

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

A STUDY OF KINSHIP RELATIONSHIPS
OF FAMILIES SERVED BY FIVE MAJOR
FAMILY AGENCIES IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

BEING A THESIS SUBMITTED IN
PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

by

Clifton L. Monk

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

APRIL, 1964



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer of this study, a participant in a research group of fifteen members, acknowledges with warm appreciation the interest, guidance and advice received from the members of the Faculty of the University of Manitoba School of Social Work, especially the assistance of Miss Patricia Woolley, Research Adviser, and Mr. H. Rogers, Instructor in Research Methods.

The contribution of Dr. G. I. Paul, Associate Professor in the Department of Actuarial Mathematics and Statistics, is also acknowledged. Special thanks go to the staff members of the five agencies who assisted in drawing the sample and in preparing the families for interviewing.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis was to study some aspects of the kinship relationships of the nuclear family with the modified extended family as a part of family functioning. The families studied were known to one or more of five major family agencies in the City of Winnipeg. The area of the study encompassed variations of relationships associated with ethnic origin, orientation of wife's family of origin, inter-generational ties and differences in occupational level.

The study was based on data obtained from face-to-face interviews with a sample group of fifty-six families. Findings revealed a majority of the nuclear families studied were not isolated from the modified extended family. According to the definition of isolation used in the study, 59 per cent of the families were considered non-isolated and 41 per cent isolated. There were no noticeable variations in relationships of the nuclear families with their modified extended families in relation to the variables studied.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	15
III. METHOD	41
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	56
V. CONCLUSIONS	69
APPENDIX A	81
APPENDIX B, ADDITIONAL DATA	92
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	96

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Numbers and Percentages of Nuclear Families According to Number of Contacts With the Modified Extended Family	57
2. Distribution of Nuclear Families According to Ethnic Groups and Number of Contacts With the Modified Extended Family	59
3. Numbers and Percentages of Nuclear Families According to Orientation of Family of Origin and Number of Contacts With the Modified Extended Family	61
4. Number of Nuclear Families According to Amount of Contact With Identified Relatives in Same or Different Occupational Levels	65
5. Relationship Between Total Number of Contacts and Expressed Sources of Potential Help	66
Appendix B	
I. Population, Sample, and Number of Families Interviewed and Not Interviewed, of Five Family Agencies in City of Winnipeg, December 1963 - February 1964	92
II. Distribution of Nuclear Families According to Number of Contacts With the Modified Extended Family	93

Table

Page

III. Distribution of Nuclear Families According to Ethnic Origin and Number of Contacts with the Modified Extended Family	94
IV. Relationship Between Total Number of Contacts and Help-giving Contacts During Past Year	95

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The family is the essential unit of our democratic society. A great deal has been written about the family, much of it expressing alarm at the impact of urbanism and industrialization on family life. The social work profession and those responsible for the administration of social welfare services recognize that modern industrial organization places strain upon family living.

Social scientists in their writings of the last two or three decades refer often to the nuclear family. In so doing, there is the connotation of isolation. In the old home town relationships with kin and friends were fairly constant. When a person needed help, he had relatives or neighbours who would rally to his support. Today the great majority of us live in the city or in a metropolitan area. All of us are aware of the rural-to-urban population movement. Frequently we see the moving van on our street. Mobility is a characteristic of our time. Today we speak of

loneliness in mass society and of anonymity in the big city. Families, we say, never put down roots in a community; or that people do not have a "feeling of belonging".

The consensus seems to be that the nuclear family is more vulnerable in today's industrialized society because of its dependence upon the economic system, lacking, as it once had, kinship and community supports, and having to find its main source of psychological security within itself. There is, however, no agreement on the eventual outcome. Two dominant views seem to prevail. One is that the family is disintegrating; the other is that the family, while changing, is quite resilient and will emerge strengthened to cope with today's society. In other words, according to some of the latest research, what we assume today may no longer be true. For instance, in spite of mobility and other factors, the nuclear family seems to have retained or restored its intimate contacts with relatives.

It was this apparent lag between what is believed to exist and what actually exists which engaged the attention of the students in their Master's year at the School of Social Work, the University of

Manitoba. The students were divided into three groups, each one to study an aspect of family functioning. One group studied child-rearing practices; the second economic practices. The objective of our research group was to study patterns of kinship relationships as a part of family functioning. This research project was carried out during the 1963 - 64 academic year.

The students in our study group were, of course, interested in families who need social welfare services. Based on their personal experiences, the students felt that, in spite of obstacles, their own kinship ties were being maintained. They believed that many families were functioning in like manner. Their reading substantiated that the kinship ties of today's nuclear family have not been seriously disrupted. However, they noted that research of the last few years has been devoted more to describing how the "non-problem" family--often middle class--functions. The so-called "problem" family, it appears, has not been put under the same scrutiny. Some of the students, after contact with clients in their field work, observed that the families being served seemed to be isolated from their kin. At the same time the students were aware of the current interest in the multi-problem family. While the studies on

"problem" families point to the isolation factor, available evidence is inconclusive. The students drew support for this position from the remarks of Professor John C. Spencer of the School of Social Work, University of Toronto. In a book on "The Multi-Problem Family" edited by Professor Benjamin Schlesinger, Professor Spencer states:

The multi-problem family is characterized by isolation and alienation from kinship group and neighbours They are isolated not merely from their kinship group but also from friends and neighbours, and thus unable to draw on an important source of aid and help in time of need and crisis.¹

Certainly such an observation is of greatest importance to the social work profession and all family service agencies, public and voluntary. To this Professor Spencer adds when he writes:

Generally speaking, sociologists have done little research work with the multi-problem family. Our knowledge of the reference groups of these families remains vague and even contradictory Research is also needed into the relationship between the multi-problem family and the kinship group, with friends and neighbours in different types of community, both rural and urban, as well as in different ethnic groups.²

¹John C. Spencer, "The Multi-Problem Family", The Multi-Problem Family, ed. Benjamin Schlesinger (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), pp. 12 and 29.

²Ibid., p. 50.

With interest thus stimulated, our research group decided to focus on the isolation of agency-served families in Winnipeg from the modified extended family, variations in the degree of isolation, and some of the factors with which these variations seem to be associated.

It is implied in the purpose that the study would be concerned with isolation of the nuclear family from the modified extended family, and not with the isolation of the nuclear family from neighbours, friends, and community. The families to be studied were to be those served by major family agencies in the City of Winnipeg within the period of December 1963 to January 1964. Our sample group was to be limited to those families known to one or more of the following agencies:

City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department
Winnipeg Regional Office (Mothers' Allowance
Branch), Province of Manitoba Department of
Welfare
Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg
Winnipeg Family Court
Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg

For the purposes of the study, our research group decided to look only at those nuclear families with children living at home, and where both marital partners are present. It was agreed that we would have to

determine the degree of isolation by looking at the actual number of contacts, both social and helping, and at the expressed direction of possible contact in time of need. We felt that there was no way to measure the feeling-tone of the interaction between relatives or the quality of the contact. The data was to be collected during January and February, 1964. The families were to be asked to give information on their kinship relationships during the previous twelve months.

No attempt was made in our study to explore all the variables and associated factors affecting the degree of isolation of the families in the sample group from the modified extended family. We did feel that those factors most fruitful for study would be ethnic origin, orientation of family of origin, intergenerational ties, and differences in occupational level. As a result the following hypothesis emerged: The majority of nuclear families served by one or more major family agencies in Winnipeg are characterized by isolation from the modified extended family with variations in the degree of isolation relating to ethnic origin, orientation of family of origin, intergenerational ties, and differences in occupational level.

By "nuclear family" we mean a co-habitant

family of a man, a woman and their children. In our definition of modified extended family we include the parents of both marital partners of the nuclear family; their married sons and daughters with their husbands and/or wives and their children resident with them; the siblings of both marital partners together with their husbands and/or wives and their children resident with them. Isolation is an aloneness. It is detachment from others of a like kind. It is difficult to define and thus we can measure isolation only in relation to the usual things that people do to maintain contact with their relatives. Such contacts would include social activities like letter-writing, telephone calls, visiting, participation in family celebrations, and help-giving activities, emergency and casual, in the nature of personal services, material and financial assistance. Thus we defined isolation as the absence of or limited observable and measurable activities or interaction with the modified extended family.

As a concomitant of the main hypothesis, our research group further refined some of the factors so as to make them more useful to our social work practice. We recognized that Winnipeg is a cosmopolitan city with many of its residents being first and second generation

Canadians. Thus cultural values stemming from ethnic origin remain prominent. Because cultural values stem from ethnic origin, we believed the wife's ethnic origin could influence the nuclear family's pattern of kinship relationships. We assumed that kinship ties are mediated through women and that the wife maintains, or fails to maintain, such ties. Hence our research group was interested in the wife's ethnic origin as a factor affecting the number of contacts with the modified extended family. Because of the migration of persons of Indian origin from rural areas to the City of Winnipeg, our research group was particularly interested in this ethnic group. Our reading on Indian culture suggested that families of Indian origin had extensive kinship ties. As a result, we hypothesized that there would be less isolation in families of Indian origin than in families of other ethnic origins.

As social workers we were aware of the persistence of attitudes and behaviour learned in the family. Based, again, on the assumption that kinship ties are mediated through women, our research group postulated that the wife's orientation in her family of origin would affect the number of contacts with the modified extended family. If the wife comes from a

nuclear-oriented family of origin, the family of procreation, we hypothesized, is more isolated than if the wife comes from an extended-oriented family of origin.

With an awareness of the growing proportion of the aged in our population and the likelihood that for married couples the number of married years with children absent from home will increase, our research group directed its attention to what may be happening to the preceding generation. Is the nuclear family more isolated from members of the modified extended family in the preceding generation than from members of the modified family in the same generation? We hypothesized that it is.

Today the possibility of occupational level affecting the number of contacts with the modified extended family is an important question. With the upgrading of the whole population and the emphasis on vertical mobility, occupational and social, we as a research group asked ourselves whether climbing the occupational ladder would have any effect on the nature and extent of kinship ties. Consequently, we stated as a sub-hypothesis that the majority of families studied show less isolation from members of the

modified extended family in the same occupational level than from members of the modified extended family in different occupational levels.

In summary, the following sub-hypotheses were formulated:

1. There is less isolation in families of Indian origin than in families of other ethnic origins.
2. In the majority of families studied, if the wife comes from a nuclear-oriented family of origin, the family of procreation is more isolated than if the wife comes from an extended-oriented family of origin.
3. A majority of nuclear families studied show more isolation from members of their modified extended family in the preceding generation than from members of the modified extended family in the same generation.
4. A majority of nuclear families studied show less isolation from members of the modified extended family in the same occupational level than from members of the modified extended family in different occupational levels.

