DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 576 RC 008 757

AUTHOR	Kutner, Nancy G.
TITLE	An Interethnic and Place of Residence Examination of the "Culture of Poverty". Departmental Technical Report No. 75-3.
INSTITUTION	Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY	Cooperative State Research Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	TAES-DTR-75-3; TAES-H-2906; USDA(CSRS)-NC-90
PUB DATE	18 Feb 75
NOTE	106p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$5.70 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Asian Americans; Attitudes; *Cross Cultural Studies; Demography; *Economically Disadvantaged; Economic Factors; *Ethnic Groups; Females; Metropolitan Areas; Mexican Americans; Mexicans; Migrant Workers; Negroes; Poverty Research; *Residential Patterns; Rural Farm Residents; Social Structure; *Spanish Speaking; Values

ABSTRACT

Data which taps aspects of traits said by Oscar Lewis to comprise a "culture of poverty" were examined for poor and non-poor families varying in ethnic background and residence. Before comparing the incidence of poverty culture across ethnic and residence lines, the question "Do alleged poverty culture traits become more pronounced as level of economic deprivation increases?" was studied. Derived from the sample obtained by 7 states participating in the NC-90 project, the following populations were represented: metropolitan whites; nonmetropolitan small town whites; rural farm and nonfarm whites; metropolitan blacks; village and small urban place blacks; metropolitan Spanish-speaking (primarily Mexican American and Puerto Rican); migrant labor camp Spanish-speaking (Mexican Americans); migrant labor camp Spanish-speaking (Mexican nationals); metropolitan Hawaiian Orientals; metropolitan Hawaiian "mixed ethnics"; and metropolitan Polynesians. Data, obtained through interviews with the main female homemaker, pertained to demography; family resource procurement and expenditure; social structure and activities of the family, both internally and within the community; and the homemaker's value-orientations regarding education and employment. Findings indicated that, on some indicators of some traits, sizeable differences existed among ethnic and/or residence categories. (NQ)

AN INTERETHNIC AND PLACE OF RESIDENCE EXAMINATION OF THE "CULTURE OF POVERTY"

Nancy G. Kutner*

Department of Rural Sociology
Texas Agricultural Experiment Station
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

Departmental Technical Report Number 75-3

February 18, 1975

*Presently Research Associate, Center for Research in Social Change, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia. Formerly Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics and Sociology, Texas A&M University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

This report contributes to Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Project H-2906 and the United States Department of Agriculture, Cooperative State Research Service Project NC-90, "Factors Affecting Patterns of Living in Disadvantaged Families." Preparation of the report was partially supported by TAES Project H-2906.

The NC-90 project is a cooperative interstate effort, and has as its general objectives: (1) "to identify life patterns among relatively disadvantaged families in selected areas of the nation" and (2) "to determine factors that are significantly associated with these patterns of living in order to progress toward pragmatic definition and measurement of ways of life in families who experience disadvantagement in different forms and extents" (Iowa State University Agricultural Experiment Station, 1973). (The term "disadvantagement" is used in the NC-90 project to mean insufficient income relative to the estimated consumption needs of a family.) Participants in NC-90 consist of the Agricultural and Home Economics Experiment Stations in 13 states.

Appreciation is expressed to members of the NC-90 Technical Committee who made data available for this report: Dr. Glenn Hawkes (California), Dr. Shirley Weeks (Hawaii), Dr. Sally Manning (Indiana and Vermont), Dr. Edward Metzen (Missouri), Dr. William Kuvlesky (Texas), and Dr. Hazel Reinhardt (Wisconsin). The writer especially wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Metzen and Dr. Sandra Helmick in compilation of data for the tables included in this report, Dr. Reinhardt's assistance in furnishing demographic background information about state samples, and Dr. Kuvlesky's facilitation of the completion of this report.

I. INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The purpose of this report is to examine, for poor and non-poor families varying in ethnic background and residence, a large amount of data which taps aspects of traits said by Oscar Lewis to comprise a "culture of poverty."

The central question asked is: Do alleged poverty culture traits become more pronounced as level of economic deprivation increases? This question about the reality of poverty culture traits must be answered before one can proceed to compare the incidence of poverty culture across ethnic and residence lines, i.e., testing the hypothesis that "very poor people from groups characterized by different major cultures are markedly similar to each other in certain attitudes, values, and patterns of behavior" (Irelan et al., 1969:406). Data relevant to the latter hypothesis are contained in this report, permitting inferences about the generalizability of the culture of poverty. However, because of sampling inconsistencies in the present data, the latter hypothesis cannot be directly tested here.

It must be noted at the outset that the "non-poor" discussed in this report are defined solely in terms of an economic (income) measure. Because of the nature of sampling in the larger study from which the present data are taken, the non-poor frequently share with the poor disadvantages associated with living in poverty census tracts or low-income counties. These disadvantages may include racial/ethnic segregation as well as lack of various neighborhood amenities. Following the arguments of social area analysts (e.g., Bell and Force, 1956), there may be a

"contextual" effect on the economically non-poor residing in deprived environments, i.e., the non-poor may tend to demonstrate many of the social and psychological characteristics of the poor who share such environments. If this is true, poor/non-poor differences will be less pronounced than would be the case if a more representative sample of non-poor were compared with the poor. On the other hand, it is possible that there is a positive effect on the outlook of the economically non-poor who use their poor neighbors as a comparative reference group in evaluating their own status. To the extent that the positive effect of such comparison acts as a countervailing influence, the negative environmental contextual effect will be reduced.

THE "CULTURE OF POVERTY" CONCEPT

After intensively studying impoverished families in Mexico and Puerto Rico, anthropologist Oscar Lewis identified about sixty characteristics comprising what he termed the "culture of poverty."[1/] According to Lewis, the subculture of poverty is a way of life with its own structure and rationale, passed down along family lines from one generation of poor to the next. The many characteristics of this culture are grouped by Lewis into four major categories: relationships between the subculture (poverty culture) and the larger society; the nature of the local slum community; the nature of the family; and the attitudes, values, and character of the individual. The following representative statements about each of these categories give an overview of the "culture of poverty":

1. "The lack of effective participation and integration of the poor in the major institutions of the larger society is one of the crucial characteristics of the culture of poverty" (Lewis, 1966:xiv).

2. "When we look at the culture of poverty on the local community level, we find...above all a minimum of organization beyond the level of the nuclear and extended family" (Lewis, 1966:xlvi).

3. "On the family level the major traits of the culture of poverty are the absence of childhood as a specially prolonged and protected state in the life cycle, early initiation into sex, free unions or consensual marriages, a relatively high incidence of abandonment of wives and children, a trend toward female- or mother-centered families,...a strong predisposition toward authoritarianism, lack of privacy,...and competition for limited goods and maternal affection" (Lewis, 1966:xlvii).

4. "On the level of the individual the major characteristics are a strong feeling of marginality, of helplessness, or of dependence and inferiority" (Lewis, 1966: xlvii).

The significance of the culture of poverty concept is its relation to the question of the source of distinctive behaviors and outlooks among the poor. Two theoretical perspectives have been applied by social scientists seeking to explain observed characteristics of lower-class and poverty existence:[2/] the subcultural and the situational approaches. Oscar Lewis has been a major proponent of the subcultural appraoch.[3/] The subcultural appraoch to explaining observed poverty-related characteristics maintains that "poor people, like people in every other stratum, possess a mutually consistent and supporting set of values, beliefs, and patterns of conduct. This integrated set of characteristics is shared by members of the stratum and differs in important ways from that possessed by persons in other strata...*The way of life is acquired early in life, and it is perpetuated from one generation to the*

next" (Kriesberg, 1970:6, italics added).

The situational approach to explaining observed poverty-related characteristics, on the other hadn, views low-income people as holding many vlaues in common with other strata but adjusting both their values and behavior in line with the deprived circumstances with which they must cope. Hyman Rodman (1963) terms this phenomenon the "lower-class value stretch"; Elliot Liebow (1967) refers to a "shadow system of vlaues."

Major differences between the subcultural and the situational approaches are that the situational approach does not assume perpetuation of so-called poverty culture characteristics across generations and that it emphasizes linkages between these characteristics and those found throughout the larger society. Thus, Oscar Lewis' culture of poverty concept has generated much controversy among social scientists. Although some, such as Ladner (1970), seem willing to assume that the poor are different from higher strata in the ways and for the reasons identified by Lewis, other social scientists (e.g., Roach and Gursslin, 1967; Valentine, 1968; Leeds, 1971; Ryan, 1971; Winter, 1974) have been highly critical of Lewis' thesis. Their criticisms have been made on several grounds.[4/] It is not the purpose of this report to enter into an extended debate on the validity of the culture of poverty concept, although the writer feels an obligation to note questions about the nature of some hypothesized poverty traits. Rather, the main purpose of this report is to see if a number of the traits listed by Lewis become more evident as economic deprivation increases in a wide range of population types.

Despite conceptual problems in Lewis' formulation, Lewis' critics do acknowledge the need for this kind of investigation. According to Irelan et al. (1969:405), "the phrase 'culture of poverty' has become current before the reality of its referent has been established." Thus, says Alan Winter (1971:18), "the final status of Lewis' hypothesized list and a more definitive description of the lifeways of the poor await further research." However, large scale systematic surveys focussing on those at the bottom of the stratification system, which Rossi and Blum advocated in 1968, remain difficult to locate. The question, "How different are the poor?", remains largely unanswered.

One relevant study, "Characteristics of the Lower-Blue-Collar Class," was published by Cohen and Hodges in 1963. It was not designed to test Oscar Lewis' culture of poverty traits, but a number of the characteristics reported closely parallel some of Lewis' traits. Thus, the lower-lower stratum in Cohen and Hodges' sample was found to differ significantly from higher strata by evidencing more nearly exclusive dependence upon kin and peer relationships for support and social participation; lower participation in voluntary associations; and greater likelihood of demonstrating preference for the familiar, anti-intellectuality, authoritarianism, pessimism-insecurity, and partiarchy. In addition, the lower-lower stratum was characterized by significantly greater expenditure on material possessions, especially car and appliances, than the upper-lower class. However, whereas Cohen and Hodges found the lower-lower stratum to be significantly more intolerant of deviations such as homosexuality, Lewis maintains that the poor share a high tolerance for "psychological pathology of all sorts."

A more recent study (Irelan et al., 1969) specifically addresses itself to empirically examining some of Lewis' hypothesized poverty culture traits. In their conclusion, the authors of that study (Irelan et al. 1969:413), who focus only on selected value-orientations, express doubt that "poverty overrides basic cultural orientations as an attitude and value determinant." They stress the need for larger scale studies, focussing on family life patterns and other behaviors as well as on attitudes and including a comparison group of higher status persons for each ethnic category--requirements which are met by the present study.

Before describing the study populations and methodology used in this research, the full content of the culture of poverty as set forth by Oscar Lewis will be presented and briefly commented upon.

Culture of Poverty Traits

According to Oscar Lewis' discussion in The Study of Slum Culture--Backgrounds for La Vida (1968b), the major characteristics of the culture of poverty are as follows:

1. Relationships between the subculture and the larger society

   Lack of effective participation and integration of the poor in the major institutions of the larger society. This crucial characteristic is evidenced by: Low wages, Chronic unemployment and underemployment. These in turn lead to
   --Low income
   --Lack of property ownership
   --Absence of savings
   --Absence of food reserves in the home
   --A chronic shortage of cash.

   As a response, there is a high incidence of
   --Pawning of personal goods
   --Borrowing from local moneylenders at usurious interest rates
   --Spontaneous informal credit devices organized by neighbors
   --Use of secondhand clothing and furniture
   --The pattern of frequent buying of small quantities of food many times a day as the need arises.

In addition, people with a culture of poverty:
--Have a low level of literacy and education
--Do not belong to labor unions
--Are not members of political parties
--Generally do not participate in the national welfare agencies,
--Make very little use of banks, hospitals, department stores, museums, or art galleries
--Have a critical attitude toward some of the basic institutions of the dominant classes, hatred of the police, mistrust of government and those in high position, and a cynicism that extends even to the church
--Are aware of middle-class values;...but on the whole they do not live by them.

II. The nature of the slum community

Poor housing conditions
Crowding
Gregariousness
Above all, a minimum of organization beyond the level of the of the neclear and extended family.

III. The nature of the family

The absence of childhood as a specially prolonged and protected stage in the life cycle
Early initiation into sex
Free unions or consensual marriages
A relatively high incidence of the abandonment of wives and children
A trend toward female- or mother-centered families, and consequently a much greater knowledge of maternal relatives
A strong predisposition to authoritarianism
Lack of privacy
Verbal emphasis upon family solidarity, which is only rarely achieved because of sibling rivalry
Competition for limited goods and maternal affection.

IV. The attitudes, values, and character structure of the individual

Strong feelings of marginality, of helplessness, of dependence, and of inferiority
High incidence of maternal deprivation
High incidence of orality
High incidence of weak ego structure
Confusion of sexual identification
Lack of impulse control
Strong present-time orientation, with relatively little ability to defer gratification and to plan for the future

Sense of resignation and fatalism
Widespread belief in male superiority
High tolerance for psychological pathology of all sorts

In addition, people with a culture of poverty:

Are provincial and locally oriented and have very little sense of history
Are not class conscious although they are very sensitive indeed to status distinctions.

The above "listing" of traits comprising the culture of poverty is the most recent one formulated by Oscar Lewis. Anthony Leeds (1971:239-241) lists traits mentioned by Lewis in his writings over the period 1961-1966. Leeds' list contains the characteristics given above with these additions:

Relatively higher death rate
Lower life expectancy
A higher proportion of individuals in the younger age groups
Child labor and working women--therefore higher proportion of gainfully employed
Constant struggle for survival
Miscellany of unskilled occupations
High incidence of alcoholism
Frequent resort to violence in training children
Wife beating
Predominance of neclear family
Martyr complex among women
Feeling that existing institutions do not serve their interests and needs
Feeling of powerlessness, personal unworthiness

It is unclear whether Lewis' 1968 discussion represents a rethinking of the content of the culture of poverty or whether he simply wished to present its content in more concise form in that discussion. This writer is inclined to believe that the latter is true.

Anthony Leeds (1971:239) is critical of Lewis' method of presenting the content of the culture of poverty, charging that "...the alleged traits are presented in running paragraph form--nowhere listed--so that one is unable, anywhere, to establish definitively what the discrete

traits are as he conceives them." In his 1968 discussion, Lewis (1968a:192) provides at least a partial answer to this charge by cautioning the reader that "the traits fall into a number of clusters and are functionally related within each cluster, and many...of the traits of different clusters are also functionally related." Moreover, "none of the traits, taken individually, is distinctive per se of the subculture of poverty. It is their conjunction, their function, and their patterning that define the subculture." Perhaps this interconnectedness is what Lewis was trying to imply by presenting the traits as he did.

Although Lewis' emphasis on the inter-relation of culture of poverty traits would seem to suggest that analysis of individual traits is inappropriate, he (1968a:192) specifically states that "the subculture of poverty, as defined by these traits, is a statistical profile; that is, the frequency of distribution of the traits both singly and in clusters will be greater than in the rest of the population" (italics added). This statement seems to permit examination of the distribution of any number of individual traits mentioned by Lewis as defining the culture of poverty.

