Have you had any other training? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

(c) If so, what kind?

(c) If so, what kind?

University \_\_\_\_\_  
Vocational \_\_\_\_\_  
Nursing training \_\_\_\_\_  
Teachers college \_\_\_\_\_  
Business college \_\_\_\_\_  
Apprenticeship \_\_\_\_\_  
Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

University \_\_\_\_\_  
Vocational \_\_\_\_\_  
Nursing training \_\_\_\_\_  
Teachers college \_\_\_\_\_  
Business college \_\_\_\_\_  
Apprenticeship \_\_\_\_\_  
Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(d) How many years of this training? less than 1, 1, 2,3,4,5,6,7,

(d) How many years of this training? less than 1, 1, 2,3,4,5,6,7,

(e) Did you complete this training? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

(e) Did you complete this training? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

COMMENTS:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



3. Income (continued)

10	11	12	13	14	15	16
\$4500.	\$4800.	\$5100.	\$5400.	\$5700.	\$6000.	\$6300.
above	above	above	above	above	above	above
below	below	below	below	below	below	below

(c) To whom is the major source of income paid?

4. Residence

Mother

Father

Check one

(a) How long have you lived in Winnipeg?

(a) How long have you lived in Winnipeg?

( ) 1-3 months

( ) 1-3 months

( ) 4-12 months

( ) 4-12 months

( ) 13-24 months

( ) 13-24 months

If over 24 months, indicate length. \_\_\_\_\_

If over 24 months, indicate length. \_\_\_\_\_

If less than 25 months, please write in the last place of residence before coming to Winnipeg.

Mother

Father

Where did you come from?

Where did you come from?

( ) rural Canada

( ) rural Canada

( ) urban Canada

( ) urban Canada

( ) rural (outside of Canada)

( ) rural (outside of Canada)

( ) urban (outside of Canada)

( ) urban (outside of Canada)

What is your background? Check

What is your background? Check

( ) country

( ) country

( ) city

( ) city

( ) small town

( ) small town

( ) other (specify)

( ) other (specify)

5. Spending Practices

There are many different ways in which people spend their money. Would you give us some information about your way? For instance:

A. (a) Do you: Own \_\_\_\_\_ Rent \_\_\_\_\_ the House \_\_\_\_\_ Apartment \_\_\_\_\_ in which you are living?

If answer is "Rent": Is it: Furnished \_\_\_\_\_ Partly furnished \_\_\_\_\_ Unfurnished \_\_\_\_\_? (i.e. by the landlord)

How often do you pay the rent? Weekly \_\_\_\_\_ Semi-monthly \_\_\_\_\_ Monthly \_\_\_\_\_

Do you pay it in advance? Always \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Never \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever had to move because you were not able to pay the rent? Often \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Never \_\_\_\_\_

If answer is "Own": Is it, Paid for in full \_\_\_\_\_ Mortgaged \_\_\_\_\_?

Are you able to meet the mortgage payments when they are due? Always \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Never \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Is fuel included in the rent? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Are utilities included in the rent? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Do you ever get behind in payments for fuel or utilities? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Do you have a telephone? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Has the gas or power company ever threatened to discontinue services because you were unable to pay the bill? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Has your telephone ever been disconnected because you were unable to pay the bill? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

(c) How often do you go grocery shopping? Every day \_\_\_\_\_ Irregularly, as needed \_\_\_\_\_ once a week \_\_\_\_\_

Do you buy groceries by charge account? Always \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Never \_\_\_\_\_

How often do you pay the charge account? Weekly \_\_\_\_\_ Semi-weekly \_\_\_\_\_ Monthly \_\_\_\_\_

Do you ever get behind in these payments? Always \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Never \_\_\_\_\_



- (d) Do you buy clothing by: Cash \_\_\_\_\_ Charge Account \_\_\_\_\_?  
If answer is "charge account": Do you ever get behind in these payments? Always \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Never \_\_\_\_\_
- (e) Do you carry full medical coverage? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Were you able to pay for this yourself? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- (f) Do you own a car or truck? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, Was it bought by Cash \_\_\_\_\_ Financed \_\_\_\_\_?  
If "financed": Are you able to meet the payments when they are due? Always \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Never \_\_\_\_\_
- (g) Do you own a T.V. set? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Was it bought by: Cash \_\_\_\_\_ Credit \_\_\_\_\_?  
If "credit": Have you been able to meet the payments: Always \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Never \_\_\_\_\_
- (h) How much liquor do you buy every week? Beer \_\_\_\_\_ Wine \_\_\_\_\_  
Hard liquor \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in approximate amounts)
- (i) Do you ever take a vacation trip? Yearly \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_  
Never \_\_\_\_\_  
Do you ever entertain friends (have parties)? Often \_\_\_\_\_  
Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Never \_\_\_\_\_
- (j) Do you usually travel by: Bus \_\_\_\_\_ Taxi \_\_\_\_\_ Walk \_\_\_\_\_  
Drive own car \_\_\_\_\_?
- (k) Has anything you bought ever been repossessed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Have your wages ever been garnisheed to pay for something you bought? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Spending Practices

B. (a) How much of your monthly income is spent using cash? \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
using credit? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Are you able to save any? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, how much? \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

(b) In this next question about buying, there are again a number of ways of purchasing things you want. Maybe you could describe your particular way of buying, that is:

When you see something you like to buy, do you

(i) buy it immediately? \_\_\_\_\_

OR

(ii) think about it for awhile first and then buy it?  
\_\_\_\_\_

(c) Are you paid by cash or cheque? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

OR

Are you on an administered budget? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B

TABLE I

COMPOSITION OF SAMPLE BY AGENCIES SHOWING  
NUMBERS INTERVIEWED AND WHERE APPLICABLE  
REASON FOR NO INTERVIEW

	TOTAL	C.P.W.D.	M.A.	F.C.	C.A.S.	F.B.
Population	2701	1310	395	441	420	135
Sample Drawn	369	146	45	63	70	45
Interview not Requested	54	2	—	3	33	16
Interview Requested	315	144	45	60	37	29
Refused	77	47	7	15	6	2
Moved and/or Unable to Locate	62	11	10	26	8	7
Interviewed	176	86	28	19	23	20

TABLE II

SPENDING PRACTICES ACCORDING TO  
LEVELS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING  
SHOWN IN NUMBER OF FAMILIES

EDUCATION	TOTAL	Low Level- No Other Training	Low Level- With Other Training	High Level- No Other Training	High Level- With Other Training
Total	141	70	12	36	23
Over-All Non-Budget	22	11	1	7	3
Budget For Non- Necessities Only	16	9	1	4	2
Budget For Necessities Only	13	8	1	2	2
Over-All Budget	90	42	9	23	16

TABLE III

SPENDING PRACTICES ACCORDING TO  
EMPLOYMENT STATUS SHOWN IN  
NUMBER OF FAMILIES

EMPLOYMENT	TOTAL	Not In Labour Force	Irregularly Employed	Seasonally Employed	Regularly Employed
Total	141	66	26	2	47
Over-All Non-Budget	22	10	5	0	7
Budget For Non- Necessities Only	16	6	2	1	7
Budget for Necessities Only	13	5	2	0	6
Over-All Budget	90	45	17	1	27

TABLE IV

SPENDING PRACTICES ACCORDING TO  
LEVELS OF INCOME SHOWN IN  
NUMBER OF FAMILIES

INCOME	TOTAL	LOW LEVEL	HIGH LEVEL
Total	141	113	28
Over-All Non-Budget	22	18	4
Budget for Non-Necessities Only	16	11	5
Budget for Necessities Only	13	12	1
Over-All Budget	90	72	18