Ethnic origin was to be determined by the language predominantly spoken by the male ancestor on his arrival in Canada. Indian origin was to include those people who identified themselves with Indian ancestry.

As previously indicated, we assumed that the wife maintains kinship ties. Since ethnic origin is a

factor in the transmitting of culture, our research group decided, for the sake of consistency, to trace ethnic origin through the male ancestor of the female line, and not through the male line, as the population census does. This was to give us the ethnic origin of the wife in the nuclear family.

In connection with occupation, it was assumed that the occupational status of the nuclear family is determined by the occupation of the father of the nuclear family.

The method of our study was to interview adult members of the nuclear families in their own homes, using the formal interview technique. Because of our assumption that kinship ties are mediated through women and the importance of securing data relating to the wife in the nuclear family, it was decided that the wife would be the person to be interviewed. Questions were structured to secure information relating to ethnic origin, family of orientation, the kind and frequency of contacts, including intergenerational contacts as well as contacts with kin in the same generation. The respondent was to answer questions concerning her husband's occupation, and the occupations of the heads of families in the kinship group with whom the nuclear

family had most and least contact. In addition, there were questions to permit the respondent to indicate direction of possible contact in time of need, whether to members of the modified extended family or to another source of help. All questions were incorporated into a schedule designed to obtain all the information relevant to our study.

In the analysis of our findings, isolation was measured solely by the number of contacts expressed in social and help-giving activities. Our group decided on a specified number of contacts which served as a dividing line to determine whether the nuclear family was isolated or non-isolated from the modified extended family. Thereupon the families were classified according to ethnic origin and, in turn, the families according to ethnic origin were correlated with the number of contacts of the nuclear family with the modified extended family. In the next step the families were divided into two categories according to the wife's orientation in her family of origin. Here, too, we correlated families according to wife's orientation in family of origin with the number of contacts of the nuclear family with the modified extended family. Thereafter we compared the number of contacts of the nuclear family with the preceding

generation with the number of contacts of the nuclear family with the same generation. We, then, noted the number of families which had more contact with the preceding generation and those who had more contact with the same generation. This enabled us to determine whether the nuclear family had less contact with the preceding generation than with its own generation. Following this, we classified families according to most contact with relatives in the same occupational level or with relatives in a different occupational level, and, similarly, according to least contact with relatives in the same or a different occupational level. This permitted us to ascertain whether or not nuclear families have most contact with relatives in the same occupational level and least contact with families in a different occupational level. Our research group used Blishen's occupational scale, which places all occupations into seven classes.³ Each class was considered to be an occupational level. Within the limits of our study, other interesting and relevant data was noted and analyzed.

³Bernard R. Blishen, "The Construction and Use of an Occupational Class Scale", Table 1, Canadian Society, eds. Bernard R. Blishen et al (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1961), pp. 481-484.

The literature referred to in this chapter in a general way is examined in more detail in the next chapter. Through the information provided we hope the reader will gain more understanding, as we have, of the nuclear family and its kinship ties.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

"Much of social welfare service in America can be seen as a response to the impact of industrialization on family life."¹ The most significant words to describe this impact are "change" and "movement". The head of the nuclear family changes his job; he and his family move to another locality. Our industrial society needs a mobile population. This results not only in geographical mobility, but occupational mobility and social mobility. The inference of mobility is separation. Separation presupposes isolation. It is argued that the isolated nuclear family is most adaptable to the demands of urban and industrial society. Conversely, kinship ties can become a hindrance to the nuclear family.

What actually happens, so it is said, is that the nuclear family's ties with the kinship group are

¹Harold L. Wilensky and Charles N. Lebeaux, Industrial Society and Social Welfare (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958), p. 67.

diluted. In its isolation the nuclear family relies upon its own resources for economic and emotional support and derives its social support from secondary, rather than primary, relationships. Such relationships include the union, the club, the church, the occupational and professional associations. This kind of thinking is committed

. . . to the assumption that urbanization as a social process consists of a progressive displacement of "primary" by "secondary" groups in the social structure. The close, intimate and continuous associations characteristic of the inclusive primary group community give way in the city, it is argued, to intermittent participation in a series of discontinuous groups, most of which are formally and impersonally organized about a single specific interest.²

A second assumption follows logically. The nuclear family, isolated as it is, no longer can use the strengths and resources of the modified extended family. Therefore, in time of trouble, the family turns to the social welfare system for assistance.

An extreme position is that the nuclear family may be reverting to type. In the past the tribe, when there was external threat or economic need, would move and the interlocking kinship system would remain intact.

²Floyd Dotson, "Patterns of Voluntary Association Among Urban Working-class Families", American Sociological Review, Vol. XVI (Oct. 1951), p. 687.

Today, according to M. C. Elmer, we have this situation:

In the modern city family kinship, family group ownership, and resultant controls are reduced to a minimum, and the conjugal relationship of the primitive family exists The modern city family has returned to the type of family found among the simplest hunters. The modern city family has also become something of a wanderer, much like the primitive hunter. For in most of the large cities today a family moves on the average of about every two years.³

We find a similar view expressed by Frances Jerome

Woods:

Strong, affective ties with relatives beyond the conjugal units are practically nonexistent Channels for response are narrow rather than diffuse; economic security hinges upon the small conjugal unit. These practices do not constitute a very adequate form of "social insurance".⁴

The most noteworthy exponent of the isolated nuclear family is Talcott Parsons, Professor in the Department of Social Relations at Harvard University. He has been influential in sociological research during the past two decades. He posits that:

This relative absence of any structural bias in favor of solidarity with the ascendant and descendant families in any one line of descent has enormously increased the structural isolation

³M. C. Elmer, The Sociology of the Family (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1945), p. 24.

⁴Frances Jerome Woods, The American Family System (New York: Harper & Bros. Publishers, 1959), p. 112.

of the individual conjugal family. This isolation, the almost symmetrical "onion" structure, is the most distinctive feature of the American kinship system and underlies most of its peculiar functional and dynamic problems.⁵

This, as Parsons believed in 1943, is of the greatest importance in understanding the American family, most particularly the middle-class family.

As time passed, we might expect a modification of Parsons' position. However, in 1949, he wrote:

The isolation of the conjugal family emphasized . . . as a primary characteristic of the American system is the mechanism for freeing the occupation-bearing and competing member of the family from hampering ties which would inhibit his chances and interfere with the functioning of the system. This applies, of course, both to his emancipation on maturity from his family of orientation and to the segregation of his own family of procreation from those of his brothers.⁶

In 1955 Parsons reaffirms his view concerning the isolation of the nuclear family. In fact he refers to the reduction of the importance in our society of kinship units as a continuing process.⁷ At the same

⁵Talcott Parsons, "The Kinship System of the Contemporary United States", Social Perspectives on Behavior, eds. Herman D. Stein and Richard A. Cloward (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe Inc., 1958), p. 12.

⁶Talcott Parsons, "The Social Structure of the Family", The Family: Its Function and Destiny, ed. Ruth N. Anshen (New York: Harper & Bros. Publishers, 1949), p. 192.

⁷Talcott Parsons & Robert F. Bales, Family, Socialization and Interaction Process (Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press, 1955), pp. 3 - 33.

time Parsons underscores some of the cultural factors which tend to make the nuclear family isolated. There is the presumption that the married couple will support themselves. They must become independent. But, since society expects the nuclear family to be independent, should society expect the nuclear family to have kin, such as aged parents, dependent upon it? Our society places much emphasis on individual attributes and getting ahead by one's own merits. Thus there is no need to depend upon kin for occupation, such as the son inheriting his father's business, or learning a skill that has been handed down from generation to generation. In addition, it is expected that husband and wife will find mutual support in each other and that dependence upon members of their families of orientation, that is parents and siblings, will be minimal, if not non-existent.⁸

In recent years theoretical formulations pertaining to the isolation of the nuclear family are being challenged. New data suggests that there may be a time lag in sociological research. Hope J. Leichter points to the danger of assuming isolation of the nuclear family. She says:

⁸Reference to cultural factors. Ibid., pp. 3 - 33.

Although the family is and has been long an important unit of research, there is a risk if we stop at this point and assume that the empirical unit of the family is necessarily a theoretically meaningful unit In our research, for example, we have indications that bonds of solidarity or coalitions within the family are vitally influenced by relationships outside the nuclear family as well as by occupational contacts of family members and by friendship ties.⁹

A similar note is sounded by Peter Willmott. In the abstract of one of his articles, it is pointed out that:

There is a stereotype among sociologists which still is not dead in spite of research to the contrary. That stereotype is that the family is in modern industrial societies an isolated, rootless association confined to parents and children.

In the article Willmott points out that, if the sociologists have not revised their thinking, the legislators have, because kinship plays a significant role in social legislation.¹⁰ Reporting on a Los Angeles Study, Scott Greer and Ella Kube ask whether primary relationships have "been rediscovered or perhaps were they never lost

⁹Hope J. Leichter, "Boundaries of the Family as an Empirical and Theoretical Unit", Exploring the Base for Family Therapy, eds. Nathan W. Acherman, Frances L. Beatman and Sanford N. Sherman (New York: Family Service Association of America, 1961), p. 143.

¹⁰Peter Willmott, "Kinship and Social Legislation", British Journal of Sociology, Vol. IX (1959), pp. 126 - 142.

in the first place, having always existed", and, "why, in view of the data reported, so many writers have emphasized the isolation and anomie of the urban individual, his reliance upon secondary relationships, and his loss of community?"¹¹

A stronger challenge to the theory of the isolated nuclear family comes from Eugene Litwak, Associate Professor of Social Welfare Research, University of Michigan. He has published extensively in social journals on extended family relationships. In a paper delivered at the Fourth Congress of Sociology, September, 1959, at Stresa, Italy, he declared:

If the literature on extended family relations is examined, two things emerge. On a conceptual level, there is a tendency to deal in stereotypical dichotomies between isolated nuclear families and classical extended families. Secondly, these dichotomies have very little relation to the empirical data.¹²

In a footnote to the article Litwak names Parsons as the

¹¹Scott Greer and Ella Kube, "Urbanism and Social Structure: A Los Angeles Study", Community Structure and Analysis, ed. Marvin B. Sussman (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1959), pp. 94 and 111.

¹²Eugene Litwak, "The Use of Extended Family Groups in the Achievement of Social Goals", Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, 2d ed., Marvin B. Sussman (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963), p. 478.

one who "provides the rationale for this approach".

If there has been an assumption that the nuclear family is isolated because of mobility due to industrialization, Litwak also dispels this notion.¹³

In 1959, also, we have another challenge from Marvin B. Sussman, Professor of Sociology at Western Reserve University. He states bluntly that:

The answer to the question "The Isolated Nuclear Family, 1959: Fact or Fiction?" is mostly fiction. It is suggested that kin ties, particularly intergenerational ones, have far more significance than we have been led to believe in the life processes of the urban family.¹⁴

Until recent years most of the kinship studies have been done by anthropologists. Most of their work relates to kinship in primitive societies, with very little attention to kinship in industrial societies.¹⁵ Since 1950, however, a number of studies have been

¹³Eugene Litwak, "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion", American Sociological Review, Vol. XXV (June 1960), pp. 385-394.