Traits which will be investigated in the present report are listed in Table I-1. The majority of these traits are found in Lewis' 1968 discussion; a few are found in the listing by Leeds (1971:239-241) which is based on Lewis' earlier writings. The traits in Table I-1 were selected because reasonable indicators could be found for them in data collected for the NC-90 project, "Factors Affecting Patterns of Living in Disadvantaged Families" (U.S.D.A., Cooperative State Research Servict), to be described below.

TABLE I-1

ALLEGED CULTURE OF POVERTY TRAITS

INVESTIGATED IN THIS REPORT

Relationships between the subculture and the larger society	Unemployment Working women Underemployment Unskilled occupations Lack of property ownership Absence of savings Absence of food reserves in the home Chronic shortage of cash Constant struggle for survival Borrowing from local moneylenders... Low level of education Do not belong to labor unions Do not participate in national welfare agencies
Nature of the local slum community	Poor housing conditions Crowding Minimum of organization beyond the level of the nuclear and extended family
Nature of the family	Trend toward female- or mother-centered families Predominance of the nuclear family Greater knowledge of maternal relatives Family solidarity: an ideal rarely achieved Absence of childhood as a specially prolonged and protected stage in the life cycle Strong predisposition to authoritarianism
Attitudes, values, and character of the individual	Strong feeling of alienation Feeling that existing institutions do not serve their interests and needs Strong feeling of helplessness Sense of resignation and fatalism Strong feeling of dependence Feeling of powerlessness Belief in male superiority Martyr complex among women

II. STUDY POPULATIONS

The larger study from which the data for this report are derived is the United States Department of Agriculture, Cooperative State Research Service Project NC-90, "Factors Affecting Patterns of Living in Disadvantaged Families." Populations sampled in the various states participating in the NC-90 project include a diversity of ethnic and residence types. Obtaining such diversity in the total sample was a major objective of the NC-90 researchers, in order to permit comparative study of disadvantagement among varied population types.

Populations were selected for analysis in the present study to maximize possible inter-ethnic and residence type comparisons. The following eleven population types are represented in this report: (1) metropolitan whites; (2) non-metropolitan: small town whites; (3) non-metropolitan: rural farm and nonfarm whites; (4) metropolitan blacks; (5) non-metropolitan: village and small urban place blacks; (6) metropolitan Spanish-speaking: Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans primarily; (7) non-metropolitan: migrant labor camp Spanish-speaking: Mexican-Americans; (8) non-metropolitan: migrant labor camp Spanish-speaking: Mexican nationals; (9) metropolitan Hawaiian Orientals; (10) metropolitan Hawaiian "mixed ethnics"; (11) metropolitan Hawaiian Polynesians. The nature of each study population included in this report is further specified below.

DESCRIPTIVE OVERVIEW OF STUDY POPULATIONS

With two exceptions, the study populations discussed in this report are identical with, or omit only a handful of cases from, the total sample

obtained by seven states participating in the NC-90 project. The exceptions are the metropolitan Spanish-speaking population, which represents 28% of the total sample obtained in the state of Indiana, and the Hawaiian populations, which represent 82% of the total sample obatined in that state.

The units of each study population are families, although data were obtained through interviews with one family member, the homemaker (see Chapter III).

Metropolitan whites

The metropolitan white respondent-group discussed in this report was interviewed in 1970 in Superior, Wisconsin (part of the Superior-Duluth SMSA).[5/] Families included in the study population resided in eight wards in which one-third or more of the housing units were classified as deteriorating and dilapidated, plus three public low-income housing areas. The wards selected bordered the lake front, where ore and grain docks are prominent; railroad yards; and the downtown area of Superior. Almost 26% of the families in the study population reported incomes placing them below the poverty threshold, as compared to approximately 10% of all families in Superior in 1970.

Superior has been experiencing heavy out-migration in recent years. Its population according to the 1970 Census was 32,237, of which 95.8% was white. Many residents of Superior are of Swedish or Finnish extraction.

Non-metropolitan: small town whites

White respondents were interviewed in 1970 in eight Missouri small towns (i.e., incorporated places with populations of at least 1,000 but

less than 2,500), located within a 100-mile radius of the intersection of Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska.[6/] Farming and "small-town diversity" characterize this northwestern part of Missouri. Although 14%-24% of families living in the Missouri counties in which the eight towns are located were below the poverty threshold in 1970, only 5.6% of the study population families were found to be below this threshold. Families residing in the towns from which the study population was drawn may thus be significantly "better off" than their counterparts elsewhere in the same county.

Five towns in which families were interviewed registered population increases of 5% to 35% over the decade 1960-1970; the remaining three towns registered losses of 3.3% to 8%. In 1970, over 96% of the population in these communities was white. A number of families in the area are of German extraction.

Non-metropolitan: rural farm and nonfarm whites

The rural farm and nonfarm white respondent-group was interviewed in 1970 in Vermont. These families lived in fifteen randomly selected minor civil divisions or "towns" in which 34% or more of the families has less than $3,000 income in 1959.[7/] Seventeen percent of the study population lived on farms; the remaining 83% lived in small villages or in the open country and were not engaged in farming. The incidence of poverty-level incomes was found to be over twice as high among study population families as among all families in the nine Vermont counties sampled; 26.4% of the study population families as compared to 6.2%-14.8% of all families in the counties were below the poverty threshold in 1970.

The 1970 population size of Vermont "towns" in which families were interviewed ranged from 14 to 1,198. Only one "town had a population exceeding 1,000. Twelve "towns" grew in population (0.5%-64%) during 196-1970; three "towns" lost population (8.7%-22.1%). Whites comprised 99%-100% of the population in all fifteen "towns." Contrary to the researchers' expectation of a sizeable French Canadian component among the Vermont study population, only two French-speaking families are included.

Metropolitan blacks

The metropolitan black respondent-group discussed in this report was interviewed in 1971 in Houston, Texas.[8/] These families resided in the 5th ward, located in the downtown section of Houston, which encompasses two poverty tracts. Just over 46% of the families in the study population reported incomes in 1970 placing them below the poverty threshold, as compared to 25% of all black families in the city of Houston in 1969.

Texas researchers elected to exclusively interview black families in order that blacks living in the southern part of the U.S. would be represented in the NC-90 study. Although Texas is considered to be in the Southwest, the city of Houston is located in the eastern part of the state, and many black migrants to Houston are from Louisiana. The city of Houston experienced marked growth over the decade 1960-1970 from both the in-migration (26% increase) and natural increase (25%) of black population. In 1970, 26% of Houston's population was black, and the city ranked eighth in the U.S. in total size of black population.

Non-metropolitan blacks

The non-metropolitan black respondent-group was interviewed in 1970 in two rural villages (less than 75 households each) and in Center, a small urban place (1970 population 4,989), located in Shelby County in East Texas. Lumber and poultry-processing plants are the major industries in the study area.

Shelby County is predominantly rural and is located approximately sixty miles from the nearest metropolitan center, which is in Louisiana. The county had a higher proportion of blacks and a substantially lower median income than the state of Texas generally in 1960 and was purposely selected for these reasons. Socio-economic indicators--income, occupation, and education--show the blacks of the county to be markedly disadvantaged compared to the county's whites. Of the families in the study population, 37.4% were found to have incomes below the poverty threshold, as compared to 48.6% of all black families in Shelby County in 1970.

During the decade 1960-1970, Shelby County experienced some loss of black population (5.5%). In 1970, 24.4% of the population of Shelby County was black; blacks comprised 30.3% of the population of Center.

Metropolitan Spanish-speaking (Mexican-American and Puerto Rican primarily)

A metropolitan Spanish-speaking respondent-group was interviewed in 1970 in poverty tracts of East Chicago, Indiana (part of the Gary-Hammond-East Chicago SMSA).[9/] These families were primarily of Mexican-American and Puerto Rican backgrounds. The metropolitan Spanish-speaking families were not purposely contacted as were black families in Texas and Spanish-speaking families in California; rather, 28% of the area sample interviewed in East Chicago was found to consist of Spanish-speaking families. Incomes

below the poverty threshold characterized 31.5% of this study population, compared to approximately 10.5% of all persons in Spanish-speaking families in the Gary-Hammond-East Chicago SMSA in 1970.

(Note: It would have been desirable to treat the Mexican-American and Puerto Rican families in this study population as separate groups in this report, but this would have produced extremely small N's in several categories.)

Non-metropolitan Spanish-speaking (Mexican-Americans and Mexican nationals)

Spanish-speaking families who identified themselves as Mexican-Americans and as Mexican nationals were interviewed in 1971 in twelve state-owned migrant labor camps located within a 100-mile radius of Davis, California.[10/] Incomes below the poverty threshold characterized 67-68% of these two study populations.

California researchers elected to exclusively interview Spanish-speaking migrant workers in order that this population group would be represented in the NC-90 study. The rationale for contacting migrant workers at state-owned camps was as follows: (1) such camps house approximately one-fifth of the agricultural workers and families in California; (2) the U.S. government requires that applicants for camp residence have low incomes; (3) state-owned camps are almost always full. Approximately 2,550 families lived in California's state-owned migrant camps in 1970. In addition to their providing a large potential study population, access to state-owned camps is considerably easier than access to camps owned and operated by the farmers themselves. Of the twenty-six state-owned camps, twelve were selected because (1) they comprised a continuous geographic and agricultural unit, located within

one day's commuting distance from the University of California at Davis; (2) the resident population was sufficiently large to maximize efficiency in data gathering; (3) they were in operation over the time period coinciding with the projected schedule of the research.

Metropolitan Hawaiians (Orientals, Polynesians, "Mixed")

The metropolitan Hawaiian study population was interviewed in 1970 in Honolulu. Interviewers visually identified Orientals (Chinese and Japanese), Polynesians, and a "mixed" group among this study population.[11/] Due to generations of racial intermarriage in Hawaii, it is often difficult to correctly judge another's ethnicity, and the designation of these three sub-groups must be regarded as tentative. Because distinct cultural differences are generally attributed to the three groups, however, it seemed advisable to maintain them as three separate entities in this report. Brief comment on the nature of the three groups follow:[12/]

The Oriental population is characterized by much upward social mobility. Among the Chinese, who tend to occupy the top of the social structure, are many professional persons and entrepreneurs. The Japanese, who came to Hawaii later than did the Chinese, are rapidly becoming prominent in professiona, business, administrative, legislative, technical, clerical and sales positions. The formal education of their children is a matter of very serious concern among Hawaii's Oriental Americans. Of the three Hawaiian groups considered in this report, the Oriental group had the smallest proportion of families below the poverty level (17.3%).

The Polynesian population provides an interesting contrast to the Orientals in Hawaii. Its membership tends to suffer socio-economic disadvantagement, yet efforts to achieve upward mobility are limited.

Extended families are frequently found among Polynesians. Exactly half of this study population reported below-poverty-threshold incomes.

The mixed ethnic and hapa-haole group are also often less upwardly mobile than the Orientals, and tend to resemble Polynesians in their leisure patterns. Incomes below the poverty threshold were reported by 39% of this study population.

The city of Honolulu experienced a 10.4% population increase over the decade 1960-1970. Approximately two-thirds of Honolulu's population is non-white.

SAMPLING PROCEDURES BY WHICH STUDY POPULATIONS WERE OBTAINED

Each state participating in the NC-90 project agreed at the outset to obtain 200 interviews from homemakers in households meeting the following criteria: (1) presence of a female "responsible for running the household"; (2) age of main female homemaker less than 65; (3) presence in household of at least one child under 18. If the homemaker herself was under the age of 18, whe was requjred to be the mother of a child present in the household. These criteria were used in screening households. Interviews were conducted with main female homemakers in the sample areas when all criteria were satisfied. (Note: The female's role as "homemaker" did not preclude her holding a job outside the home. The term "homemaker" is used to identify the person "responsible for running the household.")

Metropolitan whites

Superior, Wisconsin, in which this study population was interviewed, is divided into twenty wards. No census tract information was available on a ward basis to select wards with a high proportion of disadvantaged

families. The 1960 Housing Census contained information on condition of housing by wards. Those wards with one-third or more housing units classified as deteriorating and dilapidated were compared with data from the city assessor's office. Eight wards plus three public low-income housing areas were then selected for the sample. Dwelling units were counted and a ratio was set for all wards and areas in proportion to the 200 desired interviews. Procedures for a standard area sample were then followed.

At least three call-backs were made to each dwelling unti in an effort to find the desired interviewee at home. If the response rate for any ward was less than 0.85, additional call-backs were made. One call-back was made to each dwelling unit which refused an interview; if the second call did not yield an interview, the dwelling was listed as a refusal. A total of 1057 dwelling units were screened to obtain a sample of 205 completed interviews with white homemakers.

Non-metropolitan: small town whites

A two-stage method was used to sample small town white families in northwestern Missouri. The Survey Division of the Iowa State Statistical Laboratory first randomly selected communities of 1,000-2,500 population located within a 100-mile radius of the intersection of Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska. (There four states desired a common sampling design allowing pooling of their data.) Secondly, community segments were randomly selected within which all households were to be screened. A total of 197 completed interviews were obtained from white homemakers.

Non-metropolitan: rural farm and nonfarm whites

A two-stage method was also used to sample rural white families in Vermont. A random selection was made of minor civil divisions, or "towns," in which 34% or more of the families had less than $3,000 income in 1959. Secondly, "towns" were subdivided along roads and these subdivisions were randomly selected. All households within selected subdivisions were contacted. A total of 216 completed interviews were obtained from white homemakers.

Metropolitan blacks

The black population of Houston, Texas, is scattered over a wide area, and considerable variation exists among the appearance and nature of black neighborhoods in the metropolitan area. Researchers in Texas were anxious to select study populations in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas which constituted more or less holistic units. After analysis of census tract information and visual inspection of the area, the 5th ward of downtown Houston was judged to be such a unit. At the same time, some variation in residence type and general socio-economic appearance indicated that the area also contained a degree of heterogeneity regarded as desirable for comparative purposes.

Enumeration of total households in the 5th ward and the probable household eligibility rate indicated that the desired number of interviews would result from screening every other dwelling unit (or door in multiple units). This procedure resulted in 294 completed interviews with black homemakers.

Non-metropolitan blacks

In an effort to study holistic units, all households in the town of Center, Texas, and in the two nearby villages were screened. This procedure resulted in 207 completed interviews with black homemakers in Center (representing 94% of its eligible family-units), 35 completed interviews with black homemakers in the first village (representing 97% of its eligible family-units), and 17 completed interviews with black homemakers in the second village (representing 100% of its eligible family-units).

Metropolitan Spanish-speaking (Mexican-American and Puerto Rican primarily)

The metropolitan Spanish-speaking study population was obtained by means of an area sample of East Chicago, Indiana, with the assistance of the Iowa State Statistical Laboratory. Segments were randomly drawn from poverty census tracts in East Chicago. Dwellings were then enumerated within segments and randomly selected for screening. A total of 54 completed interviews were obtained from Spanish-speaking homemakers.

Non-metropolitan Spanish-speaking (Mexican-Americans)

The selection of migrant labor camps in California in which this study population was interviewed has been described in a previous section. Housing units in each of the camps were selected randomly. Interviewers were instructed to obtain interviews only from the list of randomly selected housing units and only in the order listed. Interviews were conducted almost simultaneously in each of the twelve state camps.

Interviewers screened 235 housing units, in which 21 families were

found to be ineligible. Of the remaining 214 units, 31 were vacant, and the residents in 14 units refused to participate. Thus, a total of 169 usable interviews were obtained--38 of which were with Mexican-American homemakers.

Non-metropolitan Spanish-speaking (Mexican nationals)

This study population was obtained in the same way as the Mexican-American migrant sample described above, and represents the remaining 131 interviews in the total obtained from Spanish-speaking migrant families.

Metropolitan Hawaiian (Orientals, Polynesians, "Mixed")

A two-stage method was used to sample residents of Honolulu. Eight non-military census tracts were first identified in which 40% or more of the families had less than $5,000 income in 1964-67. (This was a departure from the original plan to sample within all census tracts in which 50% or more of the families had incomes under $5,000 in the period 1964-67; this departure was made necessary by the non-availability for interviewing of homemakers residing in three eligible census tracts in the 14th Naval Housing District.)

Within the eight non-military, low-income tracts, every fifth house (or door in multiple dwellings) was screened. A total of 167 interviews were obtained from Hawaiian homemakers of Oriental, Polynesian, and "mixed" background. Interviewers identified 52 homemakers as Oriental, 20 as Polynesian, and the remaining 95 as "mixed."

III. METHODOLOGY

DATA COLLECTION

Data were collected by means of interviews, conducted by trained female interviewers, with the main female homemaker of families comprising the study populations. A standardized interview schedule was utilized in all states. Interviews were conducted in English except in the case of migrant worker families in California, with whom interviews were conducted in Spanish. Approximately one hour was required to complete each interview.

The interview schedule was designed to elicit information in four general content areas: basic demographic information about the family; information on family resource procurement and expenditure; information on the social structure and activities of the family, both internally and within the community; and the homemaker's value-orientations regarding education and employment.

IDENTIFICATION OF FAMILIES' INCOME ADEQUACY

A measure of families' economic advantagement/disadvantagement is crucial to the NC-90 study as a whole, as well as to the analysis presented in this report. An income adequacy, or poverty, index was therefore calculated for each family interviewed.

Poverty thresholds developed by the Social Security Administration of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and used by the Bureau of the Census in its annual estimates of the number of persons and families in poverty, are the base for the index. For the purposes of

the NC-90 study, these thresholds were modified in two ways: 1) multiple sets of thresholds, taking account of price differentials among regions and by place of residence, were substituted for the single set of thresholds based on average costs over the nation which is used by H.E.W.; 2) more discrimination among large families than is found in the national thresholds was included. Thus, the poverty thresholds used in classifying each family took into account: 1) the number and ages of persons in the household; 2) the proportion of the past year that each person resided in the household; 3) the consumer price index for the particular region of the country and metropolitan/nonmetropolitan place of residence; 4) farm vs. nonfarm residence.

An income index score for each family was derived by dividing the family's total disposable income for the past year by the appropriate poverty threshold. According to government interpretation, an index score of 100 would indicate that the family's income was adequate to meet "necessary" expenses only. An index score below 100 would indicate impoverished circumstances, while a score above 100 would indicate the availability of income for expenses other than those absolutely "necessary." The problem with this interpretation is that the poverty thresholds developed by the Social Security Administration are based on the economy food plan of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The U.S.D.A. has held that this plan is an emergency one which should be used no longer than three months. Use of the low cost food plan, which is more realistic, would raise the "cut-off point" for poverty status to 125 rather than 100.

In an effort to better identify families whose income is clearly inadequate and those whose income is above poverty level, two groupings

by income index are presented in this report: (1) families having an income index below 100; (2) families having an income index 150 or above. An index below 100 means that a family is in rather dire circumstances, regardless of how much below 100 it is. Such a family would ordinarily have great difficulty in obtaining even a minimum adequate level of living. The 150 and above index category may be regarded as placing a family in a non-poverty situation, at least as measured strictly by such an income index. The marginal category (100-149) is "removed" for the purposes of this report, in order to isolate and describe families which are poor and non-poor in terms of an income index. The phrase "in terms of an income index" must be emphasized, because there may well be other meaningful dimensions of "poverty status" which would yield a different categorization of the "poor" and "non-poor."

SELECTION OF INDICATORS FOR THIS STUDY

In the judgment of the writer, questions included in the NC-90 interview schedule provided reasonable indicators of approximately thirty of the poverty traits specified by Oscar Lewis. Multiple indicators were available in a few cases. For some traits--such as unemployment, low level of education, crowding--the connection between indicator and trait is obvious. In other cases, such as "constant struggle for survival," the trait could conceivably be measured by various indicators, and the particular indicator used was judged to be <u>one</u> reasonable measure of the trait. Because determining appropriate indicators for traits relating to the family and the individual is considerably more difficult than it is for traits relating the the slum community and the linkage of poverty

culture to the larger society, indicators selected for family and individual traits are discussed in some detail in the relevant findings sections of Chapter IV.

STATISTICAL EVALUATION OF DATA

Within each of the eleven ethnic-residence study populations included in this report, a greater percentage of poor families than non-poor families should (according to Oscar Lewis) demonstrate each poverty trait investigated. The data, presented in tabular form, are evaluated by means of non-parametric sign tests. With eleven possible comparisons, it is significant beyond the .05 level if nine or more differences are in the predicted direction. Ties (identical percentages for poor and non-poor) are decided randomly. Thus, a simple test is used to determine whether the number of "successful trials" exceeds what would be expected on the basis of chance. A "successful trial" in this case is simply the greater incidence of a poverty trait indicator among poor than among non-poor families in a study population. The size of the difference is not considered. More sophisticated statistical evaluation of the data is not advisable due to the amount of variation among the study populations in manner of selection and in size of N's in the poor and non-poor categories.

IV. CULTURE OF POVERTY TRAITS AMONG ELEVEN STUDY POPULATIONS

Selected poverty traits identified by Oscar Lewis are discussed below under the same four category-headings to which Lewis assigns them. The incidence of indicators of these poverty traits among the eleven study populations is shown in table form. N's in the tables represent the number of interviewees in each ethnic-residence-income category who responded to the relevant NC-90 questionnaire item. As an arbitrary criterion, a difference of twenty percentage-points or more (in the predicted direction) between the poor and non-poor categories is discussed as a "marked" difference.

PART A: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SUBCULTURE AND THE LARGER SOCIETY

Comparison of the poor with the non-poor: findings

1. Unemployment

Unemployment among husbands is high (although not "marked") only among the poor in the two black study populations and in the three Hawaiian study populations (see Table IV-A-1). Between one-fifth to one-third of these husbands were currently unemployed.

2. Working Women

According to Oscar Lewis, poor males are especially likely to be unemployed, while poor females are especially likely to be employed outside the home. However, in every study population examined in this report, poor homemakers are less likely to be employed than are non-poor homemakers, with differences of 20 percentage-points or more being observed for all except four study populations (see Table IV-A-2).

Fewer than one-half of the poor homemakers in every study population are employed; employment is highest among the white small town and the black metropolitan and non-metropolitan study populations. There is a striking absence of employment among the Spanish-speaking metropolitan homemaker (who are largely Mexican-American and Puerto Rican) at both income levels.

3. Underemployment

Underemployment among employed homemakers is marked only among the poor in the white small town population, the Mexican national migrant worker population, and the Hawaiian "mixed ethnic" population (see Table IV-A-3). More poor than non-poor homemakers are underemployed in the white metropolitan population, the black metropolitan and non-metropolitan populations, and the Mexican-American migrant worker population, but the differences are smaller. Understandably, underemployment is generally characteristic of all migrant worker homemakers.

4. Unskilled occupations

With regard to employed homemakers, the various ethnic categories show rather clear differences in prevalence of unskilled occupations (see Table IV-A-4). Among the homemakers in all three white populations, the Hawaiian Oriental population and the Hawaiian "mixed ethnic" population, a majority of the poor hold unskilled jobs, whereas no more than one-third of the non-poor do. Among black homemakers, migrant worker homemakers, and Hawaiian Polynesian homemakers, however, unskilled occupations are characteristic of both income levels.

With regard to employed husbands, it is not surprising that unskilled occupations are more characteristic of the poor than the non-poor in ten of the eleven study populations (see Table IV-A-5). The exception is Mexican national migrant workers, virtually all of whom are classified as unskilled. However, only in four study populations--white metropolitan, white rural farm and nonfarm, Hawaiian Oriental, and Hawaiian Polynesian--is the difference between the percentage of unskilled workers in the poor and non-poor categories 20 percentage-points or more. Black, Spanish-speaking, and Hawaiian Polynesian husbands are considerably more likely than whites and Hawaiian Orientals to hold unskilled jobs even at the 150 and above income index level.

5. Lack of property ownership

Two indicators of this trait are examined. Table IV-A-6 shows the prevalence of non-ownership of the family's current place of residence. Such non-ownership characterizes the poor (20 percentage-point difference) in the white metropolitan, white small town, Hawaiian Oriental, and Hawaiian "mixed ethnic" study populations. The poor more often than the non-poor do not own their homes in the white rural farm and nonfarm, black metropolitan and non-metropolitan, Spanish-speaking metropolitan, and Mexican national migrant worker populations, but the differences are not large. Metropolitan/non-metropolitan differences are much more impressive than ethnic differences on this indicator, with non-ownership being much more prevalent in metropolitan centers regardless of income level.

Table IV-A-7 indicates absence of income to families from rental property they hold. This source of income is generally absent among

poor and non-poor in all study populations. The holding of rental property does characterize the non-poor more than the poor, but the differences are small.

6. Absence of savings

Two indicators of this trait are examined. Table IV-A-8 shows the percentage of respondents indicating that their families "sometimes" or "often" experience the problem of not being able to save money "to fall back on." Marked differences between the poor and non-poor in this respect are evident for all study populations except the Mexican-American migrant workers and the Hawaiian "mixed ethnic" population. Reported inability to save characterizes 50% or more of the poor in all populations except Mexican national migrant workers, Hawaiian Polynesians, and Hawaiian "mixed ethnics." Since 38%-48% of the latter three groups report this inability, it cannot be argued that they refuse to identify an absence of savings as a family money problem. However, it should be noted that approximately one-third or more of the non-poor (with the exception of Mexican national migrant workers) also indicate an inability to save. This problem is especially noticeable among the non-poor metropolitan whites, non-metropolitan blacks, and rural farm and nonfarm whites studied.

Table IV-A-9 shows the lack of a payroll deduction for savings as a fixed financial commitment among families. This type of forced saving is virtually nonexistent at both income levels for all study populations. Only among the Hawaiian groups is a poor/non-poor difference in forced saving noted.

7. Absence of food reserves in the home

In all but one population, the poor more frequently report that they "sometimes" or "often" do not have enough food to last until there is money to buy more (see Table IV-A-10). Differences between poor and non-poor are marked only among metropolitan whites, metropolitan blacks, migrant Mexican-Americans, and Hawaiian Polynesians, however. This trait tends to characterize the poor in metropolitan settings much more than in non-metropolitan settings. Two exceptions are noted: a tendency for the Spanish-speaking groups to report this as a money problem regardless of residence and income level, and low incidence of this particular problem among poor Hawaiian Orientals despite their metropolitan residence.

8. Chronic shortage of cash

Two indicators of this trait are examined. Table IV-A-11 shows the percentage of respondents indicating that their families "often" experience the problem of not being able to buy special things desired by their children. A difference of approximately 20 percentage-points is evident between poor and non-poor in all study populations except the two migrant worker groups. Perhaps admission of such a problem touches a "sensitive nerve" for these Spanish-speaking peoples by whom dignidad (self-esteem or self-pride) is so highly valued.

With the exception of metropolitan whites, fewer than half of all poor respondents claim they often are unable to buy special things their kids want. This does not seem to indicate that a chronic shortage of cash is a generally shared trait.

Table IV-A-12 shows the percentage of respondents indicating that their families "often" experience the problem of not being able to

afford new shoes or clothes. A marked difference between poor and non-poor is evident only among the white metropolitan, black metropolitan and non-metropolitan, and Hawaiian Polynesian populations. Poor and non-poor among non-metropolitan whites, the three Spanish-speaking groups, and Hawaiian Orientals and "mixed ethnics" do not differ substantially on this indicator. Again, Spanish-speaking people may be reluctant to admit such a problem. However, no more than 44% of the poor in any population claim that they often cannot afford to buy new shoes or clothes, which, again, does not indicate a chronic shortage of cash as a generally shared trait.

9. Constant struggle for survival

Homemakers' perception of the adequacy of their family's income reveals marked differences between poor and non-poor only among the white metropolitan, black metropolitan and non-metropolitan, and Hawaiian Oriental populations (see Table IV-A-13). The most dissatisfaction with size of family income exists among poor non-metropolitan blacks (40%), poor (metropolitan) Hawaiian Orientals (33%), poor metropolitan blacks (29%), and poor metropolitan whites (26%). Again, it should be noted that the Spanish concern with dignidad may prevent admission of inadequacy.

It is possible that the conditions of small town and rural life are less likely to encourage a sense of deprivation for the whites studied than are conditions associated with metropolitan living. It is interesting, however, that among the black populations studied the non-metropolitan poor more frequently view their income as inadequate.

It is suspected that the contrast with more affluent whites and more affluent blacks is more readily felt in the small urban community studied (Center, Texas) than in black ghettos of the central city studied (Houston, Texas). Blacks of different economic status are more geographically separated in the metropolitan setting.

Although the small N's make speculation risky, one is tempted to note the upward-mobility orientation associated with Hawaiian Orientals in seeking to understand the greater tendency of the poor in that population (as compred to poor Hawaiian "mixed ethnics" and Polynesians) to view their income as inadequate.

(Note on NC-90 indicator for this trait: The writer believes that an income judged "not at all adequate" does imply a "constant struggle for survival." Anthony Leeds (1971:245) correctly observes, however, that all species are engaged in a constant struggle for survival. Thus, the vagueness of this alleged trait, as stated by Oscar Lewis, makes it very difficult to meaningfully examine on an empirical level.)

10. Borrowing from local moneylenders...

As Table IV-A-14 indicates, a commitment to repay finance company loans is not more characteristic of poor than non-poor families. With the exception of the Hawaiian populations, differences between poor and non-poor on this indicator are small.

11. Low level of education

When the data in Table IV-A-15 are examined, it is ethnic differences that stand out rather than income status differences in the percentage of homemakers with less than eight years of schooling. The latter characteristic is most visible among the Spanish-speaking populations, and more

visible among the black than the white populations. The Hawaiian Oriental population is similar to the black groups in percentage of poor homemakers with a low educational level. However, non-poor Hawaiian Oriental homemakers are less likely than non-poor black homemakers to have a low education level. Predicted differences between poor and non-poor homemakers on this indicator are most evident among the metropolitan Spanish-speaking, the migrant Mexican-Americans, Hawaiian Orientals, and non-metropolitan blacks. Among migrant Mexican nationals, Hawaiian "mixed ethnics," and Hawaiian Polynesians, however, poor/non-poor differences are in the opposite direction.