¹⁴Marvin B. Sussman, "The Isolated Nuclear Family: Fact or Fiction?", Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, 2d ed., Marvin B. Sussman (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963), p. 53.

¹⁵Michael Young and Peter Willmott, Family and Kinship in East London (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957), Appendix 4, p. 205.

directed to the kinship relationships of the nuclear family in our industrial society.

In 1951 Floyd Dotson reported on a study of fifty families selected from a working-class district in New Haven, Connecticut. He examined their face-to-face relationships. From the study Dotson concluded that:

The central fact which emerges in this connection is the important role which family and kinship continue to play in providing for the companionship and recreational needs of the persons interviewed.¹⁶

A limitation of this study, as Dotson admits, is that the families studied came from an older area where there was a more stable population, thus increasing the probability of having kin within or near the city.¹⁷

Examining the mobility of the American family as a factor contributing to the isolation of the nuclear family, Marvin B. Sussman reports on a study which involved the gathering of data on kin and family relationships in Cleveland in 1956. A sample of fifty-three

¹⁶Floyd Dotson, "Patterns of Voluntary Association Among Urban Working-class Families", American Sociological Review, Vol. XVI (Oct. 1951), p. 693.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 693.

lower middle-class families was drawn from one area and twenty-seven working-class families from another area. The questions to obtain information are similar to those used in the schedule prepared by our research group.

As Sussman reports, these questions were:

. . . about help and service exchanges, the functions of ceremonial occasions, and inter-family visitation. Help items included caring for children, help during illness, financial aid, housekeeping, advice, valuable gifts, etc. Ceremonial occasions included holidays, birthdays, and anniversaries. Questions of visits among kin included the preparing of get-togethers with relatives who lived in and out of town.¹⁸

While there are differences in degree relating to mutual aid, service, and social visits between members of kin related families in the middle-class group and members of kin related families in the lower-class group, Sussman seems to prove rather conclusively that the nuclear family is not isolated.¹⁹ Mobility, rather than contributing to isolation, may actually be caused by kin ties. Instead of one family moving to the city and leaving the kinship group behind, it is probable that the nuclear

¹⁸Marvin B. Sussman, "The Isolated Nuclear Family: Fact or Fiction?", Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, 2d ed., ed. Marvin B. Sussman, p. 50.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 50-52.

family is followed to the city by other relatives. Thus the advance guard becomes a source of help to the new arrivals.²⁰

In another study in 1957 Sussman and R. Clyde White took a random sample of 401 households.²¹ These were from the Hough area in Cleveland, Ohio, an area of the city in transition. In seven years prior to the study, there was a change-over from white to Negro occupancy. The non-whites had brought with them many of their relatives. Sussman and White began with the assumption that, when an individual needs help in American society today, he is expected to turn to a social agency, if help is not forthcoming from his family. The respondents were asked two questions: To whom would they turn if they had "some financial trouble which they could not handle", and if they had "personal trouble that they could not handle by themselves".²²

²⁰Ibid., p. 52.

²¹Marvin B. Sussman and R. Clyde White, Hough, Cleveland, Ohio: A Study of Social Life and Change (Cleveland: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1959).

²²Ibid., p. 72.

When asked to name their first choice for help, when in financial trouble, 152 of the 401 respondents said they would go to a bank; 122 to relatives; and 18 to a social agency. Similarly, for personal problems, 121 said they would go to a clergyman; 119 to relatives; and 26 to a social agency.²³ As for social relationships, Sussman and White observed that:

The non-whites seem to have moved into Hough as kin groups. Also, they visit relatives more often than the whites both within Hough and in the rest of Cleveland Ties of kinship seem to be closer and stronger among non-whites than whites.²⁴

While one should not overlook the ethnic factor, it is noted that those who have moved within recent years maintained close kinship ties.

In a 1955 Detroit Area Study the informal associations of the urban family in the general population were studied. Detroit was considered to be typical of the modern urban community. It has a large population, fairly rapid population growth, a high degree of industrialization and occupational specialization, and a

²³Ibid., p. 72.

²⁴Ibid., p. 90.

heterogeneous population.²⁵ One of the questions to be answered by the Detroit Area Study was: "To what extent are kinship relationships important in different economic and social segments of the community?"²⁶

In his analysis of the Detroit Study, Morris Axelrod of the University of Michigan states that:

More people get together frequently with their relatives outside of the immediate family than they do with friends, neighbors, and co-workers. About one-half of the population report they see these relatives at least once a week. Nearly three-quarters see relatives once a month or more often. This is in sharp contrast to the stereotype which pictures the city dweller devoid of kinship associations.²⁷

Axelrod goes on to state that:

Not only does this pattern of relatives, friends, neighbors and co-workers, in that order, hold for the general population, but it is also true for almost every important segment of the population we have studied. Whether people are young or old, teachers or labourers, high or low in status, they are more likely, with only a few exceptions, to get together frequently with their relatives outside of the immediate family, than with any other type of informal group²⁸

²⁵Morris Axelrod, "Urban Structure and Social Participation", American Sociological Review, Vol. XXI (February 1956), p. 18, footnote 8.

²⁶Ibid., p. 14.

²⁷Ibid., p. 16.

²⁸Ibid., p. 17.

Two of the conclusions from the Detroit Area Study are that:

In the population studied informal group association was well-nigh universal with only a small segment entirely devoid of such association Relatives emerged as the most important type of informal group association.²⁹

A somewhat similar approach is made by a study in San Francisco. Four different types of neighbourhoods are chosen for study, different socially and economically, believing "that differences between sections of the city should be considered in making generalizations about urban social relationships in general".³⁰ The San Francisco study was interested in those "particular urban conditions under which social relations arise most and those other conditions under which they arise least".³¹ Those interviewed were men twenty-one years of age and over. This study also underscored the importance of the kin group, regardless of neighbourhood. In the study there was a question to establish

²⁹Ibid., p. 18.

³⁰Wendell Bell and Marion D. Boat, "Urban Neighborhoods and Informal Social Relations", The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXII (January 1957), p. 391.

³¹Ibid., p. 392.

the expressed direction of possible contact in time of need. Each respondent was asked who would take care of him if he were sick even "as long as a month".³² Relatives were ranked first. As a result of the study, there is the conclusion that:

. . . there is no question about the fact that the kin are considered to be the most important in providing relationships that can be counted on in an emergency . . .³³

Greer Scott and Ella Kube are responsible for a study in kinship and other informal associations in Los Angeles. Their study, as they state, is to "consider the important differences among the nonethnic population of middle income, occupation, and education".³⁴ Greer and Kube underscore the extreme importance of kinship and hypothesize "that the more urban an area the less important are informal face-to-face primary relations".³⁵

Of interest to research in kinship is a study

³²Ibid., p. 396.

³³Ibid., p. 396.

³⁴Scott Greer and Ella Kube, "Urbanism and Social Structure: A Los Angeles Study", Community Structure and Analysis, ed. Marvin B. Sussman, p. 95.

³⁵Ibid., p. 110.

made in East London, not only because it is made in another culture, but also, because it analyzes what happens to kinship patterns when people move from a tenement district to a new housing development.³⁶ Lower-class families moved from Bethnal Green Borough in East London to Greenleigh housing estate. Families in Bethnal Green had long residence there. Relatives saw a good deal of each other. After the move to Greenleigh, relatives were seen less.³⁷ At Greenleigh, too, there was less help from relatives, whereas in Bethnal Green people with relatives close by seldom went short of money in a crisis.³⁸ Without the propinquity of relatives, people kept more to themselves. Geographical mobility can change kinship patterns, it seems, if relatives are not able to communicate and travel back and forth.

Our research group was particularly interested in the East London study because it used frequency of contact as a way to measure patterns of kinship and to determine whether families were more isolated after their

³⁶Michael Young and Peter Willmott, Family and Kinship in East London.

³⁷Ibid., p. 106.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 113-114

move from Bethnal Green to Greenleigh. As mentioned in the first chapter, our study looks at the actual number of contacts, both social and help-giving, between the nuclear family and the modified extended family.

This chapter would not be complete without some reference to the variables affecting kinship relationships. It is generally accepted that ethnic origin tells us something about kinship patterns. A number of studies on ethnic families have been noted.³⁹

³⁹Francis L. K. Hsu, "Chinese and American Marriage Practices", Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, ed. Marvin B. Sussman, pp. 21-25.

John Kosa, "Marriage and Family Among Hungarians in Canada", Canadian Society, eds. Bernard R. Blishen et al (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1961) pp. 117-168.

Philip Garigue, "French Canadian Kinship and Urban Life", American Anthropologist, Vol. LVIII (Dec. 1956), pp. 1090-1101.

E. Franklin Frazier, "The Negro Family in the United States", Social Perspectives on Behavior, eds. Herman D. Stein and Richard A. Cloward (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1958), pp. 53-57.

Ruth Landes and Mark Zborowski, "Hypotheses Concerning the Eastern European Jewish Family", Social Perspectives on Behavior, eds. Herman D. Stein and Richard A. Cloward, pp. 59-75.

Paul J. Campisi, "The Italian Family in the United States", Social Perspectives on Behavior, eds. Herman D. Stein and Richard A. Cloward, pp. 76-81.

Regarding Indian families, it is impossible to understand their kinship system without an understanding of the Indian culture. This culture emphasizes sharing as a value in contrast to the acquisitiveness of modern society.⁴⁰ This seems to explain why the Indian family is ready to extend itself and to take in all manner of kin whenever the latter ask for assistance.⁴¹ It also helps us to understand why "modern Indians living in our cities insist on grouping together, maintaining that an Indian person understands them better than a white person, even a sympathetic white one".⁴² The cultural conflict may mean that the Indian, if he is to protect the goods he has acquired, will have "to reject former friends and kin while taking on the urban values of a capitalistic society".⁴³

⁴⁰Reverend Father Léon Levasseur, Cultural Encounter, an article distributed by Indian-Eskimo Association, 47 Dundonald St., Toronto 5, Ontario.

⁴¹Harry B. Hawthorn, Cyril Belshaw and Stuart Jamieson, "Patterns of Indian Family Life", Canadian Society, eds. Bernard R. Blishen et al, p. 222.

⁴²Manitoba Department of Agriculture and Immigration, A Study of the Population of Indian Ancestry Living in Manitoba, Vol. I (1959), p. 19.

⁴³Ibid., Vol. II, p. 96.