The data on husbands' educational attainment shown in Table IV-A-16 indicate a similar picture. A low educational level is most characteristic of the Spanish-speaking populations, and more characteristic of the black than of the white populations. Predicted differences between poor and non-poor husbands on this indicator are marked only among non-metropolitan blacks, metropolitan Spanish-speaking, and migrant Mexican-Americans. Differences between poor and non-poor in all three white populations and the metropolitan black population are in the predicted direction, but are not large. On the other hand, differences between poor and non-poor in the migrant Mexican national population and all three Hawaiian populations are in the opposite direction from that predicted.

12. Do not belong to labor unions

Obligation to pay union dues is used as an indicator of this trait. A majority of all families reported no such obligation (see

Table IV-A-17). A marked difference between poor and non-poor exists only among metropolitan whites, although poor/non-poor differences are in the expected direction for rural farm and nonfarm whites, metropolitan and non-metropolitan blacks, metropolitan Spanish-speaking, and Hawaiian "mixed ethnics." Poor/non-poor differences are in the opposite direction from that predicted for four populations, and there is no difference for one population. Thus, as measured by this indicator, the poor do not belong to labor unions, but neither do the non-poor (except for the metropolitan white population studied, almost half of whom apparently belong).

13. Do not participate in national welfare agencies, i.e. benefits of the "Seguro Social"

In his 1968 discussions, Lewis substitutes the term "national welfare agencies" for the "Seguro Social" to which he earlier referred. He clearly means the receipt of benefits (old-age, medical, etc.) rather than the recepit of welfare payments. (Lewis has suggested--see, for example, La Vida, 1966--that recepit of public assistance serves to perpetuate the culture of poverty.) Thus, Social Security as a source of family income for the past year is used as an indicator of this trait. Over 80% of all families denied such an income source (see Table IV-A-18). Moreover, non-poor families in eight of the study populations are more likely than poor families to deny this source (in the remaining three populations there is no difference between poor and non-poor). As measured by this indicator, the poor do not participate in "national welfare agencies," but the non-poor participate even less.

Discussion

Oscar Lewis (1968a:189-190) cites as a crucial characteristic of the culture of poverty "the lack of effective participation and integration of the poor in the major institutions of the larger society..." Among the "conditions" which "reduce the possibility of effective participation in the larger economic system" Lewis includes: unemployment, working women, underemployment, unskilled occupations, lack of property ownership, absence of savings, absence of food reserves in the home, a chronic shortage of cash, constant struggle for survival. By using the term "conditions," Lewis himself implies that these characteristics of the larger social structure rather than characteristics of a subculture.

As a response to these "conditions," according to Lewis (1968a:190), "we find in the culture of poverty a high incidence of...borrowing from local money-lenders at usurious interest rates..." Whereas Lewis seems to view such borrowing as a cultural trait, Anthony Leeds (1971:248) maintains that this characteristic, also, should be viewed as linked to the structuring of the larger societal system: alternatives such as banks and savings and loan associations are necessarily "outside the universe of these people in a structural way."

Finally, in describing the relationship between the culture of poverty and the larger society, Lewis (1968a:190) asserts that "people with a culture of poverty...have a low level of...education, do not belong to labor unions...generally do not participate in the national welfare agencies..." According to Anthony Leeds (1971:260), a low level of education is simply another "reflex of the structure which creates

poor people." In other words, the same forces responsible for low incomes, absence of savings, etc., operate to impede educational attainment. It is likely that lack of participation in labor unions and in national welfare agencies also stems to a large degree from structural forces.

Thus, although the poor families studied were characterized significantly more often by unskilled occupations, lack of property ownership, absence of savings, absence of food reserves in the home, chronic shortage of cash, and constant struggle for survival, there is serious doubt as to whether these traits say anything meaningful about a way of life which develops among poor families and is perpetuated by their children. It seems more accurate to view such traits as economic conditions by which the poor are defined than to view them as comprising a cultural response to the environment in which people find themselves.

PART B: NATURE OF THE LOCAL SLUM COMMUNITY

Comparison of the poor with the non-poor: findings

1. Poor housing conditions

Three objective indicators and one subjective indicator of this trait are considered.

Lack of both hot and cold piped water in the family's home is a marked characteristic of poor rural farm and nonfarm whites, poor nonmetropolitan blacks, and poor Spanish-speaking migrants (who answered in reference to their current living quarters) (see Table IV-B-1). The poor among the metropolitan populations and the small town white population, on the other hand, do not lack this convenience.

Lack of a flush toilet (including one shared with another household) is a marked characteristic only among poor non-metropolitan black families and among poor Spanish-speaking migrant families (see Table IV-B-2). This amenity is found among almost all metropolitan families and most whites (except for a few rural farm and nonfarm whites).

Lack of a bathtub or shower (including one shared with another household) is a marked characteristic only of poor non-metropolitan black families and of poor Spanish-speaking migrant families (see Table IV-B-3). A less marked difference between the poor and non-poor is also evident among rural farm and nonfarm white families. Again the metropolitan/non-metropolitan contrast is vivid.

The subjective indicator of housing conditions is the homemaker's evaluation of how satisfactory her home is in all respects other than size. Marked differences between poor and non-poor homemakers in judging their home unsatisfactory or very unsatisfactory are observed only among the non-metropolitan black and the metropolitan Spanish-speaking populations, although more poor than non-poor homemakers are dissatisfied in seven other populations as well (see Table IV-B-4). Dissatisfaction is greater among metropolitan than among non-metropolitan poor white and poor Spanish-speaking homemakers. Among black homemakers, the opposite is true--probably due to the lack of amenities in their homes, as described above. It is interesting that dissatisfaction is lowest among rural farm and nonfarm poor white homemakers, whose homes frequently do lack the amenities described above.

2. Crowding

An objective and a subjective indicator of this trait are considered. Fewer rooms in a dwelling than the number of persons occupying that dwelling is a common measure of crowding (Gist and Fava, 1964:554). Based on this measure, crowding is a marked characteristic of poor families in all populations studied except Mexican-American migrants, Hawaiian Orientals, and Hawaiian Polynesians (see Table IV-B-5). Although a marked contrast between poor and non-poor families is not observed among Mexican-American migrants and Hawaiian Polynesians, 56-60% of poor families in these two populations are characterized by crowding.

The subjective indicator of crowding is the homemaker's evaluation of the adequacy for the family's needs of the size of the family's current housing. Only among Mexican migrants is there a marked difference between poor and non-poor homemakers who regard the size of their current housing as less than the family needs (see Table IV-B-6). For the most part, differences between poor and non-poor homemakers on this indicator are small, with more non-poor than poor claiming crowding in five populations studied. At both income levels, more crowding is claimed by homemakers in the non-metropolitan black population than in any other population.

3. Minimum of organization beyond the level of the...family

Oscar Lewis says that the slum community is characterized above all by a minimum of organization beyond the level of the nuclear and extended family. He uses (but does not define) the term "voluntary association," noting that "informal temporary groupings or voluntary associations"

occasionally do exist within slums, but making it clear that organization on a formal level is the exception rather than the rule. It is interesting that Lewis does not talk about other possible forms of community organization--specifically, ties with neighbors and ties with friends. If in fact a "minimum of organization beyond the level of the... family" is characteristic of the poor, one would expect a general absence of the latter ties as well as of formal voluntary associations. While supporting Lewis' voluntary association prediction, one study (Cohen and Hodges, 1963) has shown that in the total relationship system of lower-lower class people there is a greater significance of neighbors than is true of the other strata and that peer relationships are extremely important for aid as well as for social participation. Thus, data on neighboring and interaction with friends are examined in this report along with data on voluntary association involvement.

A. Voluntary association attendance

Only husband-wife families are included in the data presented in Table IV-B-7 through IV-B-11, producing somewhat smaller cell frequencies.

A marked difference between poor and non-poor families in church attendance is evident only among the Hawaiian "mixed ethnic" population (see Table IV-B-7). More poor than non-poor families are non-attenders in six other populations, but differences are smaller. In the remaining four populations, more non-poor families are non-attenders.

A marked difference between poor and non-poor families in church-connected group attendance is evident only among small town white and Mexican migrant families (see Table IV-B-8). More poor than non-poor

families are non-attenders in two other populations (smaller differences), but in seven populations more non-poor families are non-attenders!

There are no marked differences between poor and non-poor families in PTA and community group attendance (see Table IV-B-9). More poor than non-poor families are non-attenders in four populations; in seven populations, more non-poor families are non-attenders.

A marked difference between poor and non-poor families in lodge, VFW, etc. attendance is evident only among Mexican migrant families (see Table IV-B-10). (Note: Fewer poor Mexican-American and Mexican migrant families, and fewer non-poor Mexican migrant families, are non-attenders of this type of organization than are the poor and non-poor in other populations. This is apparently due to the respondents' interpretation of the Spanish translation for "lodge" as including camp councils, in which many migrants participate.) More poor than non-poor families are non-attenders in six populations besides Mexican migrants (smaller differences); there is no difference between the percentage of non-attenders in two populations. More non-poor families are non-attenders in two populations.

A marked difference between poor and non-poor families in recreation group attendance is evident only among Mexican migrant families (see Table IV-B-11). More poor than non-poor families are non-attenders in seven other populations (smaller differences). In the remaining three populations, more non-poor families are non-attenders.

B. Neighboring

A composite measure of homemakers' "neighboring practices" was constructed, based on homemakers' frequency of shopping with, exchanging

favors with, and chatting with neighbors. Infrequent neighboring, as reflected by this measure, is marked only among poor rural farm and non-farm whites, who are probably prevented by distance from more frequent neighboring activities (see Table IV-B-12). More poor than non-poor homemakers are characterized by infrequent neighboring also among small town whites, metropolitan and non-metropolitan blacks, migrant workers, and Hawaiian Orientals. The opposite is true, however, among the metropolitan white, metropolitan Spanish-speaking, Hawaiian "mixed ethnic," and Hawaiian Polynesian populations studied. It is interesting that all of the latter are metropolitan residents. It appears that metropolitan/non-metropolitan residence needs to be considered in discussing the significance of neighbors in the total relationship system of lower vs. higher strata persons.

C. Interaction with friends

Homemakers were asked about the frequency of interaction by themselves and their husbands with "friends from work" and with "other friends." Understandably, lack of interaction with friends from work (other than at work) is least characteristic of migrant families, both at the poor and non-poor levels (see Table IV-B-13). Still, a marked difference is observed between poor and non-poor migrant families on this indicator; poor families are less likely than non-poor families to report interacting with friends from work. Among Hawaiian Oriental families, also, there is a marked difference between poor and non-poor families on this indicator. Smaller predicted differences between poor and non-poor exist in six other populations. In most populations, a majority of poor families report no interaction with friends from work.

Lack of interaction with other friends (not friends from work) is marked among poor metropolitan Spanish-speaking families and poor Hawaiian "mixed ethnic" families (see Table IV-B-14). Smaller predicted differences between poor and non-poor exist in seven other populations. Although lack of interaction with other friends does more frequently characterize poor than non-poor families in the populations studied, there is much variation in the actual percentage of poor families reporting such a lack of interaction--as few as 9% of poor small town white families to as many as 76.5% of poor metropolitan Spanish-speaking families.

It appears that friends from work do play a minor role in the social life of poor persons, but that other friends may or may not play an important role.

Discussion

Significant differences between poor and non-poor were found on one indicator of poor housing conditions (homemaker's expressed general dissatisfaction with her current housing) and on crowding as measured by the number of persons per room. Anthony Leeds (1971) argues that the condition of living in crowded quarters, similar to an absence of food reserves and other "traits" included in the first part of this chapter, stems from the structural realities of "poverty" and is not a "cultural trait." One can take a similar view of the characteristic which Lewis calls "poor housing conditions." Thus, these two characteristics of the local slum community, like traits examined in the first part of this chapter, seem more accurately viewed as defining the poor rather than as comprising a cultural response to the environment in which people find themselves.

Lack of interaction with friends--both "friends from work" and "other friends"--was also found to significantly differentiate poor and non-poor families.

PART C: NATURE OF THE FAMILY

Comparison of the poor with the non-poor: findings

1. Trend toward female- or mother-centered families

The NC-90 indicator of "trend toward female- or mother-centered families" is the frequency with which homemakers report themselves as family head. There is a marked difference between poor and non-poor families having female heads among all populations except the two nonmetropolitan white populations and the three Spanish-speaking populations (see Table IV-C-1). Differences among the latter are in the predicted direction, but are smaller.

Both ethnic and residence factors are apparent in the data of Table IV-C-1. Poor black families are much more likely to have female heads regardless of residence; Spanish-speaking families, regardless of residence and income level, tend not to have female heads. Poor metropolitan white and poor metropolitan Hawaiian families have female heads much more often than do their non-poor counterparts; differences between poor and non-poor non-metropolitan white families on this indicator are small, however.

Anthony Leeds (1971) discusses several substantive problems with regard to this trait and the related trait, predominance of the nuclear family. First, Leeds (1971:266) argues that the traits are obscure:

"The households, he (Lewis) is saying, are comprised predominantly of the nuclear family group, i.e., of mother, father, and one or more children. Or, apparently, they are composed of mother-centered family groups, i.e., a mother and one or more children..."

Implicit contradictions are also apparent in these traits. "A mother-centered family household is not a nuclear-family household. Is the trend toward the former; is there really a predominance of the latter, or is there 'a trend' toward the extended-family household?... The problem is most important, because quite different processes (e.g. different articulations with the labor market) may be involved, or different stages in the trajectories of family-household histories" (Leeds, 1971:266-267).

Another substantive problem with regard to the above traits is that they treat households as static rather than dynamic. Leeds (1971:268) states that his own data show, and he expects that Lewis' own data also show, that "for any prolonged period of time, and especially a lifetime, any definable household (a budgeting unit) changes composition constantly, especially among the poor who are extending emergency services, care, protection, social security, and the like to relatives. While, at the same time, the children are growing, marrying, moving out, and moving back; grandchildren or other's children...are taken in for temporary or permanent adoption or bringing up, and so on. The entire process is not, however, random. Rather, household forms display certain regularities as the household-family unit evolves under given sets of circumstances and under specifiable

crisis situations. This is a structural-dynamic process..." Leeds has identified here an important problem with respect to efforts to measure Lewis' family traits; unfortunately, the data included in this report have the limitation of being static in nature. (Changes in the composition of the household over a one-year period of time were recorded in the NC-90 interview, but this is too short a time period to give the dynamic picture Leeds is talking about.)

Thirdly, Leeds (1971:258) argues that "if...'mother-centered families' are simply a by-product of abandonment of mothers and children, which Lewis supposed to be a trait, then it is not a culture trait at all and has no logical reason to be listed as a trait of the culture of poverty."