The second sub-hypothesis of our research study assumed that the wife maintains, or fails to maintain, kinship relations. This is supported in literature. Margaret Mead tells us that:

Children absorb during infancy and early childhood the whole pattern of family interrelationships which they then will be able to repeat, . . . to reproduce the family behavior learned in childhood.⁴⁴

Professor Mirra Komarovsky contends that, because girls are more sheltered in the American middle-class family, daughters are more likely than sons to maintain a dependent relationship with their parents after marriage. There "is a dependency upon and attachment to the family of orientation".⁴⁵ In a study on sibling solidarity Elaine Cumming and David M. Schneider emphasize the sister-sister bond and that, for most people, the sibling ties seem to be mediated through women.⁴⁶ Philip Garigue in his study on French

⁴⁴Margaret Mead, "The Contemporary American Family as an Anthropologist Sees It", Social Perspectives on Behavior, eds. Herman D. Stein and Richard A. Cloward, p. 21.

⁴⁵Mirra Komarovsky, "Functional Analysis of Sex Roles", Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, 2d ed., ed. Marvin B. Sussman, p. 129.

⁴⁶Elaine Cumming and David M. Schneider, "Sibling Solidarity in American Kinship", American Anthropologist, Vol. LXIII (June 1961), pp. 498-507.

Canadian kinship reports that "all informants, male and female, stressed the fact that it was the women who acted as links between the various households of the kin group".⁴⁷

While there is evidence of sibling solidarity as a "feature of American life",⁴⁸ it appears that this does not exist at the expense of a break with the previous generation. Sussman, in a 1950 New Haven study of the parents of ninety-seven middle-class families who together had 195 married children, produced data indicating that there is a pattern of giving and receiving between the parents and their married children. He said that "affectional and economic ties link the generational families and give stability to their relationships".⁴⁹ Sussman in his Cleveland study says this pattern also exists among working-class families

⁴⁷Philip Garigue, "French Canadian Kinship and Urban Life", op. cit., p. 1093.

⁴⁸Elaine Cumming and David M. Schneider, "Sibling Solidarity in American Kinship", op. cit., p. 498.

⁴⁹Marvin B. Sussman, "The Help Pattern in the Middle-Class Family", Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, 2d ed., ed. Marvin B. Sussman, p. 385.

but not to the same extent as in middle-class families.⁵⁰

In a study based on a sample of 1,500 families of the Cornell Study of Occupational Retirement, Professor Gordon F. Streib was concerned whether parents in retirement are maintaining relationships with their married children. He documented intergenerational solidarity and reciprocity of assistance patterns, concluding that, "the picture drawn of a neglected older generation is not substantiated".⁵¹

Closely associated with intergenerational ties is the effect of occupational mobility on the nuclear family in its relation to the modified extended family. Our culture places great importance on achievement. When one moves into a higher status level, there is the tendency to make new friends and to take on different values. The status of the family in the community is probably related to the occupation of

⁵⁰Marvin B. Sussman, "The Isolated Nuclear Family: Fact or Fiction?", op. cit., p. 51.

⁵¹Gordon F. Streib, "Family Patterns in Retirement", Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, 2d ed., ed. Marvin B. Sussman, pp. 410-419.

the husband and father.⁵² Because there are differences in status due to occupation, it is felt that the modified extended family members can have little in common. Thus the nuclear family that has achieved a higher status will have less contact with the modified extended family members with occupations that are representative of lower status.

Recent research suggests that, in this area also, there may be a time lag in our knowledge of the nuclear family. With the increase of bureaucracy, the husband and father separates his job from his home and personal life. Thus one can separate one's associates at work from family associations, "an institutionally accepted procedure".⁵³ Eugene Litwak points out that the modified extended family, which he defines as "a series of nuclear families joined together on an equalitarian basis"⁵⁴ maintains cohesion regardless of the occupational position of its members. These nuclear families pay deference to each other and thus

⁵²Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales, Family, Socialization and Interaction Process, op. cit., p. 13.

⁵³Eugene Litwak, "The Use of Extended Family Groups in the Achievement of Social Goals", op. cit., p. 481.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 478.

aid and strong bonds between families cut across class lines.⁵⁵

Results of a study previously mentioned agree with Litwak's findings. It is suggested in the study that "family solidarity is not adversely affected by social mobility".⁵⁶ Instead it was found that older persons have expectations that their children will strive for higher achievement, even though they are aware of the risk to family relations.⁵⁷

The East London study also refers to social mobility. It seems that there was no difference in frequency of contact between siblings in white-collar jobs and siblings in manual jobs, provided that distance was equal. "Most people did not suggest that the good fortune of their siblings had led to embarrassment".⁵⁸

It is quite apparent from the available literature and from observation of studies to date that the focus on the nuclear family has been to ascertain

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 481.

⁵⁶Gordon F. Streib, "Family Patterns in Retirement", op. cit., p. 418.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 418.

⁵⁸Michael Young and Peter Willmott, Family and Kinship in East London, op. cit., p. 143.

whether the nuclear family is isolated, or not, from the modified extended family. Considerable attention has been given to the middle-class family, the so-called typical family of our culture. To a lesser degree there has been research on the lower-class family. However, the families studied, whether middle-class or lower-class, seem to include only the non-problem family. The consensus seems to be that the non-problem family is not isolated.

On the other hand, there appears to be dearth of information on the dysfunctioning nuclear family and its ties with the modified extended family. An important study on disorganized families in Greater St. Paul, Minnesota, used a score sheet to check off, among other things, the informal associations of the families studied.⁵⁹ These informal associations, which included relationships with the modified extended family, were analyzed to determine psychological distance from the community. However, the fact that in the study all informal associations were lumped together makes it impossible to make valid observations on disorganized

⁵⁹L. L. Geismar and Beverley Ayres, Measuring Family Functioning (St. Paul, Minnesota: Family Centered Project, Greater St. Paul Community Chest and Councils Inc., 1960), p. 101, Appendix C.

families and kinship ties. Dysfunctioning families are likely to exist mainly in the lower class.

"Lower-class families", it is said, "exhibit the highest prevalence of instability of any class in the status structure".⁶⁰ Talcott Parsons suggests that another kind of kinship pattern may exist among such families and that the situation has not been adequately studied.⁶¹

Evidence seems to point to the emergence of a more stable family life, deriving strengths and resources from the modified extended family. Our research group addressed itself to the question whether the dysfunctioning or problem family is a part of the trend or whether it remains isolated from the modified extended family. To find out whether a contrast exists in kinship ties between the non-problem family and the problem family becomes important knowledge for the diagnosis and treatment of the problem family.

⁶⁰August B. Hollingshead, "Class Differences in Family Stability", Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, 2d ed., ed. Marvin B. Sussman, p. 260.

⁶¹Talcott Parsons, "The Kinship System of the Contemporary United States", Social Perspectives on Behavior, eds. Herman D. Stein and Richard A. Cloward, p. 12.

We, therefore, invite the reader to the next chapter as we unfold the method used to secure and analyze the data pertinent to our study.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Our research group used the formal interview to secure data. By this is meant a face-to-face interview with an adult. The interview took place in the family home. Wherever the wife was present, it was she who was interviewed and not the husband. The interviewer was provided with a schedule containing specific questions to be asked.

As previously stated, our study of the kinship relationships of the families served by the major family agencies in Winnipeg City was part of a larger study of family functioning. The two other aspects of the study related to patterns of child-rearing and to economic practices. There was a composite schedule, with one section for each of the three aspects of family functioning. A fourth section was added to secure information common to the three sections on family functioning. This was done to avoid repetitive questioning. One interviewer administered the composite schedule.

The kinship section of the composite schedule is to be found in Appendix A. This is the revised version of a previous schedule drawn up after our research group had postulated the hypothesis and sub-hypotheses to be tested.

The questions in the kinship section in the interviewing schedule were grouped into seven sub-sections: (1) Ethnic origin, (2) Wife's orientation in family of origin, (3) Whether relatives living and whether any living with nuclear family, (4) Frequency of contacts with parents and siblings, (5) Frequency of contact with married sons and daughters, (6) Husband's occupation and contacts with relatives according to occupation, (7) Expressed direction of contact in time of need.

The unrevised schedule, that is the one originally drawn up, had a question on ethnic origin of both husband and wife. This was counter-checked by asking place of birth of both husband and wife and, also, by asking language predominantly spoken by male ancestor of both husband and wife at the time of the male ancestor's arrival in Canada.

Questions were phrased to determine whether wife's orientation in her family of origin was nuclear

family-oriented or extended family-oriented. The wife was to be asked to recall whether, as a child, she and her relatives exchanged visits; whether she spent vacations with relatives; whether she attended family celebrations with her relatives; whether her parents and their relatives exchanged help-giving; and whether there was mutual assistance among her relatives. The respondent was to be given a choice between "frequently" or "not". It was realized that it would be impossible to indicate numerically the number of visits or exchanges of assistance.

Thereupon followed questions to ascertain whether parents and/or siblings were alive and whether or not relatives were living in the same house.

The next sub-section contained a series of questions to determine the amount of letter-writing between the nuclear family and the parents of both marital partners and, as well, with the siblings of both marital partners. Similarly there were questions to determine the number of telephone calls and the number of family visits. Also, relating to contact with both parents and siblings, our research group included questions to ask about baby-sitting or other help around the house, about doing errands, about material help and financial

assistance. To these questions the respondent was to be asked to indicate the number of times per month. One question on attending family celebrations with parents or siblings or both requested a number for the year.

To deal with occupational level, the husband's occupation was requested. This was to be checked against what jobs he had during the past year. Thereafter the respondent was to be asked to name those relatives with whom she had contact beginning with the one having most contact and then in descending order. For families named, the husband's occupation was to be given.

Finally, to add depth to our study, it was decided to add a series of questions about whom the respondent would "want" to contact in time of need. Where there was contact with relatives but no need to ask for assistance, this would enable our research group to make a guarded prediction whether the nuclear family would actually turn to relatives or to a social agency.

The original schedule was tested by interviewing thirty-nine families whose names and addresses were supplied by the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department, the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, and

Winnipeg Regional Office (Mothers' Allowance Branch),
Province of Manitoba Department of Welfare.

After testing, some revisions were made in the original schedule. This was after our research group examined the responses to see whether they would be useful for the purposes of our study. It was decided that the revised schedule should have a place for the interviewer's initials for the purpose of clarifying indefinite answers. It was also decided to state the definition of modified extended family, for the benefit of the interviewer. A new sub-section was to be added for married sons and daughters of the nuclear family, asking the same questions as those pertaining to contacts with parents and siblings of the nuclear family. It was realized that the nuclear family might be isolated from relatives in the preceding generation or in their own generation but, nevertheless, have frequent contact with married children.

The sub-section on wife's orientation in family of origin was altered considerably. The questions offering a choice between "frequently" or "not" were changed to enable the respondent to be more selective. The changes permitted the respondent to answer one of "frequently", "occasionally", "seldom", or "never". For the

question about attending family celebrations the respondent had to remember at least two occasions before a "yes" answer could be accepted. Our research group thereupon defined that extended family-oriented meant three or more (out of five possible) positive answers of "yes" or "frequently" or "occasionally". Nuclear family-oriented meant three or more negative answers of "no" or "seldom" or "never".

In the testing of the schedule, interviewers found that some of the respondents found it difficult to state a monthly figure. Hence "per year" was added to most questions in addition to "per month". The interviewer was instructed in the schedule that "year" meant the past year and that answers to questions asking "how many" had to be in specific numbers.

Changes were also made in the sub-section relating to occupational level and with regard to relatives with whom the nuclear family has most and least contact. The respondent was asked to name three relatives with whom the nuclear family has most contact and three with whom the nuclear family has least contact. The occupation of such relatives was to be stated, using the husband's occupation where a married female relative was named. When the husband was retired or

deceased, the interviewer was instructed to record the husband's usual former occupation. The interviewer was further instructed to be careful to state the definite occupation of the husband in the nuclear family and not simply record place of employment.

In the last section where the respondent is asked to indicate expressed direction of possible contact in time of need the word "want" was changed to "ask". It was felt that the respondent might want to ask but, to be realistic, we had to know whom the respondent would actually ask. The interviewer was instructed to record exactly what the respondent said, whether a relative or not. If a relative, the interviewer was to indicate which relative.

Our study was to secure relevant data on the December 1963 or January 1964 population of five major family agencies in Winnipeg City. This population included a total of 2,701 families. The agencies with number of families for each were: City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department, 1,310 families; Winnipeg Regional Office (Mothers' Allowance Branch), Province of Manitoba Department of Welfare, 395 families; Winnipeg Family Court, 441 families; Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, 420 families; and Family Bureau of Greater

Winnipeg, 135 families.

Since it was impossible to interview all families, a sample was drawn, using the method of stratified systematic random sampling. Prior to drawing the sample certain families were withdrawn because they lived outside of Winnipeg City or because it was very clear that there were no children. When drawn, the sample size was one in nine for the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department; one in nine for the Winnipeg Regional Office (Mothers' Allowance Branch), Province of Manitoba Department of Welfare; one in seven for the Winnipeg Family Court; one in six for the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg; and one in three for the Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg.

The rationale for variation according to agency is explained by the different population of each agency coupled with an attempt to enhance the probability of a representative sample of the families known to each agency. In addition, there was a desire to have in the total sample roughly 50 per cent of families served by the two public assistance agencies and 50 per cent from the other three agencies.

The total sample drawn contained a total of 369 families. For fifty-four of these families there was a

decision not to interview. An agency worker requested same for treatment purposes or indicated there were no children present. Also, some duplication of names appeared. There remained a total of 315 families to be interviewed: 144 from the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department; 45 from the Winnipeg Regional Office (Mothers' Allowance Branch), Province of Manitoba Department of Welfare; 60 from the Winnipeg Family Court; 37 from the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg; and 29 from the Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg. Of the 315 families a total of 139 were not interviewed. There were 77 refusals and 62 families had moved or could not be located. The reader is referred to Appendix B, Table I, for more details concerning population, sample, number interviewed, and not interviewed.

Before the interviewing began, there was an attempt to contact every family. Those families being served by the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department or the Provincial Mothers' Allowance Branch received a letter from the School of Social Work. Some of the families responded, via telephone, stating they were willing or unwilling. Those being served by the Children's Aid Society or the Family Bureau received a letter prepared by the School of Social Work but mailed

out over the signature of the agency worker. Those families being served by the Family Court received a letter signed by the senior counsellor of that agency. Where the letter came from the School of Social Work, sixty-eight per cent of the families co-operated. Where the letter came from the agencies, seventy-three per cent co-operated. The percentages suggest that the difference in the way families were prepared had no effect on their willingness to participate. Those 176 families who did participate were interviewed during January and February, 1964.

After the interviewing our research group noted some of the limitations of the study. It was recognized that the subjective feelings of the respondents in the sample could enter into answers given. There was no way to assess whether the families in the sample felt that participation in the research study was a price to be paid for dependency upon agency help. Some resistance against revealing personal information was encountered and this prevented pressing for specific answers. Also, we recognized that respondents might have been guessing or giving answers according to societal expectations. Each interviewer was instructed to assure the respondent concerning the confidentiality of

the interview but there was no way to detect a hidden suspicion that information might be shared with the agency to which the family was known. It was also realized that a lack of intelligence or even neurotic traits could invalidate the accuracy of the respondent's answers.

Another limitation was that the questions in the schedule were subject to clarification by the interviewer who may not always have been aware of the intention of the questions. Two-thirds of the interviewers were not involved in the process of developing that part of the composite schedule relating to kinship ties. To reduce incorrect interpretation to a minimum, all interviewers were briefed before making their calls.

Also acknowledged as a limitation was that our findings could be representative only of a sample of families living in the City of Winnipeg. In addition, since it was impossible to interview every family in the total sample, we had no way to assess whether the 139 families not interviewed affected the representativeness of the sample.

Before our research group could analyze the data, we had to arrive at a formula to measure isolation and non-isolation. Based on census findings,

there were 2.31 children per Canadian family in 1931 and 2.06 per family in 1941.¹ The marital partners in the nuclear family would have been born in or relatively near the decades covered by the census figures. Thus our research group decided that each nuclear family has the possibility to contact at least four units, that is, a parent or parents of each marital partner, and one sibling for each marital partner. As a way of measuring the minimum expectation for non-isolation, our group further decided that there should be at least four contacts per month with each unit, either to or from. The four contacts could be any combination of two phone calls, one visit or help-giving act, and one letter. This would mean 192 contacts annually. One hundred and ninety-two or less contacts annually would constitute isolation and anything more than 192 contacts would constitute non-isolation.

The next step of our research group was to analyze the data consisting of the responses by a sample of families served by five major family agencies in Winnipeg to the questions in the interview schedule.

¹Eighth Census of Canada (Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics), Vol. I (1941), p. 433.

We began by tabulating the frequency of contacts of the nuclear family with the modified extended family to classify whether isolated or non-isolated. As a refinement, we had two sub-categories for the isolated: (1) 96 contacts or less, and (2) 97 to 192 contacts. The non-isolated families were divided into five sub-categories: (1) 193 to 288 contacts, (2) 289 to 384 contacts, (3) 385 to 480 contacts, (4) 481 to 576 contacts, and (5) 577 contacts plus.

Using the same grouping for number of contacts, we tabulated the number of contacts in relation to ethnic origin. Anticipating a variety of ethnic origins among the respondents, we decided to place the ethnic groups into sub-categories. The details are given in Chapter IV but our five sub-categories were: Anglo-Saxon, West European, East European, Latin and Indian-Métis. We compared the isolation of the different sub-categories and especially the Indian-Métis families with families in the other ethnic groups.

Then, again using the grouping for number of contacts, we tabulated the number of contacts in relation to nuclear-oriented families and, similarly, the number of contacts in relation to extended-oriented families. The family of procreation was, as previously

mentioned, defined as nuclear family-oriented or extended family-oriented according to the wife's orientation in her family of origin. The two tabulations were compared to test our second sub-hypothesis: In the majority of families studied, if the wife comes from a nuclear-oriented family of origin, the family of procreation will be more isolated than if the wife comes from a modified extended family of origin.

After the above step our research group tabulated the number of contacts of the nuclear family with the preceding generation and the number of contacts of the nuclear family with the same generation. We compared the two.

Thereafter, we examined the responses concerning those relatives with whom the nuclear family had most contact and those relatives with whom the nuclear family had least contact. This was done in relation to occupational level and thus we noted whether the nuclear family had most or least contact with relatives in the same occupational level, with relatives in a higher occupational level, or with relatives in a lower occupational level. The occupational level of the majority of the identified relatives determined whether the nuclear family had most contact with relatives in the

same or a different occupational level. In the same manner it was determined whether the nuclear family had least contact with relatives in the same or a different occupational level. This was to test whether differences in occupational level contribute to isolation of the nuclear family from the modified extended family. Our research group used the seven occupational categories outlined in Blishen's occupational scale.² According to this scale all occupations are placed into seven categories. We had previously decided that, for the purposes of our study, those occupations in the same category would constitute one occupational level.

Finally, our research group tabulated the responses relating to expressed direction of possible contact in time of need. We divided the responses according to whether the respondent would ask a relative or another source of help, such as a social agency.

This, then, describes our method to secure and analyze the data of our study. The next chapter presents an analysis of the data and the findings of our study.

²Bernard R. Blishen, "The Construction and Use of an Occupational Class Scale", Table 1, Canadian Society, eds. Bernard R. Blishen et al (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1961), pp. 481-484.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The total number of families in the original sample amounted to 315. Of this number 176 were interviewed. The remaining 139 families were not interviewed for the following reasons: seventy-seven refused; sixty-two had moved or could not be located. Thus our research group examined 176 completed schedules. For detailed information the reader is referred to Table I in Appendix B.

When our research group applied the definition of nuclear family used for this study, we found 120 schedules were not applicable. There were 114 schedules which showed only one marital partner in the home -- 105 wife only and nine husband only. One schedule revealed two marital partners but no children. Another five schedules were eliminated because there were relatives living with the nuclear family. Thus the data for our study was obtained from a final sample of fifty-six nuclear families.

The first step in our analysis was to group the

fifty-six nuclear families according to number of contacts with the modified extended family. The findings are presented in detail in Table II in Appendix B. The summary of our findings is found in Table 1.

TABLE 1

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF NUCLEAR FAMILIES
ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH THE
MODIFIED EXTENDED FAMILY

No. of Contacts	No. of Families	Percentage
Total	56	100.0
0-192	23	41.0
193 or more	33	59.0

According to our definition of isolation, that is having 192 contacts or less with the modified extended family, twenty-three nuclear families in our sample can be described as isolated and thirty-three as non-isolated. Thus the majority of the nuclear families in our sample are not isolated from the modified extended family. Of interest, when one observes Table II in Appendix B, is the clustering of families at each end of the distribution scale. By way of example, twenty-three families are classified as isolated while twenty-three families are in the category of 577 or more

contacts with the modified extended family.

Our research group was interested in the large number of schedules which revealed a mother but no father in the family unit. Of the 105 schedules which gave this information, twenty-one were eliminated for various reasons. This left eighty-four schedules which were examined to tabulate number of contacts with the modified extended family. Thirty-six families or 42.8 per cent showed isolation; forty-eight or 57.2 per cent showed non-isolation. There is a close correlation with the percentages of isolation and non-isolation for the fifty-six families in our sample. However, it is recognized the absence of the father from the home could alter the number of contacts with the modified extended family. Hence one cannot make comparisons based on the data derived from the aforementioned eighty-four schedules. The findings are reported as a matter of interest and could be the object of further research.