Thus, (1) it is very difficult to know just what Lewis intended by "trend toward female- or mother-centered families;" (2) a mother-centered family today may not be a mother-centered family tomorrow; and (3) mother-centered families may simply be the result of males abandoning their "wives" and children. This writer would like to point out that census data in the U.S. very clearly show a higher percentage of families headed by females among the poor than among higher economic groups. This is undoubtedly the phenomenon Lewis was identifying among the Mexican and Puerto Rican people he studied. Although it is quite possible that female-headed families may not remain female-headed families, it does seem to be true that poor families more frequently show up in this category than do non-poor families whenever a census is taken. Abandonment of wives and children by husbands/fathers may

be one important cause of this phenomenon, but research such as that of Liebow (1967) indicates that a family headed by a husband/father may never even exist for any length of time as a meaningful social unit among some people.

The biggest problem with this trait, in this writer's opinion, is deciding how many "female or mother-centered families" must be present before the trait is confirmed. What does Lewis mean by "a trend"? This is a problem encountered with Lewis' culture of poverty traits generally; i.e., Lewis provides no measurement criteria for determining presence/absence of traits.

2. Predominance of the nuclear family

Two indicators are considered here, one objective and one subjective in nature. First, the strict definition of nuclear family (husband, wife, and their immediate children) is used to determine "family type." As noted above, female-headed families are not "nuclear" by this definition. Thus, it is understandable, given the results reported above, that 50% or less of poor families in the metropolitan white, metropolitan Hawaiian, and both black populations are classified as "nuclear" (see Table IV-C-2). Only among poor non-metropolitan white families and poor Spanish-speaking families is the nuclear form "predominant" in the sense of characterizing over 50% of the families.

When poor and non-poor families are compared, more non-poor than poor families are "nuclear" in all populations except the two Spanish-speaking migrant groups. Differences are marked in six of the nine populations having more non-poor families classified as "nuclear."

Thus, based on the first indicator examined, Oscar Lewis's trait only fits the two Spanish-speaking migrant populations studied.

The second indicator considered is the homemaker's expressed orientation, as measured by Litwak's (1960:388) family orientation scale, toward a nuclear rather than an extended family.[13/] Based on this measure, more poor than non-poor homemakers are nuclear-family oriented in six populations, with marked differences among small town whites, Hawaiian Orientals, and Hawaiian "mixed ethnics" (see Table IV-C-3). Less than one-half of the poor homemakers in the rural farm and nonfarm white population, the two black populations, and the three Spanish-speaking populations expressed a nuclear orientation, suggesting that orientation toward extended family is related to ethnic differences and, among whites, to residence differences.

3. Greater knowledge of maternal relatives

A measure of this trait was derived by comparing, in each study population, the percentage of homemakers who did not know what their father's and their mother's main occupations were. Based on this measure, more poor than non-poor homemakers have "greater knowledge of maternal relatives" in five of the eleven study populations (see Table IV-C-4). In another five populations, there is no difference between poor and non-poor in knowledge of father's and mother's occupations. If the latter, i.e., no difference in knowledge, is taken as the null hypothesis, the data do show support for Lewis' trait.

4. Family solidarity: an ideal rarely achieved

Oscar Lewis describes families sharing the culture of poverty as placing great verbal emphasis on family solidarity. However, this

ideal, he says, is rarely achieved--due primarily to sibling rivalry.

Families classified as highly cohesive, based on the homemaker's report of frequency of family interaction, are shown in Table IV-C-5. Fewer poor than non-poor families are rated highly cohesive in nine of the eleven study populations, with marked differences in three populations.

5. Absence of childhood as a specially prolonged and protected stage in the life cycle

A value-orientation item serves as the indicator of this alleged trait--providing, admittedly, only a superficial measure. It was hypothesized that a homemaker's agreement that "if the family needs more money it is all right for a child to quit school and help out for awhile" indicates low concern with prolonging for a child the (generally) responsibility-free status of student. More poor than non-poor homemakers agree with this statement in six study populations, but differences are small (see Table IV-C-6). Thus, this indicator furnishes no support for the alleged "absence of childhood..." trait.

6. Strong predisposition to authoritarianism

Cohen and Hodges (1963) found that lower-class persons were significantly more characterized by belief in the importance of obedience and respect for authority in children than were higher strata. Indicators of authoritarianism in this report are a series of items concerning parental dominance and expectation of behavior compliance on the part of the children. The items are control-oriented, not love-oriented.

Strong agreement that "respect for parents is the most important thing kids should learn" is more characteristic of homemakers in poor than non-poor families in six populations, but differences are quite

small. What is most impressive about the data presented in Table IV-C-7 is that a majority of both poor and non-poor homemakers in all ethnic/residence categories (study populations) express strong agreement with this statement.

Strong agreement that "most kids should be toilet trained by 15 months of age" is more characteristic of homemakers in poor than non-poor families in every study population except the two black populations and the Hawaiian Polynesian population (see Table IV-C-8). Differences are marked in three populations. An ethnic difference is evident in responses to this statement: the black and Spanish-speaking homemakers, regardless of income level, seem considerably more convinced of the value of early toilet training.

Strong agreement that "most kids should be spanked more often" is more characteristic of homemakers in poor than non-poor families in eight study populations, with a marked difference only in one population (see Table IV-C-9). Homemakers at both income levels in the two black populations are more likely than other homemakers to strongly agree with this statement.

Strong agreement that "a child should be taken away from the breast or bottle as soon as possible" is more characteristic of homemakers in poor than non-poor families in seven populations, with a marked difference only in one population (see Table IV-C-10). On the average, black and Spanish-speaking homemakers, regardless of income level, seem considerably more convinced of the value of early weaning (in addition to early toilet training).

Strong agreement that "the main goal of a parent is to see that the kids stay out of trouble" is more characteristic of homemakers in poor than non-poor families in seven populations, with marked differences in two populations (see Table IV-C-11). An ethnic difference is evident in responses to this statement; the black, Spanish-speaking, and Hawaiian populations more frequently express strong agreement with this statement than do the white populations.

To summarize the data presented in Tables IV-C-7 through IV-C-11, in a majority of the study populations, the poor, relative to the non-poor, seem to demonstrate a predisposition to authoritarianism. For the most part, however, differences are not marked between poor and non-poor. In addition, there is the following rough rank ordering of ethnic categories in total predisposition to authoritarianism represented in the five tables: (1) blacks, (2) Spanish-speaking; (3) Hawaiian populations; (4) whites.

Discussion

Significant differences between poor and non-poor were found for two family-related traits: prevalence of female- or mother-centered families (i.e., female-headed families), and relatively low family solidarity (as measured by a family cohesiveness score).

Two indicators of predominance of the nuclear family failed to show significant differences between poor and non-poor on this characteristic. One wonders what Lewis means by "predominance." As Leeds (1971:270) observes, "the nuclear-family household is characteristic for all layers of Western society at least insofar as budgets, house-

hold grouping, child training, and the like, are concerned." It would seem, therefore, that this characteristic is "irrelevant to a culture of poverty."

The present data do not indicate significant differences between poor and non-poor on the traits greater knowledge of maternal relatives, absence of childhood as a specially prolonged and protected stage in the life cycle, or strong predisposition to authoritarianism.

PART D: ATTITUDES, VALUES, AND CHARACTER OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Comparison of the poor with the non-poor: findings

All indicators in this section are value-orientation statements with which homemakers expressed their agreement or disagreement. The statements were judged by the writer to be related to particular traits, but due to the overlap among the traits themselves, the connection between indicators and traits may seem rather tenuous in some cases. Justification of the indicators selected for the following traits is therefore given before presenting findings in this section:

(1) Strong feeling of alienation. The statement, "Too many people on the job are just out for themselves and don't really care for anyone else," reflects alienation from others who are viewed as potential competitors for the same scarce rewards.

(2) Feeling that existing institutions do not serve their interests and needs. Cohen and Hodges (1963:323) reported that "LL's [Lower-lowers], more than members of any other stratum, are cynical and distrustful..." The statement, "When a child has problems there is no use

getting in touch with the school because they aren't really interested," reflects this feeling as it is directed toward one aspect of the existing power structure.

(3) Strong feeling of helplessness. Cohen and Hodges (1963:322) reported that LL's (lower-lower class persons) were convinced that "in all probability...things will turn out badly as they generally have in the past." The statement, "It makes no difference which job you take because you are likely to get laid off anyway," conveys a sense of helplessness, specifically related to employment opportunity, stemming from this conviction.

(4) Sense of resignation and fatalism. There is no question that this trait is closely related to the feeling of helplessness. For the present analysis, this writer has interpreted "helplessness" as developing in response to an external force one feels he/she cannot control, while "resignation" and "fatalism" are viewed as more generalized. The statements, "Some people just cannot finish high school so why try," and "Few people really look forward to their work," convey a sense of being resigned to the inevitable, for which no particular external force is to blame.

(5) Strong feeling of dependence. Cohen and Hodges (1963) reported that LL's frequently viewed "friends or connections," as essential to economic and occupational success. The statement, "In getting a job it is not what you know but who you know," conveys dependence on such connections.

(6) Feeling of powerlessness. Feelings of powerlessness and dependence are closely related. For the present analysis, the writer has interpreted dependence as tied to another individual or set of individuals, while powerlessness is seen as more diffuse. Cohen and Hodges (1963) noted the frequent alluding by LL persons to the role of "luck or chance" in their lives. The statement, "The most important thing about getting a job is being at the right place at the right time," reflects the feeling of one's destiny being controlled by impersonal forces.

(7) Belief in male superiority. The statements, "It is more important for a boy to get an education beyond high school than for a girl," and "It is all right for women to hold jobs which are usually men's jobs," are judged to be related to belief in male superiority on the basis of face validity. Cohen and Hodges (1963) found that the LL persons they studied agreed most often, compared to higher strata, with the statement, "Men should make the really important decision in the family." The statement, "The man should be the one to make all the decisions about choosing his job," seems very similar in meaning to Cohen and Hodges' statement and thus is used as a third indicator of belief in male superiority.

(8) Martyr complex among women. The statement, "Kids should be nicer than they are to their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them," is judged to be related to martyr complex among women on the basis of face validity.

Some of the traits discussed above, as listed by Oscar Lewis, are prefaced by the adjective "stront" (e.g. "strong feeling of alienation"), and in these cases strong agreement with the corresponding value-orienta-

tion statement is used as an indicator. If the trait is not labeled "strong" (e.g. "feeling of powerlessness"), agreement or strong agreement with the corresponding statement is used an an indicator.

Findings for the traits considered in this section are now presented.

1. Strong feeling of alienation

Strong agreement that "too many people on the job are just out for themselves and don't really care for anyone else" is more characteristic of poor than non-poor homemakers in six populations, with a marked difference in two populations (see Table IV-D-1). Fewer than one-half of the poor homemakers in any population express strong agreement with this statement.

2. Feeling that existing institutions do not serve their interests and needs

Agreement that "when a child has problems there is no use getting in touch with the school because they aren't really interested" is more characteristic of poor than non-poor homemakers in nine populations, but differences are small (see Table IV-D-2). Fewer than one-half of the poor homemakers in any population express agreement with this statement

3. Strong feeling of helplessness

Strong agreement that "it makes no difference which job you take because you are likely to get laid off anyway" is more characteristic of the poor than non-poor homemakers in seven populations, but differences are small (see Table IV-D-3). Fewer than one-third of the poor homemakers in any population express strong agreement with this statement.

4. Sense of resignation and fatalism

Two indicators of this trait are considered: one pertaining to education and one pertaining to employment.

Agreement that "some people just cannot finish high school so why try" is more characteristic of poor than non-poor homemakers in six populations, with a marked difference in one population (see Table IV-D-4). Fewer than one-half of the poor homemakers in any population express agreement with this statement.

Agreement that "few people really look forward to their work" is more characteristic of poor than non-poor homemakers in only five populations, with marked differences in two populations (see Table IV-D-5). With the exception of the three white populations and the Hawaiian Polynesian population, a majority of poor homemakers express agreement with this statement. However, a majority of non-poor homemakers in six populations express agreement with this statement also.

5. Strong feeling of dependence

Strong agreement that "in getting a job it is not what you know but who you know" is more characteristic of poor than non-poor homemakers in eight populations, with a marked difference in one population (see Table IV-D-6). Fewer than one-third of the poor homemakers in any population express strong agreement with this statement, except for poor metropolitan Spanish-speaking homemakers, 41.2% of whom express strong agreement.

6. Feeling of powerlessness

Agreement that "the most important thing about getting a job is being at the right place at the right time" is more characteristic of

poor than non-poor homemakers in nine populations, with marked differences in four populations (see Table IV-D-7). A majority of almost all poor homemakers (49.1% in the case of rural farm and nonfarm whites) express agreement with this statement. However, a majority of non-poor homemakers in eight populations (and 49.5% of non-poor homemakers in a ninth population) express agreement with this statement also.

7. Belief in male superiority

Three indicators of this trait are considered: one pertaining to education, two pertaining to employment.

Agreement that "it is more important for a boy to get an education beyond high school than for a girl" is more characteristic of poor than non-poor homemakers in seven populations, but differences are small (see Table IV-D-8). With the exception of the metropolitan black, Mexican-American migrant, and Hawaiian Oriental populations, a majority of poor homemakers express agreement with this statement. However, with the exception of only the non-metropolitan black and Mexican-American migrant populations, a majority of non-poor homemakers express agreement with this statement also.

Disagreement that "it is all right for women to hold jobs which are usually men's jobs" is more characteristic of poor than non-poor homemakers in seven populations, with a marked difference in one population (see Table IV-D-9). With one exception, fewer than one-half of the poor homemakers in any population express disagreement with this statement.

Agreement that "the man should be the one to make all the decisions about choosing his job" is more characteristic of poor than non-poor homemakers in only four populations, with marked differences in two of these populations (see Table IV-D-10). Sizeable majorities of both poor and non-poor homemakers express agreement with this statement.

Thus, both poor and non-poor homemakers generally see more value in higher education for males as compared to females and feel that men should not have to take wives' wishes into account when choosing their jobs (if this is the way the statement was interpreted). There is a greater tendency for poor than non-poor homemakers to disapprove of women moving into traditionally male jobs, but this disapproval does not characterize a majority of poor homemakers.

8. Martyr complex among women

Strong agreement that "kids should be nicer than they are to their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them" is more characteristic of poor than non-poor homemakers in eight populations, with a marked difference in one population (see Table IV-D-11). The sentiment in this statement seems to evoke a stronger reaction among poor and non-poor black, Spanish-speaking, and Hawaiian Polynesian homemakers than among poor and non-poor white, Hawaiian Oriental, and Hawaiian "mixed ethnic" homemakers.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In order to summarize as concisely as possible the findings of this report, results obtained with NC-90 indicators of selected poverty culture traits in Oscar Lewis' four categories are presented in tabular form. For each indicator examined, sign test results are given, along with a notation of ethnic and/or residence differences when the latter exceed, on the average, income index category differences. Thus, for each indicator, the tables show (1) whether a greater percentage of "poor" than "non-poor" families are characterized by the trait (as represented by the indicator) in more study populations than would be expected by chance; (2) whether sizeable differences exist among ethnic and/or residence categories in prevalence of the trait (as represented by the indicator).

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SUBCULTURE AND THE LARGER SOCIETY

Table V-1

Summary of Findings for Selected Traits in Category 1:
Relationship Between the Subculture and the Larger Society

Trait	NC-90 Indicator	Sign test results	Ethnic Differences Observed?	Residence Differences Observed?
Unemployment	Husband's occupational status	n.s.	yes	
Working women	Homemaker's occupational status	n.s.		
Underemployment	# weeks worked by employed homemaker	n.s.		
Unskilled Occupations	Employed homemakers' occupation Employed husbands' occupation	p=.03 p=.006	yes yes	
Lack property ownership	Housing tenure Income from rental property	p=.03 p=.006		yes
Absence of savings	Q. 201	p=.0005		
Absence of food reserves in home	Q. 193	p=.006		yes
Chronic Shortage of cash	Q. 195 Q. 200	p=.006 p=.006		
Constant struggle for survival	Q. 204	p=.006	yes	
Borrowing	Finance company loan	n.s.		
Low Level of education	Homemaker's ed. Husband's ed.	n.s. n.s.	yes yes	
Do not belong to labor unions	Union dues	n.s.		
Do not participate in national welfare agencies	Social Security income	n.s.		

As noted in Chapter IV, there is serious doubt as to whether Oscar Lewis alleged culture of poverty traits under this heading deserve to be considered "cultural" traits at all. They are, for the most part, traits that one would expect to characterize poor families to a greater degree than non-poor families. Sign test results are not significant, however, for indicators of seven of the thirteen traits examined.

Ethnic differences are observed on indicators of four traits: unemployment, unskilled occupations, constant struggle for survival, and low level of education. It appears that some of the poor are "less equal" than others. Place of residence differences are observed on indicators of two traits: lack of property ownership and absence of food reserves in the home. On these two traits, the poor appear to fare better in non-metropolitan settings.

NATURE OF THE LOCAL SLUM COMMUNITY

Table V-2

Summary of Findings for Selected Traits in Category 2: Nature of the Local Slum Community

Trait	NC-90 Indicator	Sign test results	Ethnic Differences Observed?	Residence Differences Observed?
Poor housing Conditions	Hot & cold piped water	n.s.		yes
	Toilet	n.s.		yes
	Bathtub/shower	n.s.		yes
	Q. 70	p=.03	yes	yes
Crowding	Persons/room	p=.006		
	Q. 69	n.s.		
Minimum of organization beyond the... family	Q. 105 (Voluntary association attendance)	n.s.		
	Q. 106	n.s.		
	Q. 107			
	Q. 108			
	Q. 109	n.s.		
		n.s.		
		n.s.		
	Neighboring practices score	n.s.		yes
	Q. 103	p=.03		
	Q. 104	p=.03		

There is also serious doubt as to whether the alleged culture of poverty traits "poor housing conditions" and "crowding" should be considered "cultural" traits. Sign test results are significant for only two of six indicators of these two traits, dissatisfaction with housing and the ratio of persons to number of rooms--neither of which seem "cultural" in nature.

Sign test results are not significant for the voluntary association and neighboring indicators of "minimum of organization beyond the... family." Sign test results are significant for the interaction with friends indicators of "minimum of organization beyond the...family."

Ethnic differences are observed on the subjective indicator of poor housing conditions. Place of residence differences are observed on the latter indicator as well as on the three objective indicators of poor housing conditions; place of residence differences are also observed on the indicator of neighboring.

NATURE OF THE FAMILY

Table V-3

Summary of Findings for Selected Traits in Category 3: Nature of the Family

Trait	NC-90 Indicator	Sign test results	Ethnic Differences Observed?	Residence Differences Observed?
Female- or mother-centered families	Q. 2	p=.0005	yes	yes
Predominance of the nuclear family	Family type	n.s.	yes	yes
	Nuclear vs. extended family orientation	n.s.	yes	yes
Greater knowledge of maternal relatives	Q. 18	n.s.		
Family solidarity: ideal rarely achieved	Family cohesiveness score	p=.03		
Absence of childhood...	Q. 37	n.s.		
Strong predisposition to authoritarianism	Q. 111	n.s.		
	Q. 112	n.s.	yes	
	Q. 115	n.s.	yes	
	Q. 117	n.s.	yes	
	Q. 118	n.s.	yes	

Sign test results are singificant for indicators of only two of the six traits examined: trend toward female- or mother-centered families and family solidarity--an ideal rarely achieved. It should be noted that poverty can be viewed as stemming from female-headed families rather than vice versa. Lowered family cohesiveness (especially as measured by frequency of family interaction) among impoverished people is supported by other research and is not difficult to understand in view of the "struggle for survival" constraints on such people.

Ethnic differences are observed on indicators of three traits: trend toward female- or mother-centered families, predominance of the nuclear family, and strong predisposition to authoritarianism (except for one indicator of the latter). On indicators of trend toward female- or mother-centered families and predominance of the nuclear family, place of residence differences are also observed.

ATTITUDES, VALUES AND CHARACTER OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Table V-4

Summary of Findings for Selected Traits in Category 4: Attitudes, Values and Character of the Individual

Trait	NC-90 Indicator	Sign test results	Ethnic Differences Observed?	Residence Differences Observed?
Strong feeling of alienation	Q. 25	n.s.		
Feeling that existing institutions do not serve their interests and needs	Q. 33	p=.03		
Strong feeling of helplessness	Q. 40	n.s.		
Sense of resignation & fatalism	Q. 32 Q. 28	n.s. n.s.		
Strong feeling of dependence	Q. 43	n.s.		
Feeling of powerlessness	Q. 24	p=.03		
Belief in male superiority	Q. 36 Q. 46 Q. 55	n.s. n.s. n.s.		
Martyr complex in women	Q. 114	n.s.	yes	

Sign test results are significant for indicators of only two of the eight traits examined: feeling that existing institutions do not serve their interests and needs and feeling of powerlessness.

Only for the indicator of one trait, martyr complex among women, are ethnic differences observed. No place of residence differences are observed.

CONCLUSION

The present analysis suggests only the following characteristics as candidates for components of a "culture of poverty" among the populations examined: lack of interaction with friends as a form of organization beyond the family, relatively lower family solidarity, and two value-orientations--feeling that existing institutions do not serve their interests and needs, and feeling of powerlessness.

It should be emphasized that this report is descriptive in nature. Hopefully, some insights are furnished about the variation in "poverty characteristics" across different population types. Even when a greater percentage of "poor" than "non-poor" families are found to be characterized by a particular trait in more study populations than would be expected by chance it should be noted that the actual percentage difference between "poor" and "non-poor" families may be quite small. The extent to which any set of poor and non-poor families can reasonably be expected to differ varies with the trait under consideration, and probably with the particular indicator of the trait as well. Thus, it is very difficult to decide whether the size of an observed difference is meaningful or not, especially since Lewis has furnished no guidelines for such decisions. As noted earlier, the 20 percentage-point criterion adopted in Chapter IV is arbitrary. Significance of differences in proportions was not tested because of the small N's in some categories.

This report does suggest that, on some indicators of some traits, sizeable differences exist among ethnic and/or residence categories--differences which are more impressive than differences between the two

income index categories representing "poor" and "non-poor" families. It is interesting that Irelan et al. (1969) found little difference between the recipients and non-recipients of public assistance (a rough measure of income differences) among their Spanish-speaking sample, but did find consistent differences between these two sub-sets of their black and white samples. These findings suggest that the "culture of poverty" may have "limited general utility" (Irelan et al., 1969:412). Possible ethnic and place of residence differences suggest important directions for further research into poverty characteristics. The study evolving from NC-90, "Differential Effects of Areas of Residence on Quality of Life of Economically Advantaged and Disadvantaged Families" should provide information relevant to unanswered questions surrounding Oscar Lewis' alleged culture of poverty traits.

Table IV-A-1: Percent of Intact Families in which Husband was Currently Unemployed, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity and Place of Residence.

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)[a]	-- (16)	-- (11)	-- (48)	21.2 (33)	20.8 (48)	-- (13)	4.0 (25)	1.2 (87)	25.0 (4)	20.0 (15)	33.3 (6)
150 & above (n)	-- (87)	1.5 (137)	-- (90)	3.3 (61)	1.3 (78)	-- (23)	-- (2)	-- (9)	-- (30)	-- (26)	-- (4)

n.s.

[a] In this Table, and in all subsequent Tables, n represents the number of interviewees in each ethnic-residence-income category for whom the NC-90 questionnaire item was relevant, and who responded to the item.

Table IV-A-2: Percent of Homemakers Employed During Past Twelve Months, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence.

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	26.4 (53)	45.4 (11)	14.0 (57)	41.5 (135)	45.4 (97)	-- (17)	28.0 (25)	32.6 (89)	22.2 (9)	27.0 (37)	20.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	35.0 (103)	52.4 (147)	38.7 (93)	55.4 (74)	74.5 (94)	16.7 (24)	100.0 (2)	66.7 (9)	84.4 (32)	59.4 (32)	50.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-A-3: Percent of Homemakers Employed During Past Twelve Months Who Worked Less Than 26 Weeks, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence.

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	35.7 (14)	60.0 (5)	25.0 (8)	19.6 (56)	13.6 (44)	-- (0)	57.1 (7)	96.6 (29)	--- (1)	44.4 (9)	50.0 (2)
150 & above (n)	25.0 (36)	15.6 (77)	36.1 (36)	7.3 (41)	2.9 (70)	-- (4)	50.0 (2)	33.3 (6)	11.5 (26)	-- (19)	50.0 (2)

n.s.

Table IV-A-4: Percent of Employed Homemakers Holding Unskilled Jobs, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity and Place of Residence.

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	50.0 (14)	60.0 (5)	62.5 (8)	67.9 (56)	75.0 (44)	--- (0)	100.0 (7)	100.0 (29)	50.0 (2)	60.0 (10)	50.0 (2)
150 & above (n)	27.8 (36)	16.9 (77)	33.3 (36)	51.2 (41)	60.0 (70)	25.0 (4)	50.0 (2)	100.0 (6)	22.2 (27)	26.3 (19)	50.0 (2)

p = .03

Table IV-A-5: Percent of Employed Husbands (Intact Families) Holding Unskilled Jobs, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	37.5 (16)	9.1 (11)	31.2 (48)	50.0 (26)	39.5 (38)	53.8 (13)	95.8 (24)	98.8 (24)	33.3 (3)	33.3 (12)	75.0 (4)
150 & above (n)	16.1 (87)	3.7 (135)	11.1 (90)	40.7 (59)	31.2 (77)	39.1 (23)	50.0 (2)	100.0 (9)	13.3 (30)	23.1 (26)	50.0 (4)

p = .006

Table IV-A-6: Percent of Families Not Owning Their Home, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (Q. 61)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	84.9 (53)	45.4 (11)	24.6 (57)	92.6 (135)	39.2 (97)	70.6 (17)	48.0 (25)	47.2 (89)	88.9 (9)	97.3 (37)	100.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	43.7 (103)	16.2 (148)	17.2 (93)	87.7 (73)	29.8 (94)	54.2 (24)	100.0 (2)	33.3 (9)	50.0 (32)	68.8 (32)	100.0 (4)

p = .03

Table IV-A-7: Percent of Families Having No Income from Rental Property, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	100.0 (53)	100.0 (11)	96.5 (57)	84.4 (135)	99.0 (97)	100.0 (17)	100.0 (25)	100.0 (89)	100.0 (9)	100.0 (37)	100.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	89.6 (96)	93.8 (146)	86.0 (93)	83.8 (74)	95.7 (94)	95.8 (24)	100.0 (2)	88.9 (9)	90.6 (32)	90.6 (32)	100.0 (4)

p = .006

Table IV-A-8: Percent of Respondents Reporting They Sometimes or Often Are Not Able to Save Money to Fall Back On, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (Q. 201)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	90.4 (52)	81.8 (11)	86.0 (57)	62.2 (135)	81.4 (97)	76.5 (17)	50.0 (24)	48.2 (85)	77.8 (9)	37.8 (37)	40.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	63.5 (96)	31.1 (148)	52.7 (93)	41.9 (74)	59.6 (94)	45.8 (24)	50.0 (2)	22.2 (9)	31.2 (32)	37.5 (32)	-- (4)

p = .0005

Table IV-A-9: Percent of Families Having No Payroll Deduction for Savings, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence.

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	98.1 (53)	100.0 (11)	100.0 (57)	100.0 (135)	100.0 (97)	100.0 (17)	100.0 (25)	100.0 (89)	100.0 (9)	100.0 (37)	100.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	100.0 (103)	99.3 (148)	100.0 (93)	91.9 (74)	100.0 (94)	100.0 (24)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (9)	75.0 (32)	81.2 (32)	75.0 (4)

(No sign test because of number of ties)

Table IV-A-10: Percent of Respondents Reporting They Sometimes or Often Lack Food Reserves in the Home, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (Q. 193)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	43.1 (51)	9.1 (11)	8.8 (57)	63.0 (135)	46.6 (97)	47.1 (17)	40.0 (25)	46.0 (87)	11.1 (9)	40.5 (37)	40.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	7.2 (97)	2.7 (148)	5.4 (93)	23.0 (74)	28.0 (93)	37.5 (24)	-- (2)	44.4 (9)	15.6 (32)	28.1 (32)	-- (4)

p = .006

Table IV-A-11: Percent of Respondents Reporting They Often Cannot Buy Special Things Their Children Want, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 195)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	50.0 (52)	18.2 (11)	29.8 (57)	38.5 (135)	45.4 (97)	35.3 (17)	8.7 (23)	12.8 (86)	22.2 (9)	21.6 (37)	20.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	5.2 (97)	2.0 (148)	6.4 (93)	10.8 (74)	12.9 (93)	12.5 (24)	50.0 (2)	-- (8)	3.1 (32)	3.1 (32)	-- (4)

p = .006

Table IV-A-12: Percent of Respondents Reporting They Often Cannot Buy New Shoes or Clothes, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q.200)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	44.2 (52)	9.1 (11)	14.0 (57)	32.8 (134)	36.1 (97)	11.8 (17)	4.2 (24)	12.5 (88)	-- (9)	10.8 (37)	30.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	11.3 (97)	-- (148)	1.1 (93)	8.1 (74)	10.6 (94)	16.7 (24)	-- (2)	11.1 (9)	-- (32)	-- (32)	-- (4)

p = .006

Table IV-A-13: Percent of Respondents Reporting that Family Income is Not at all Adequate, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 204)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	26.4 (53)	-- (11)	8.8 (57)	28.9 (135)	40.2 (97)	11.8 (17)	4.0 (25)	6.8 (88)	33.3 (9)	10.8 (37)	10.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	4.0 (100)	0.7 (148)	1.1 (93)	6.8 (74)	8.5 (94)	-- (24)	-- (2)	-- (9)	-- (32)	-- (32)	-- (4)

p = .006

Table IV-A-14: Percent of Families Making Finance Company Payments, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence.