Our next step was to examine the responses concerning the ethnic origin of the wife in the nuclear family. We noted the distribution of nuclear families according to the wife's ethnic origin in relation to the number of contacts with the modified extended family. All ethnic origins found in our sample, a total of

fourteen, are recorded in Table III in Appendix B. For analytical purposes our research group decided to arrange the total number of fourteen into five groups according to geographical location and cultural similarity. The five groups are: Anglo-Saxon, West European, East European, Latin, and Indian-Métis. Our findings for these five groups are reported in Table 2.

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF NUCLEAR FAMILIES ACCORDING TO
ETHNIC GROUPS AND NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH
THE MODIFIED EXTENDED FAMILY

No. of Contacts	Total	Anglo- Saxon	West Euro- pean	East Euro- pean	Latin	Indian- Métis
Total	56	25	10	9	8	4
0-96	14	10	..	2	.	2
97-192	9	1	3	2	3	.
193-288
289-384	5	3	1	.	.	1
385-480	2	2
481-576	3	2	.	.	.	1
577 or more	23	7	6	5	5	.

The fact that twenty-five of the fifty-six families fall into the Anglo-Saxon group has no significance unless related to the ethnic composition of the population of the City of Winnipeg. There seems to be

no association between ethnic origin and degree of isolation. Of the Anglo-Saxon families 44 per cent can be described as isolated. The West European group has 30 per cent isolated. The East European group has 44.4 per cent isolated and the Latin group 37.5 per cent. Since the ethnic representation in the sample is uneven and numerically small one cannot assume that these percentages reveal a tendency. Neither can one make any valid observations for the Indian-Métis group. The latter group in the sample consists of four families, two of whom can be described as isolated and two as non-isolated.

After the above step we noted the distribution of nuclear families according to number of contacts with the modified extended family in relation to the wife's orientation in her family of origin. Four of the schedules could not be used in this phase of our analysis because the wife was not the respondent. This left us with fifty-two families where there was a clear indication that the wife was nuclear family-oriented or extended family-oriented. Table 3 shows our findings.

Our research group had hypothesized that the wife's orientation in her family of origin would be reflected in the nuclear family in which she was the wife.

TABLE 3

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF NUCLEAR FAMILIES ACCORDING TO ORIENTATION OF FAMILY OF ORIGIN AND NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH THE MODIFIED EXTENDED FAMILY

No. of Con- tacts	Nuclear-Oriented		Extended-Oriented	
	No. of Families	Percent- age	No. of Families	Percent- age
Total	12	100.0	40	100.0
0-96	5	41.7	8	20.0
97-192	.	. .	6	15.0
193-288
289-384	2	16.6	3	7.5
385-480	.	. .	2	5.0
481-576	1	8.4	2	5.0
577 or more	4	33.3	19	47.5

Our findings do not support this supposition.

Seven of the twelve nuclear families (58.3 per cent) where the wife had a background of nuclear family orientation show degrees of non-isolation. While 41.7 per cent of these twelve families show isolation, it is noted that 41.7 per cent of them have very extensive contact with the modified extended family. Over against this is the picture of the forty nuclear families where the wife's background is extended family-oriented. Here we see fourteen or 35 per cent of these forty families are isolated according to our definition of isolation. Regardless of wife's orientation in family of origin,

more of the nuclear families are non-isolated. We can only observe that 65 per cent of the nuclear families where wife's background is extended family-oriented show non-isolation, while 58.3 per cent of the nuclear families where wife's background is nuclear family-oriented are non-isolated.

Attention was then directed to those responses which indicated the number of contacts of the nuclear family with the preceding generation and the number of contacts of the nuclear family with the same generation. In comparing the two, our findings were inconclusive. Nine of the schedules were not applicable. Either there were no parents living or no siblings. Three families had no contact with either generation. When our research group tabulated the number of contacts of the remaining forty-seven nuclear families, we discovered that twenty-four families had more contacts with the preceding generation and twenty-three had more contacts with the same generation. Of the seventeen isolated families in this group of forty-seven, we find that eight had more contacts with the preceding generation and nine had more with the same generation. Of the thirty non-isolated families the figures are sixteen and fourteen respectively.

In looking at the factor of occupational level our research group gave consideration to the responses of the nuclear families concerning those three relatives with whom they have most contact and those three relatives with whom they have least contact. We compared the occupational level of the husband in the nuclear family with the occupational level of the husband in the identified families in the modified extended family.

Blishen's occupational scale lists seven classes of occupations ranging from the class including the high status professionals down to the class including the menial labourer.¹ All occupations in one class were considered to be in one occupational level. Not all the respondents named three relatives with whom they had most contact and three with whom they had least contact. Where the majority of responses indicated most contact with identified relatives in the same occupational level, our research group said the nuclear family had most contact with members of the modified extended family in the same occupational level. If the majority of responses

¹Bernard R. Blishen, "The Construction and Use of an Occupational Class Scale", Table 1, Canadian Society, eds. Bernard R. Blishen et al (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1961), pp. 481-484.

showed most contact with identified relatives in a different occupational level, either higher or lower, we said the nuclear family had most contact with members of the modified extended family in different occupational levels. We followed the same procedure in connection with the identified relatives with whom the nuclear family had least contact. In those instances where only two relatives were identified, one in the same occupational level and one in a different occupational level, either higher or lower, we said the responses were not applicable for our study. Four of the nuclear families gave no response either to the question about "most contact" or the question about "least contact". Table 4 presents the outcome of our findings.

The findings illustrated in Table 4 do not portray any tendency for nuclear families to have more contact with relatives in the modified extended family who have the same occupational level. With relatives in the same occupational level the nuclear family shows a slight tendency to have more contact rather than less contact. Over against this is the figure that twenty-five of the fifty-six nuclear families (44.7 per cent) have most contact with relatives in a

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF NUCLEAR FAMILIES ACCORDING TO AMOUNT
OF CONTACT WITH IDENTIFIED RELATIVES IN
SAME OR DIFFERENT OCCUPATIONAL LEVELS

Amount of Contact	No. of Families	Occupational Level			Not Appli- cable	No Response
		Same	Higher	Lower		
Most	56	13	25	8	5	5
Least	56	6	18	17	6	9

higher occupational level. With relatives in a lower occupational level we see some tendency to have least contact.

In order to assess what the nuclear family might do in time of need, regardless of number of contacts with the modified extended family, our research group examined those responses which named persons or other sources who would actually be asked for assistance. We tabulated the responses according to whether the nuclear family would depend upon itself or upon members of the modified extended family, friends, social agencies, or other sources. The fifty-six nuclear families named 448 sources of help. In Table 5 is given the breakdown in an attempt to ascertain what relation number of contacts with modified extended family has to reaching out to sources of help.

TABLE 5

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACTS
AND EXPRESSED SOURCES OF POTENTIAL HELP

No. of Contacts	Total	Sources of Help				Other
		Nuc- lear Family	Ex- tended Family	Friends	Social Agency	
Total	448	54	194	37	70	93
0-96	112	16	15	16	27	38
97-192	72	11	35	4	7	15
193-288
289-384	40	8	16	2	8	6
385-480	16	2	..	.	6	8
481-576	24	2	15	2	1	4
577 or more	184	15	113	13	21	22

Noteworthy for our study is that those nuclear families in the category of 577 contacts or more with the modified extended family think of the modified extended family when help is required. Out of 184 possible contacts in time of need the modified extended family is mentioned 113 times. This is in comparison with twenty-one possible contacts with a social agency.

Out of 264 possible contacts all the nuclear families, which can be described as non-isolated, would ask members of the modified extended family 144 times in comparison with 120 times for all other sources. By way of contrast, out of 184 possible contacts all the

nuclear families, which can be described as isolated, would ask members of the modified extended family fifty times in comparison with 134 times for all other sources.

As an added step to test whether the number of contacts with the modified extended family are on the whole social contacts, our research group compared the number of help-giving contacts for each nuclear family with its total number of contacts with the modified extended family. We were interested to see whether social contacts are translated into help-giving contacts. The reader is referred to Table IV in Appendix B for the results.

Our findings revealed that during the past year thirty-two or 57 per cent of the nuclear families in our sample had twelve or less help-giving contacts with the modified extended family. Fourteen or 25 per cent of the families had sixty-one or more help-giving contacts. Further analysis shows that twenty of the twenty-three isolated families in our sample had twelve or less help-giving contacts with the modified extended family, while twelve of the thirty-three non-isolated families fall into this category. By way of comparison we noted that another twelve of these non-isolated families had

sixty-one or more help-giving contacts with the modified extended family. At the same time we observed that twenty-one of the thirty-three non-isolated families had thirteen or more help-giving contacts with the modified extended family while we could make this claim for only three of the twenty-three isolated families in our sample.

The final step of our research group was to relate the aforementioned findings to the questions asked at the beginning of our study. Our conclusions and an assessment of their significance are recorded in the concluding chapter.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

To achieve a greater knowledge of families served by five major family agencies in the City of Winnipeg the students in the Master's year at the School of Social Work, the University of Manitoba, undertook research on three aspects of family functioning. The objective of our research group was to study patterns of kinship relationships as a part of family functioning.

Our study was specifically interested in whether or not the agency-served families were isolated from the modified extended family. For a closer examination, we were interested in whether isolation was affected by ethnic origin, the wife's orientation in her family of origin, intergenerational ties, and differences in occupational level. Other variables could alter kinship ties but for practical considerations, such as time at our disposal, we limited ourselves to the aforementioned four factors. Within these limits, our research group sought to establish

the actual number of social and help-giving contacts that the nuclear family had with the modified extended family, as a way to assess the nature and extent of kinship ties.

While 176 completed schedules were examined, the definition of nuclear family used for our study reduced our final sample to fifty-six families. This is a very small sample and any conclusions drawn or observations made hereafter must be viewed in this light. Furthermore, our findings are representative only of families living in the City of Winnipeg and known to the five major family agencies.

The hypothesis tested was that the majority of nuclear families served by one or more family agencies in Winnipeg are characterized by isolation from the modified extended family with variations in the degree of isolation relating to ethnic origin, orientation of family of origin, intergenerational ties, and differences in occupational level. The variations will be dealt with as we relate our findings to the sub-hypotheses. With regard to isolation of the nuclear family from the modified extended family, our findings do not support the central affirmation of our hypothesis. On the contrary, we discovered that the

majority of the nuclear families in our sample (59 per cent) were not isolated, according to our definition, from the modified extended family. In addition, we noted there was no gradation in the number of contacts with the modified extended family from few to many. Rather, nuclear families had either very limited or very extensive contact with the modified extended family. Twenty-three families had 192 or less contacts with the modified extended family while twenty-three families had 577 or more contacts.