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	17.3 (52)	9.1 (11)	14.0 (57)	14.1 (135)	27.8 (97)	17.6 (17)	24.0 (25)	5.6 (89)	11.1 (9)	13.5 (37)	10.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	23.4 (94)	13.7 (146)	14.0 (93)	19.2 (73)	21.3 (94)	8.3 (24)	50.0 (2)	22.2 (9)	43.8 (32)	43.8 (32)	50.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-A-15: Percent of Homemakers with less than 8 Years of Schooling, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence.

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	3.8 (53)	-- (11)	7.1 (56)	16.7 (132)	29.2 (96)	52.9 (17)	72.0 (25)	85.4 (89)	22.2 (9)	10.8 (37)	-- (10)
150 & above (n)	1.0 (103)	-- (147)	1.1 (93)	12.2 (74)	11.8 (93)	29.2 (24)	50.0 (2)	100.0 (9)	3.1 (32)	25.0 (32)	25.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-A-16: Percent of Husbands (Intact Families) with less than 8 Years of Schooling, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence.

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	9.5 (21)	10.0 (10)	15.4 (52)	30.3 (33)	46.7 (45)	46.2 (13)	75.0 (24)	90.0 (88)	-- (3)	25.0 (16)	16.7 (6)
150 & above (n)	2.3 (86)	0.7 (135)	3.3 (91)	14.3 (56)	26.8 (71)	21.7 (23)	-- (2)	100.0 (9)	6.7 (30)	40.7 (27)	25.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-A-17: Percent of Families Not Paying Union Dues, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence.

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	82.7 (52)	72.7 (11)	100.0 (57)	99.3 (135)	96.9 (97)	76.5 (17)	96.0 (25)	89.9 (89)	88.9 (9)	97.3 (37)	100.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	56.5 (92)	81.5 (146)	87.1 (93)	87.8 (74)	84.0 (94)	68.2 (22)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (9)	90.6 (32)	93.8 (32)	100.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-A-18: Percent of Families with no Social Security Income, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence.

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	92.4 (53)	90.9 (11)	91.2 (57)	91.8 (135)	86.6 (97)	94.1 (17)	100.0 (25)	100.0 (89)	88.9 (9)	89.2 (37)	90.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	92.2 (103)	93.9 (147)	97.8 (93)	95.9 (74)	92.5 (93)	95.8 (24)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (9)	93.8 (32)	93.8 (32)	100.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-B-1: Percent of Families Whose Homes Have No Hot or Cold Piped Water, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 63a)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	-- (53)	-- (11)	21.0 (57)	2.2 (135)	60.8 (97)	-- (17)	37.5 (24)	58.0 (81)	-- (9)	-- (37)	-- (10)
150 & above (n)	-- (103)	-- (148)	.2 (93)	1.4 (74)	37.2 (94)	-- (24)	-- (2)	33.3 (9)	3.1 (32)	-- (32)	-- (4)

n.s.

Table IV-B-2: Percent of Families Whose Homes Have No Flush Toilet, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 64)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	1.9 (53)	-- (11)	14.0 (57)	0.7 (135)	58.8 (97)	-- (17)	20.8 (24)	49.4 (81)	11.1 (9)	-- (37)	-- (10)
150 & above (n)	-- (103)	-- (148)	2.2 (93)	-- (74)	31.9 (94)	-- (24)	-- (2)	11.1 (9)	-- (32)	-- (32)	-- (4)

n.s.

Table IV-6-3: Percent of Families Whose Homes Have No Tub or Shower, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 65)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	-- (53)	9.1 (11)	15.8 (57)	4.4 (135)	63.9 (97)	-- (17)	25.0 (24)	37.0 (81)	11.1 (9)	-- (37)	-- (10)
130 & above (n)	1.0 (101)	-- (148)	3.2 (93)	2.7 (74)	39.4 (94)	-- (24)	-- (2)	11.1 (9)	-- (32)	-- (32)	-- (4)

n.s.

Table IV-6-4: Percent of Respondents Who Say Their Home is Unsatisfactory or Very Unsatisfactory, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 70)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	28.3 (53)	9.1 (11)	8.8 (57)	37.0 (135)	57.7 (97)	47.1 (17)	12.5 (24)	19.8 (81)	11.1 (9)	16.2 (37)	20.0 (10)
130 & above (n)	12.6 (103)	4.0 (148)	5.4 (93)	29.7 (74)	34.0 (94)	8.3 (24)	-- (2)	11.1 (9)	15.6 (32)	12.5 (32)	25.0 (4)

p = .03

Table IV-B-5: Percent of Families Whose Homes Have Fewer Rooms Than Persons Living There, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 1, Q. 62)

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	32.1 (53)	45.4 (11)	42.1 (57)	43.7 (135)	68.0 (97)	64.7 (17)	56.0 (25)	74.2 (89)	33.3 (9)	64.9 (37)	60.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	8.7 (103)	7.4 (148)	11.8 (93)	20.3 (74)	27.7 (94)	41.7 (24)	50.0 (2)	55.6 (9)	40.6 (32)	43.8 (32)	50.0 (4)

p = .006

Table IV-B-6: Percent of Respondents Who Say Their Home Has Less Room Than Family Needs, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 69)

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	34.0 (53)	9.1 (11)	12.5 (56)	42.2 (135)	66.0 (97)	35.3 (17)	12.5 (24)	22.2 (81)	22.2 (9)	24.3 (37)	30.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	17.5 (103)	16.9 (148)	14.0 (93)	40.5 (74)	50.0 (94)	29.2 (24)	-- (2)	-- (9)	37.5 (32)	34.4 (32)	50.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-E-7: Percent of Intact Families in Which Neither Spouse Regularly Attends Church, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 105)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100	40.0	44.4	53.8	25.0	29.2	7.7	20.8	14.6	33.3	53.3	--
(n)	(20)	(9)	(52)	(32)	(48)	(13)	(24)	(82)	(3)	(15)	(5)
150 & above	39.5	33.3	43.7	22.6	27.3	9.1	50.0	12.5	78.6	34.6	25.0
(n)	(80)	(135)	(87)	(53)	(77)	(22)	(2)	(8)	(28)	(26)	(4)

n.s.

Table IV-E-8: Percent of Intact Families in Which Neither Spouse Regularly Attends Church-Connected Groups, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 106)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100	80.0	88.9	81.2	75.0	64.6	61.5	68.2	56.9	66.7	93.3	40.0
(n)	(20)	(9)	(48)	(32)	(48)	(13)	(22)	(72)	(3)	(15)	(5)
150 & above	80.2	65.2	84.5	65.4	68.8	72.7	100.0	37.5	92.9	88.5	100.0
(n)	(86)	(135)	(84)	(52)	(77)	(22)	(2)	(8)	(28)	(26)	(4)

n.s.

Table IV-B-9: Percent of Intact Families in Which Neither Spouse Regularly Attends PTA or Other Community Groups, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 107)

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	55.0 (20)	66.7 (9)	65.4 (52)	68.8 (32)	93.8 (48)	53.8 (13)	58.3 (24)	49.3 (75)	33.3 (3)	26.7 (15)	-- (5)
150 & above (n)	67.4 (86)	48.9 (135)	65.5 (84)	67.9 (53)	77.9 (77)	52.4 (21)	100.0 (2)	50.0 (8)	57.1 (28)	57.7 (26)	50.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-B-10: Percent of Intact Families in Which Neither Spouse Regularly Attends Lodge, VFW, or Similar Groups, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 108)

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	80.0 (20)	77.8 (9)	92.3 (52)	90.6 (32)	85.4 (48)	92.3 (13)	63.6 (22)	61.8 (68)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (15)	80.0 (5)
150 & above (n)	61.6 (86)	59.3 (135)	82.8 (87)	90.6 (53)	80.5 (77)	90.9 (22)	100.0 (2)	28.6 (7)	96.4 (28)	100.0 (26)	100.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-B-11: Percent of Families in Which Neither Spouse Regularly Attends Recreation Groups, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 109)

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	75.0 (20)	66.7 (9)	90.4 (52)	90.6 (32)	93.8 (48)	100.0 (13)	72.7 (22)	66.7 (69)	33.3 (3)	80.0 (15)	40.0 (5)
150 & above (n)	59.3 (86)	52.6 (135)	80.5 (87)	83.0 (53)	77.9 (77)	81.8 (22)	100.0 (2)	42.9 (7)	60.7 (28)	65.4 (26)	75.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-B-12: Percent of Homemakers With Low Scores* on Neighboring Practices Index, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence.

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	47.2 (53)	45.4 (11)	63.2 (57)	65.7 (134)	47.4 (97)	52.9 (17)	56.0 (25)	59.1 (88)	77.8 (9)	51.4 (37)	50.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	54.4 (103)	35.1 (148)	34.4 (93)	50.0 (74)	43.6 (94)	62.5 (24)	-- (1)	44.4 (9)	62.5 (32)	78.1 (32)	75.0 (4)

n.s.

*score of 2-5 (possible score range 2-11)

Table IV-B-13: Percent of Families in Which Neither Homemaker Nor Husband (if present) Interact with Friends from Work Other than at Work, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (Q. 103)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	68.0 (25	36.4 (11)	62.5 (48)	65.8 (114)	55.3 (76)	75.0 (16)	33.3 (24)	33.7 (86)	100.0 (5)	70.8 (24)	66.7 (6)
150 & above (n)	55.0 (100)	40.6 (143)	60.4 (91)	49.2 (67)	36.7 (90)	60.9 (23)	-- (2)	11.1 (9)	68.8 (32)	61.3 (31)	100.0 (4)

p = .03

Table IV-B-14: Percent of Families in Which Neither Homemaker Nor Husband (if present) Interact With Other Friends (Not friends from work), by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 104)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	25.5 (51)	9.1 (11)	29.8 (57)	44.6 (130)	37.1 (97)	76.5 (17)	16.0 (25)	24.8 (87)	44.4 (9)	63.9 (36)	30.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	18.4 (103)	5.4 (148)	20.4 (93)	31.0 (71)	31.9 (94)	41.7 (24)	50.0 (2)	33.3 (9)	31.2 (32)	34.4 (32)	50.0 (4)

p = .03

Table IV-C-1: Percent of Families Headed by the Homemaker, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (Q. 2)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	60.4 (53)	18.2 (11)	5.3 (57)	77.8 (135)	55.7 (97)	17.6 (17)	4.0 (25)	1.1 (89)	66.7 (9)	62.2 (37)	40.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	10.8 (102)	8.1 (148)	2.2 (93)	29.7 (74)	19.2 (94)	8.3 (24)	-- (2)	-- (9)	9.4 (32)	12.5 (32)	-- (4)

p = .0005

Table IV-C-2: Percent of Families Which Are Nuclear (i.e., Two-Parent, Not Extended), by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	37.7 (53)	72.7 (11)	87.7 (57)	17.8 (135)	28.9 (97)	70.6 (17)	92.0 (25)	88.8 (89)	33.3 (9)	40.5 (37)	50.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	80.6 (103)	89.9 (148)	91.4 (93)	62.2 (74)	68.1 (94)	83.3 (24)	50.0 (2)	66.7 (9)	87.5 (32)	81.2 (32)	100.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-C-3: Percent of Respondents With a Nuclear Family Orientation, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	85.7 (21)	66.7 (3)	35.7 (28)	15.1 (86)	7.7 (26)	-- (4)	8.7 (23)	-- (78)	50.0 (4)	62.5 (8)	100.0 (2)
150 & above (n)	71.9 (32)	26.6 (64)	50.0 (48)	11.3 (53)	12.5 (32)	18.2 (11)	-- (1)	-- (6)	27.3 (11)	31.6 (19)	-- (1)

n.s.

Table IV-C-4: Difference Between Percent of Respondents Having No Knowledge of Their Father's Main Occupation and Percent of Respondents Having No Knowledge of Their Mother's Main Occupation, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (+ indicates greater knowledge about mother's occupation, - indicates greater knowledge about father's) (Q. 18)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	+13.2	0.0	0.0	+4.4	+2.1	+23.5	0.0	+1.3	0.0	+2.7	0.0
150 & above (n)	+ 6.8	0.0	0.0	+1.4	+3.2	+ 8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

n.s.

Table IV-C-5: Percent of Families With High Scores* on Family Cohesiveness Index, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	34.0 (53)	27.3 (11)	45.6 (57)	13.7 (131)	22.7 (97)	12.5 (16)	48.0 (25)	18.4 (87)	22.2 (9)	43.2 (37)	40.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	44.7 (103)	62.2 (148)	65.6 (93)	28.4 (74)	27.7 (94)	50.0 (24)	50.0 (2)	22.2 (9)	28.1 (32)	40.6 (32)	25.0 (4)

p = .03

*score of 8 (possible score range 2-8). This score means that family often goes places together as a family and works around the home together. Since the majority of families were scored high or medium on family cohesiveness, and very few were scored low (meaning that they never or seldom went places together or worked together around home), only the % of high scorers is reported here. If family solidarity is an ideal rarely achieved among the poor, the % of high scorers should decrease with decreasing income level. Thus, the % of high scorers at the below 100 level should be less than the % of high scorers at the 150 & above level.

Table IV-C-6: Percent of Respondents Who Agree or Strongly Agree That If the Family Needs More Money it is All Right for a Child to Quit School and Help Out for Awhile, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (Q. 37)

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	7.6 (53)	-- (11)	14.0 (57)	20.3 (133)	32.0 (97)	23.5 (17)	28.0 (25)	40.7 (86)	11.1 (9)	16.2 (37)	10.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	7.8 (103)	8.1 (148)	6.4 (93)	21.6 (74)	29.8 (94)	8.3 (24)	-- (2)	66.7 (9)	9.4 (32)	15.6 (32)	50.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-C-7: Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agree that Respect for Parents is the Most Important Thing Kids Should Learn, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (Q.111)

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	66.0 (53)	54.5 (11)	68.4 (57)	93.3 (135)	95.9 (97)	94.1 (17)	96.0 (25)	84.3 (89)	88.9 (9)	94.6 (37)	90.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	73.5 (102)	66.9 (148)	61.3 (93)	89.2 (74)	92.6 (94)	87.5 (24)	100.0 (2)	88.9 (9)	84.4 (32)	87.5 (32)	100.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-C-8: Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agree that Most Kids Should be Toilet Trained by 15 Months of Age, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (Q. 112)

	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	22.6 (53)	18.2 (11)	31.6 (57)	60.7 (135)	71.1 (97)	70.6 (17)	80.0 (25)	70.4 (88)	44.4 (9)	51.4 (37)	30.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	11.8 (102)	16.2 (148)	10.8 (93)	64.9 (74)	74.5 (94)	50.0 (24)	50.0 (2)	66.7 (9)	28.1 (32)	50.0 (32)	75.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-C-9: Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agree that Most Kids Should Be Spanked More Often, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (Q.115)

	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	34.0 (53)	27.3 (11)	33.3 (57)	41.5 (135)	52.6 (97)	35.3 (17)	28.0 (25)	21.6 (88)	-- (9)	35.1 (37)	20.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	23.5 (102)	18.9 (148)	28.0 (93)	31.1 (74)	48.9 (94)	16.7 (24)	-- (2)	22.2 (9)	9.4 (32)	9.4 (32)	50.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-C-10: Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agree that A Child Should Be Weaned As Soon as Possible, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (Q. 117)

	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (a)	17.0 (53)	27.3 (11)	29.8 (57)	44.8 (134)	62.9 (97)	47.1 (17)	56.0 (25)	57.5 (87)	44.4 (9)	18.9 (37)	-- (10)
150 & above (n)	17.6 (102)	10.1 (148)	23.7 (93)	36.5 (74)	62.8 (94)	33.3 (24)	50.0 (2)	66.7 (9)	12.5 (32)	28.1 (32)	75.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-C-11: Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agree that a Parent's Main Goal is to See that the Kids Stay Out of Truble, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence (Q. 118)

	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	35.8 (53)	36.4 (11)	42.1 (57)	64.7 (133)	78.4 (97)	52.9 (17)	87.5 (24)	71.9 (89)	77.8 (9)	59.5 (37)	50.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	22.6 (102)	17.6 (148)	19.4 (93)	52.7 (74)	73.4 (94)	45.8 (24)	100.0 (2)	88.9 (9)	50.0 (32)	68.8 (32)	75.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-D-1: Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agree That Too Many People on the Job Are Just Out for Themselves, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 25).

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	39.6 (53)	45.4 (11)	43.9 (57)	45.5 (134)	48.4 (97)	35.3 (17)	36.0 (25)	40.4 (89)	22.2 (9)	35.7 (37)	10.0 (10)
100 & above (n)	38.8 (103)	20.9 (148)	37.6 (93)	32.4 (74)	53.2 (94)	25.0 (24)	50.0 (2)	11.1 (9)	25.0 (32)	37.5 (32)	50.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-D-2: Percent of Respondents Who Agree or Strongly Agree that when a Child has Problems there is no use getting in Touch with the School, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 33)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	13.2 (53)	9.1 (11)	15.8 (57)	30.4 (135)	47.4 (97)	23.5 (17)	29.2 (24)	48.3 (89)	11.1 (9)	16.2 (37)	10.0 (10)
100 & above (n)	9.7 (103)	6.8 (148)	6.4 (93)	20.3 (74)	37.2 (94)	16.7 (24)	-- (2)	55.6 (9)	3.1 (32)	3.1 (32)	25.0 (4)

p = .03

Table IV-D-3: Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agree that It Makes No Difference Which Job You Take Because You are Likely to Get Laid Off Anyway, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 40)

	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	5.7 (53)	-- (11)	3.5 (57)	10.4 (134)	27.8 (97)	5.9 (17)	16.0 (25)	30.7 (88)	22.2 (9)	10.8 (37)	20.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	1.0 (103)	0.7 (148)	2.2 (93)	2.7 (74)	19.2 (94)	4.2 (24)	50.0 (2)	44.4 (9)	3.1 (32)	6.2 (32)	25.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-D-4: Percent of Respondents Who Agree or Strongly Agree that Some People Just Cannot Finish High School so Why Try, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 32).

	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	22.6 (53)	9.1 (11)	28.1 (57)	25.2 (135)	29.9 (97)	23.5 (17)	20.0 (25)	41.6 (89)	44.4 (9)	29.7 (37)	20.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	11.6 (103)	6.8 (148)	17.4 (92)	32.4 (74)	38.3 (94)	16.7 (24)	-- (2)	55.6 (9)	18.8 (32)	37.5 (32)	75.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-D-5: Percent of Respondents Who Agree or Strongly Agree that Few People Really Look Forward to Their Work, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 28)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	45.3 (53)	36.4 (11)	47.4 (57)	67.4 (135)	74.2 (97)	64.7 (17)	56.0 (25)	64.0 (89)	66.7 (9)	64.9 (37)	30.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	46.6 (103)	31.8 (148)	32.6 (92)	73.0 (74)	77.4 (93)	37.5 (24)	100.0 (2)	88.9 (9)	40.6 (32)	56.2 (32)	100.0 (4)
									n.s.		

Table IV-D-6: Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agree that in Getting a Job It is not What You Know But Who You Know, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 43)

Income Index	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	24.5 (53)	18.2 (11)	5.3 (57)	21.5 (135)	30.9 (97)	41.2 (17)	25.0 (24)	30.3 (89)	22.2 (9)	18.9 (37)	-- (10)
150 & above (n)	16.5 (103)	8.1 (148)	4.3 (93)	16.2 (74)	18.1 (94)	20.8 (24)	50.0 (2)	55.6 (9)	15.6 (32)	6.2 (32)	25.0 (4)
									n.s.		

Table IV-D-7: Percent of Respondents Who Agree or Strongly Agree that the Most Important Thing About Getting a Job is Being at the Right Place at the Right Time, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 24)

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	56.6 (53)	63.6 (11)	49.1 (57)	66.7 (135)	75.3 (97)	76.5 (17)	92.0 (25)	92.1 (89)	88.9 (9)	62.2 (37)	80.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	49.5 (103)	33.1 (148)	26.9 (93)	58.1 (74)	67.0 (94)	58.3 (24)	100.0 (2)	66.7 (9)	62.5 (32)	50.0 (32)	100.0 (4)

p = .03

Table IV-D-8: Percent of Respondents Who Agree or Strongly Agree that it is More Important for a Boy than for a Girl to Get an Education Beyond High School, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q.36

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	52.8 (53)	54.5 (11)	63.2 (57)	34.8 (135)	55.7 (97)	58.8 (17)	40.0 (25)	56.2 (89)	33.3 (9)	59.5 (37)	90.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	61.2 (103)	53.4 (148)	52.7 (93)	52.7 (74)	44.7 (94)	50.0 (24)	-- (2)	77.8 (9)	56.2 (32)	53.1 (32)	75.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-D-9: Percent of Respondents Who Disagree or Strongly Disagree that it is All Right for Women to Hold Jobs Which are Usually Men's Jobs, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 46)

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	48.1 (52)	54.5 (11)	49.1 (57)	42.5 (134)	37.1 (97)	47.1 (17)	36.0 (25)	30.3 (89)	22.2 (9)	37.8 (37)	30.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	37.9 (103)	39.9 (148)	28.0 (93)	50.0 (74)	40.4 (94)	41.7 (24)	100.0 (2)	11.1 (9)	18.8 (32)	43.8 (32)	25.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-D-10: Percent of Respondents Who Agree or Strongly Agree that the Man Should be the One to Make all the Decisions About Choosing His Job, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 55)

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	67.9 (53)	54.5 (11)	91.2 (57)	59.0 (134)	78.4 (97)	82.4 (17)	68.0 (25)	77.3 (88)	77.8 (9)	70.3 (37)	90.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	75.7 (103)	70.9 (148)	71.0 (93)	71.6 (74)	75.5 (94)	83.3 (24)	100.0 (2)	55.6 (9)	75.0 (32)	87.5 (32)	100.0 (4)

n.s.

Table IV-D-11: Percent of Respondents Who Strongly Agree that Kids Should be Nicer to Their Mothers Since Their Mothers Suffer so Much for Them, by Family Income Index, Ethnicity, and Place of Residence. (Q. 114)

	WHITE			BLACK		SPANISH-SPEAKING			HAWAIIAN		
Income Index	Metro	Non-metro Rural small place	Non-metro Rural farm & nonfarm	Metro	Non-metro 2 villages Small urban place	Metro	MEXICAN-AMERICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	MEXICAN Non-metro Migrant Camp	Oriental Metro	Mixed Metro	Polynesian Metro
Below 100 (n)	17.0 (53)	18.2 (11)	22.8 (57)	68.9 (135)	75.3 (97)	64.7 (17)	45.8 (24)	57.3 (89)	22.2 (9)	37.8 (37)	50.0 (10)
150 & above (n)	9.8 (102)	3.4 (148)	6.4 (93)	47.3 (74)	72.3 (94)	45.8 (24)	50.0 (2)	77.8 (9)	15.6 (32)	31.2 (32)	75.0 (4)
									n.s.		

.001 .95

FOOTNOTES

1. Lewis (1968a:199) notes that the term "subculture of poverty" is technically more accurate; "culture of Poverty" is meant to be a shortened form of that term. By his own admission, the "catchy" nature of the "culture of poverty" phrase was viewed as useful. The inaccuracy of the phrase, however, has generated much criticism because of its implication of a full-blown cultural system. See, for example, Leeds (1971) and Valentine (1968).

2. For an inventory of these characteristics in social science literature published since World War II, see Rossi and Blum (1968:38-39).

3. Similarly, Walter Miller (1958) described a lower-class cultural system, as "a long established, distinctively patterned tradition with an integrity of its own."

4. The discussion by A. Leeds (1971) covers many criticisms voiced by other writers. Leeds identifies the issues raised by the culture of poverty concept as 91) theoretical-conceptual; (2) methodological; (3) substantive; and (4) ethical-civic. Within the first category, Leeds identified three sub-issues; (a) Lewis' imprecise use of the term culture; (b) the possibility that Lewis' listed poverty traits are autonomous and meaningful as concepts in themselves--hence not determined by the culture in which they are embedded; (c) a faulty view of the relationship between trait and structure (particularly in Lewis' view of poverty culture economic traits as distinct from the institutions of the larger society). The methodological issue concerns Lewis' relaince on a case study approach; according to Leeds (1971:275), "...the biography does not involve methodologically precise procedures of structural analysis, producing the empirically validated and replicable delimitation of groups and group boundaries necessary to specify the societal carrier of any culture..." The substantive issue concerns whether Lewis correctly interpreted his data; Leeds maintains that structural interpretations are not recognized by Lewis as feasible alternatives to the cultural interpretations he offers for many phenomena (e.g., greater knowledge of maternal relatives among the poor). Finally, the ethical-civic issue concerns the potentially damaging effect on the poor themselves of an esssentially deterministic view of poverty existence to which Lewis gave scientific credibility. For others' discussion of the latter issue see Ryan (1971:Chap. 5) and Winter (1971).

5. Three Indian families who were interviewed in Superior are omitted from this report.

6. The eight towns, in order of 1970 population size, were Savannah, Gallatin, Hamilton, Rockport, Stanberry, Princeton, Lathrop, and Mound City. Five black families who were interviewed are omitted from this report.

7. The fifteen "towns," in order of 1970 population size, were Underhill, Shoreham, Huntington, Wolcott, Waterford, Vershire, Waltham, Isle La Motte, West Haven, East Haven, Belvidere, Albany, Stannard, Victory, and Ferdinand. One Oriental family which was interviewed in Vermont is omitted from this report.

8. This study population was contacted in 1971 rather than 1970 because state funds for a metropolitan sample did not become available until that tiem. (A non-metropolitan sample had been contacted in 1970).

9. Also interviewed in East Chicago were 114 black families and 24 white families; these families are omitted from this report.

10. Interviewing took place in 1971 because of additional time needed to translate the interview schedule into Spanish. The twelve camps were located in the following eight counties: Merced, Monterey, San Benito, San Joaquin, Santa Clara, Solano, Stanislaus, and Sutter.

11. Because of Federal Government regulations, interviewers were instructed to visually identify the ethnicity of respondents; interviewers were not permitted to ask the race of ethnicity of respondents. One black family, 3 Spanish-speaking families and 31 white families of haoles were also interviewed; they are not considered in this report.

12. These comments were funished by Dr. Shirley Weeks, Professor in the Dept. of Human Development, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

13. This orientation is measured by responses to a series of four items: (1) Generally, I like our family to spend evenings together; (2) I want a house where our family can spend time together; (3) I want a location which would make it easy for relatives to get together; (4) I want a house with enough room so our parents could move in with us if they wanted to. Positive responses to items (1) or (2) but not (3) or (4) define neclear family orientation. Homemakers with incomplete responses to the series, or who were scored a non-family oriented, are omitted. Thus, cell N's are reduced, especially among the Polynesian group which therefore is not discussed here.

REFERENCES

Bell, Wendell and Maryanne T. Force
1956 "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations." American Sociological Review 21 (February): 25-34.

Cohen, Albert K. and Harold M. Hodges, Jr.
1963 "Characteristics of the Lower-Blue-Collar Class." Social Problems 10 (Spring): 303-334.

Gist, Noel P. and Sylvia F. Fava
1964 Urban Society. New York: Crowell, 5th Edition.

Iowa State University Agricultural Experiment Station
1973 Patterns of Living in Disadvantaged Families. North Central Regional Research Publication.

Irelan, Lola M.; Oliver C. Moles; and Robert M. O'Shea
1969 "Ethnicity, Poverty, and Selected Attitudes: A Test of the 'Culture of Poverty' Hypothesis." Social Forces 47 (June): 405-413.

Kriesberg, Louis
1970 Mothers in Poverty. Chicago: Aldine.

Ladner, Joyce A.
1970 "Women in Poverty: Its Roots and Effects." Pp. 43-56 in A. F. Scott (ed.), What is Happening to American Women. Atlanta: Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation.

Leeds, Anthony
1971 "The Concept of the 'Culture of Poverty': Conceptual, Logical, and Empirical Problems, with Perspectives from Brazil and Peru." Pp. 226-284 in Eleanor Leacock (ed.), The Culture of Poverty: A Critique. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Lewis, Oscar
1959 Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty. New York: Basic.

1966 La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty--San Juan and New York. New York: Random House.

1968a "The Culture of Poverty." Pp. 187-200 in Daniel P. Moynihan (ed.), On Understanding Poverty. New York: Basic.

1968b The Study of Slum Culture--Backgrounds for La Vida. New York: Random House.

Liebow, Elliot
1967 Tally's Corner. Boston: Little, Brown

Litwak, Eugene
1960 "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion." American Sociological Review 25 (June): 385-394.

Miller, Walter
1958 "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency." Journal of Social Issues 14 (3): 5-19.

Roach, Jack L. and Orville R. Gursslin
1967 "An Evaluation of the Concept 'Culture of Poverty.'" Social Forces 45 (March): 383-392.

Rodman, Hyman
1963 "The Lower-Class Value Stretch." Social Forces 42 (December): 205-215.

Rossi, Peter H. and Zahava D. Blum
1968 "Class, Status, and Poverty." Pp. 36-63 in Daniel P. Moynihan (ed.), On Understanding Poverty. New York: Basic.

Ryan, William
1971 "Learning to be Poor: The Culture of Poverty Cheesecake." Pp. 112-135 in Blaming the Victim. New York: Vintage.

Valentine, Charles A. et al.
1969 "Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals." Current Anthropology 10 (April-June): 181-201.

Winter, J. Alan (ed.)
1971 The Poor: A Culture of Poverty or a Poverty or Culture? Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

RELATED NC-90 REPORTS

Dietrich, Katheryn T.
1973 Black Families in a Nonmetropolitan, Southern County: Social Economic, and Psychological Attributes. Departmental Information Report No. 73-10. College Station, Texas: Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Texas A&M University.

Hawkes, Glenn R.; Minna Taylor; and Beverly E. Bastian
1973 Patterns of Living in California's Migrant Labor Families. Research Monograph No. 12. Davis, California: Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences, University of California, Davis.

Iowa State University Agricultural Experiment Station
1973 Patterns of Living in Disadvantaged Families. North Central Regional Research Publication.