In connection with the main hypothesis of this study our research group recognized the difficulty of defining isolation. We had decided to measure isolation by the absence of the usual things that people do to maintain contact with their relatives, namely social and help-giving acts. However, there did not seem to be any available guide stating what actual number of contacts constituted the dividing line between isolation and non-isolation. Another consideration is that we could not completely eliminate the guesswork of the respondents when they stated the number of contacts with relatives.

At the same time we recognized that some nuclear families may have a meaningful relationship

with the modified extended family without having a large number of contacts. It takes more initiative to visit a relative in another city than to telephone a relative in your own city. However, our research group did not set out to differentiate the kinds of contacts. Our aim was to find out what contacts the family had with the modified extended family.

No attempt was made in our study to seek out all the causal factors which may decrease or increase the number of contacts of the nuclear family with the modified extended family. For instance, geographical distance can alter kinship ties. Recent movement from a rural area to the city could be another factor.

Neither did our research group attempt to compare the actual number of contacts with what contacts the nuclear family could have had with the modified extended family. The data for our study did not include the number of relatives each family had. To study this aspect of kinship relationships could well be the object of another research project.

At the beginning of our study we had postulated that there would be variations in the number of contacts the nuclear family had with the modified extended family, due to certain factors. Firstly, we

had hypothesized that there is less isolation in families of Indian origin than in families of other ethnic origins. We had assumed that kinship ties are mediated through women. Therefore, because cultural values stem from ethnic origin, we believed the wife's ethnic origin could influence the nuclear family's pattern of kinship relationships. For this reason we classified families according to wife's ethnic origin.

Because of our reading on Indian culture, our research group had anticipated that families of Indian origin would likely have extensive kinship ties. We had focused on this group because of the interest in the transition of the Indian-Métis group from rural to urban living. However, there were only four families of Indian origin in our sample. While other families may have had Indian ancestry, we had to rely on the respondent's answer concerning her ethnic origin.

Of the four families of Indian origin, two or 50 per cent can be described as isolated according to our definition of isolation. This percentage is higher than that for any one of the other four groups in our sample. For these the range is from 30 per cent to 44.4 per cent isolated. But the small number of families of Indian origin in our sample together with the small

representation from all ethnic groups makes our findings statistically insignificant. The amount of variation in the percentages could be attributed to chance. Within our sample, ethnic origin did not affect materially the number of contacts of the nuclear family with the modified extended family. Any other observations must be tempered by the fact that our study did not establish whether nuclear families were first or second generation in Canada and whether relatives had joined them through immigration. Neither did we ascertain whether there was cultural conflict between generations because the younger generation was becoming integrated into Canadian society.

The second sub-hypothesis of this study was also based on the assumption that kinship ties are mediated through the wife. We had hypothesized that the wife's orientation in her family of origin would be reflected in the nuclear family in which she was the wife. More precisely, our second sub-hypothesis was that, in the majority of families studied, if the wife comes from a nuclear-oriented family of origin, the family of procreation will be more isolated than if the wife comes from an extended-oriented family of origin. Our findings did not substantiate this sub-hypothesis. Instead, of

those families where wife had been nuclear-oriented in family of origin, 58.3 per cent had extensive contact with the modified extended family. In other words, being nuclear-oriented in family of origin provides no clear indication that the pattern will be continued in the family of procreation. Thirty-five per cent of the nuclear families where wife had been extended-oriented in family of origin exhibited a tendency toward minimum contact with the modified extended family. Hence we have no reason to believe that the wife's extended-orientation in family of origin will be reflected in most instances in the family of procreation. In drawing these conclusions, there is the inference that our assumption about kinship ties being mediated through women is in all respects true. It was recognized that this is not a constant factor. An unknown variable in our study was the initiative of the husband in reaching out to or discouraging contact with the modified extended family.

The third sub-hypothesis of this study stated that a majority of nuclear families studied show more isolation from members of their modified extended family in the preceding generation than from members of the modified extended family in the same generation. No

matter how we analyzed the data, there was almost an even split, that is contact with both generations was nearly the same. Whether the families had many or few contacts with the modified extended family seemed to make no difference. Our findings obviously did not support our sub-hypothesis. Rather they suggest that the so-called problem families do maintain similar contact with both generations. In view of our small sample this latter statement must be accepted with some reservation. Nevertheless, there does seem to be some indication that the so-called problem family may not be essentially different from the non-problem family, which, according to current literature, has retained or restored its relationship with members of the modified extended family, whether such members be in the same or preceding generation.

Where in those families there has been little or no contact with relatives, we have no assurance that this is a permanent pattern. It may be due to mobility causing a temporary disruption of kinship ties. Because of economic costs the family may do without a telephone or refrain from visits to relatives some miles away. It, therefore, does not follow that the lack of contact with either the preceding or same

generation means lack of interest.

In view of the findings it seems important to have more research on the intergenerational ties of agency-served families. This is of consequence, especially since there is every indication that for married couples the number of middle years with children absent from home will increase and since there is the probability of many years of life after retirement.

In the fourth sub-hypothesis of this study it is stated that a majority of nuclear families studied show less isolation from members of the modified extended family in the same occupational level than from members of the modified extended family in different occupational levels. Our findings suggest that the nuclear family has contact with members of the modified extended family regardless of the occupational level of the identified relatives. Here, too, there is agreement with current literature which contends that relations among kin are on an equalitarian basis. Only thirteen nuclear families in our sample indicated they had most contact with relatives in the same occupational level, while thirty-three had most contact with relatives in a different occupational level. Of these latter families twenty-five had most contact with relatives in a

higher occupational level and eight with relatives in a lower occupational level.

Perhaps our findings would have been more significant if our research group had identified the occupational level of the majority of the nuclear families in our sample. Fifty-eight per cent of the families in the sample drawn were being served by the two Public Assistance Agencies. This would seem to indicate that a majority of the families were in the lowest occupational levels. If so, then, with the upgrading of the whole population today, these families had to reach to relatives in a higher occupational level in order to maintain contact with the modified extended family. To speculate, there may be on the part of the families a desire for upward mobility. On the other hand, it may simply mean that they have contact with relatives in a higher occupational level because the latter are better able to give help when needed.

The findings concerning whether the modified extended family is actually or potentially a source of help are not strictly within the scope of our study. Yet they do enable us to note that the nuclear family sees the modified extended family not only in terms of sociability. The help-giving contacts were not

extensive but, on the other hand, our study did not ascertain whether they were in proportion to the requirements of the nuclear family. It was observed that the families who were considered non-isolated showed a tendency to be involved in more help-giving activities. On the whole, for the families in our sample, interaction with kin included more than socio-emotional and ritual activities.

When asked to designate potential sources of help, the nuclear families named a member of the modified extended family 194 times out of a total of 448 sources named. The fact that a social agency was named only seventy times is not significant, because the questions in the schedule did not ask the respondent to make a choice between relative or agency in the event she was confronted with a specific need or emergency.

What is significant for our study is that the agency-served family does see the modified extended family as a resource. Material help is important but the intangibles in social contacts should not be underestimated. The current literature and recent studies, to which reference is made in an earlier chapter, challenge previously held theory concerning the diminishing

importance of kinship ties. More recent theory contends that the nuclear family is not isolated from the modified extended family but the theory is based mainly on studies of non-problem families.

The conclusions of our study suggest that we may have to modify our thinking about the kinship ties of the so-called problem or agency-served families. For such families the modified extended family may have more importance as a source of psychological and material help than was originally believed.

This study does point up the need for additional research. It appears that no one factor alone affects the kinship pattern of the families studied. Additional research could identify and pursue other factors or combination of factors. A study or studies keeping one or more variables constant should yield better results.

It is hoped that the findings of our study on the kinship relationships of agency-served families will not only provide new insights for workers serving such families but, at the same time, open new vistas for research.

APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE

SECTION B. KINSHIP

Interviewer's Initials _____

Note to Interviewer

In this part of the schedule, when "relative" is used, it refers to only the parents, and brothers and sisters (with their husbands and wives, and children still living in the home) of the parents of the nuclear family. Only these fall within our definition of the modified-extended family, so please do not include any other relatives).

(Questions preceded by an asterisk (*) have already been asked in Section A. There is no need to ask them again).

- I. *1. Where were you born? _____
Your husband? _____
- *2. What language was predominantly spoken by your male ancestor upon his arrival in Canada? _____
Your husband's male ancestor? _____
- *3. What is your ethnic origin? _____
Your husband's? _____
(for example, English, French, German, Polish. Canadian cannot be accepted as an ethnic origin).

COMMENTS _____

II. Note: If respondent is the husband, please disregard this section.

Could you tell us a little bit about your background?

When you were a child:

(1) Did you and your relatives exchange visits?

(a) Frequently _____

(b) Occasionally _____

(c) Seldom _____

(d) Never _____

(2) Did you spend your vacations (or part of them) with your relatives?

Yes _____ No _____

(3) Did you attend family celebrations such as weddings, picnics, or anniversaries, etc. with your relatives?

Yes _____ No _____

(Note: a "yes" answer is to be accepted here only if this is reported to have happened on at least two occasions).

(4) Did your parents exchange help with relatives around such things as harvesting, home and/or car repairs, gardening, canning, sewing, or baby-sitting, etc.?

(a) Frequently _____

(b) Occasionally _____

(c) Seldom _____

(d) Never _____

- (5) Did your parents exchange gifts with relatives, such as new or used clothing, garden produce, birthday and Christmas gifts?

(a) Frequently _____

(b) Occasionally _____

(c) Seldom _____

(d) Never _____

COMMENTS _____

- III. (1) Are any of your parents or your husband's parents living?
Yes _____ No _____
- (2) Are any of your brothers, sisters, brothers-in-law, or sisters-in-law living?
Yes _____ No _____
- (3) Are any of your parents or parents-in-law, brothers, sisters, brothers-in-law, or sisters-in-law living with you?
Yes _____ No _____

COMMENTS _____

IV. Note to Interviewer: Where the term "year" is used, it refers to the past year. Answers to questions which ask "how many" must be a specific number.

- (1) Do you and your family correspond with relatives? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, then ask the following:

- (a) How many letters does your family write to your parents? in one month _____ in one year _____

To your brothers and sisters and their families? in one month _____ in one year _____

- (b) How many letters do you and your family receive from your parents? in one month _____ in one year _____

From your brothers and sisters and their families? in one month _____ in one year _____

- (2) Do you and your family call your relatives on the telephone?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

- (a) How many phone calls does your family make to your parents? in one month _____ in one year _____

To brothers and sisters and their families? in one month _____ in one year _____

- (b) How many phone calls does your family receive from parents? in one month _____ in one year _____

From brothers and sisters and their families? in one month _____ in one year _____

- (3) Do you and your family visit with relatives?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

- (a) How many visits do you and your family make to parents? in one month _____
in one year _____

To your brothers and sisters and their families? in one month _____
in one year _____

- (b) How many visits do you and your family receive from parents? in one month _____
in one year _____

From brothers and sisters and their families? in one month _____
in one year _____

- (4) Do you and your family attend family celebrations? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, then answer:

- (a) How many times in one year? _____

- (b) Do you attend with parents?

Yes _____ No _____
with brothers, sisters and their families?

Yes _____ No _____
with both?

Yes _____ No _____

- (5) Do your parents or relatives ever baby-sit for you, or help you around the house?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

- (a) How many times do your parents baby-sit for your family? in one month _____
in one year _____

How many times do your brothers and sisters and their families baby-sit for your family? in one month _____
in one year _____

- (b) In the past year, when help was needed around the house, did parents help?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, answer the following:

How many times? in one month _____
in one year _____

Did brothers and sisters and their families help?

If yes, then answer:

How many times did they help?
in one month _____
in one year _____

- (6) Do parents or relatives ever do errands for you? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

- (a) How many times do parents do errands for you? in one month _____
in one year _____

- (b) How many times do brothers, sisters and their families do errands for you?
in one month _____
in one year _____

(Errands: shopping, taking children to appointments, mailing letters, etc.)

- (7) Did you and your family receive material help or financial assistance (gifts or loans) from parents or relatives in the past year?

Yes _____ No _____

(Material help: food, clothing, furniture, etc.)

If yes, then answer the following:

- (a) How many times do you receive material goods (gifts or loans) from parents?
in one month _____
in one year _____

From brothers and sisters and their families? in one month _____
in one year _____

- (b) How many times do you receive financial assistance (gifts or loans) from parents?
in one month _____
in one year _____

From brothers and sisters and their families? in one month _____
in one year _____

COMMENTS _____

- V. Do you have any married sons or daughters?
Yes _____ No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

- (1) Do you or your family correspond with married sons and daughters? Yes _____
No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

- (a) How many letters do you and your family write to your married sons and daughters? per month _____
per year _____

- (b) How many letters do you and your family receive from married sons and daughters? per month _____
per year _____

- (2) Do you and your family speak to your married sons and daughters on the phone?
Yes _____ No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

- (a) How many phone calls do you and your family make to your married sons and daughters? per month _____
per year _____
- (b) How many phone calls does your family receive from your married sons and daughters? per month _____
per year _____

- (3) Do you and your family visit with your married sons and daughters?
Yes _____ No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

- (a) How many visits do you and your family make to your married sons and daughters? in one month _____
in one year _____
- (b) How many visits do you and your family receive from your married sons and daughters? in one month _____
in one year _____

- (4) Do you and your family attend family celebrations with your married sons and daughters?
Yes _____ No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

How many times do you attend family celebrations with your married sons and daughters?
in one month _____
in one year _____

- (5) Do your married sons and daughters ever babysit for you, or help you around the house?
Yes _____ No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

(a) How many times do your married sons and daughters baby-sit for you?
in one month _____
in one year _____

(b) In the past year, how many times did your married sons and daughters help you around the house (with chores, special projects, building), care during illness, spring cleaning, etc.)?
in one month _____
in one year _____

(6) Do your married sons and daughters ever do errands for you? Yes _____
No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

How many times do married sons and daughters do errands for you? in one month _____
in one year _____

(7) Did you and your family, in the past year, receive material help, or financial assistance (gifts or loans) from your married sons or daughters? (Material help: food, clothing, furniture, etc.) Yes _____
No _____

If yes, then answer the following:

(a) How many times do you receive material goods (gifts or loans) from your married sons and daughters? in one month _____
in one year _____

(b) How many times do you receive financial assistance (gifts or loans) from your married sons and daughters?
in one month _____
in one year _____

COMMENTS _____

VI. Instructions to Interviewer: In this section:

1. Definite occupation is required, place of work is not enough.
2. If retired, or married woman whose husband is deceased, determine husband's former occupation.

1. What job(s) has your husband done in the past year?

2. What is your husband's usual occupation?

3. With which three relatives does your family have the most contact? What is the occupation of each? (Note to interviewer - if respondent is a married woman, give husband's occupation. If single woman, put an "S" beside the name).

Relative

Occupation

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. Note to Interviewer: If respondent is unable to answer these questions for at least one relative, leave it out.

- (a) With which three relatives does your family have the least contact, and what is the occupation of each?

(Note to interviewer: please follow instructions given in (3) where relative named is a woman.

	<u>Relative</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____

VII. Note to Interviewer: In the below section, record exactly whatever the respondent says. If the answer names a relative, determine which relative.

(1) If you or your husband would be unable to look after your children for an extended period of time, whom would you ask to look after your children?

(2) Whom would you ask if you needed:

(a) Help in caring for children?

(b) Help in cooking or housework?

(c) Financial help?

(d) Helping and errands?

(e) Help during illness?

(f) Help in settling into a new home?

(g) Help in finding a job?

APPENDIX B

TABLE I

POPULATION, SAMPLE, AND NUMBER OF FAMILIES
INTERVIEWED AND NOT INTERVIEWED, OF FIVE
FAMILY AGENCIES IN CITY OF WINNIPEG

DECEMBER 1963 - FEBRUARY 1964

	Total	1 ^a	2	3	4	5
Population	2701	1310	395	441	420	135
Sample drawn	369	146	45	63	70	45
Interview not re- quested ^b	54	2	..	3	33	16
Interview requested	315	144	45	60	37	29
Refused	77	47	7	15	6	2
Moved and/ or not located	62	11	10	26	8	7
Interviewed	176	86	28	19	23	20

- ^a1. City of Winnipeg Welfare Department.
2. Winnipeg Regional Office (Mothers' Allowance Branch), Province of Manitoba Department of Welfare.
3. Winnipeg Family Court.
4. Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg.
5. Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg.

^b At worker's request, or where worker knew no children present or duplication.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF NUCLEAR FAMILIES
ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF CONTACTS
WITH THE MODIFIED EXTENDED FAMILY

No. of Contacts	No. of Families
Total	56
0-48	9
49-96	5
97-144	5
145-192	4
193-240	0
241-288	0
289-336	4
337-384	1
385-432	0
433-480	2
481-528	1
529-576	2
577 or more	23

TABLE III

DISTRIBUTION OF NUCLEAR FAMILIES ACCORDING TO ETHNIC
ORIGIN AND NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH THE MODIFIED
EXTENDED FAMILY

No. of Con- tacts	Total	Anglo- Saxon			West European					East Euro- pean			Latin		
		English	Irish	Scotch	Dutch	German	Norwegian	Danish	Swedish	Polish	Ukrainian	Russian	French	Italian	Indian-Métis
Total	56	18	3	4	3	4	1	1	1	1	7	1	7	1	4
0-96	14	9	.	1	1	1	.	.	.	2
97-192	9	.	.	1	1	1	.	.	1	.	1	1	2	1	.
193-288
289-384	5	1	1	1	.	1	1
385-480	2	.	1	1
481-576	3	2	1
577 or more	23	6	1	.	2	2	1	1	.	.	5	.	5	.	.

TABLE IV

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACTS
AND HELP-GIVING CONTACTS DURING PAST YEAR

No. of Contacts	Total	No. of Help-giving Contacts					
		12 or less	13- 24	25- 36	37- 48	49- 60	61 or more
Total	56	32	4	4	2	.	14
48-96	14	13	.	1	.	.	.
97-192	9	7	2
193-288
289-384	5	3	1	.	.	.	1
385-480	2	1	1
481-576	3	3
577 or more	23	8	2	3	2	.	8

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Ackerman, Nathan W., Beatman, Frances L., and Sherman, Sanford N. (eds.). Exploring the Base for Family Therapy. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1961.
- Anshen, Ruth N. (ed.). The Family: Its Function and Destiny. New York: Harper & Bros. Publishers, 1949.
- Blishen, Bernard R. et al (eds.). Canadian Society. Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1961.
- Elmer, M. C. The Sociology of the Family. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1945.
- Geismar, L. L., and Ayres, Beverley. Measuring Family Functioning. St. Paul, Minn.: Family Centered Project, Greater St. Paul Community Chest and Councils Inc., 1960.
- Parsons, Talcott, and Bales, Robert F. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.
- Schlesinger, Benjamin (ed.). The Multi-Problem Family. Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1961.
- Stein, Herman D., and Cloward, Richard A. (eds.). Social Perspectives on Behavior. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1958.

Sussman, Marvin B. (ed.). Community Structure and Analysis.

New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1959.

_____. Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family.
2d ed.

Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963.

Sussman, Marvin B., and White, R. Clyde.

Hough, Cleveland, Ohio: A Study of Social Life and Change.

Cleveland: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1959.

Wilensky, Harold L. and Lebeaux, Charles N.

Industrial Society and Social Welfare.

New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958.

Woods, Frances Jerome. The American Family System.

New York: Harper & Bros. Publishers, 1959.

Young, Michael and Willmott, Peter. Family and Kinship in East London.

London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957.

Articles

Axelrod, Morris. "Urban Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXI (February 1956), pp. 13-18.

Bell, Wendell and Boat, Marion D. "Urban Neighborhoods and Informal Social Relations," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXII (January 1957), pp. 396-398.

Cumming, Elaine and Schneider, David M. "Sibling Solidarity in American Kinship," American Anthropologist, Vol. LXIII (June 1961), pp. 498-507.

Dotson, Floyd. "Patterns of Voluntary Association Among Urban Working-class Families," American Sociological Review, Vol. XVI (October 1951), pp. 687-693.

- Garigue, Philip. "French Canadian Kinship and Urban Life," American Anthropologist, Vol. LVIII (December 1956), pp. 1090-1101.
- Levasseur, Reverend Father Léon. "Cultural Encounter," an article distributed by Indian-Eskimo Association, 47 Dundonald St., Toronto 5, Ontario.
- Litwak, Eugene. "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXV (June 1960), pp. 385-394.
- Willmott, Peter. "Kinship and Social Legislation," British Journal of Sociology, Vol. IX (1959), pp. 126-142.

Public Documents

- Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Seventh Census of Canada: 1931. Population: General Characteristics, Vol. I. Ottawa: King's Printer.
- Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Eighth Census of Canada: 1941. Population: General Characteristics, Vol. I. Ottawa: King's Printer.
- Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Tenth Census of Canada: 1961. Population: General Characteristics, Vol. I. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Manitoba, Department of Agriculture and Immigration. A Study of the Population of Indian Ancestry in Manitoba, I, II, III. Winnipeg: Social and Economic Research Office, 1959.

Unpublished Material

Leichter, Hope J. "Kinship and Casework". Report of a research project under the joint sponsorship of the Jewish Family Service of New York City and the Russell Sage Foundation. Remarks at: The National Conference on Social Welfare. Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 15, 1961. (Mimeographed.)