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PREFACE

This is the second in a series of four reports dealing with the 1975 Every Student Survey. This survey is very similar to one done in 1970.

The present report provides a further description of students' social and demographic background. It also contains comparisons with data from the 1970 survey. It does not, however, establish relationships with program placement; this is done in the third report in the series.

The preparation of these reports was made possible by the assistance of many persons, most notably Dr. E. N. Wright, who lent his guidance in many respects. Our appreciation also goes out to Dr. Jack Murray, Val McLeod, Janis Gershman, and Lynda Groves -- all of whom assisted in different but important ways.

Ramesh A. Deosaran.
EXPLANATORY NOTE

Some of the groupings of countries and languages in the tables of this report may not reflect current political realities or conventional linguistic distinctions.

In the case of languages, the coding reflects the students' responses as accurately as possible. For instance, many students reported that their mother tongue was "Serbo-Croatian" others "Serbian" and still others "Croatian." No attempt was made to correct or rationalize such apparent inconsistencies.

The coding system used for countries was developed first in 1970 prior to our knowing the origins of all students. For the most part, the coding of countries in 1975 was held as closely as possible to that used in the 1970 survey to facilitate comparisons between the two surveys. Moreover, in order to compile the results as efficiently as possible, some geographically contiguous or politically related countries were combined. Examples include the West Indies; Russia/Ukraine; India/Ceylon and Pakistan/Bangladesh. In preparing the 1975 report, some previously grouped countries were reported individually, such as the countries in the West Indies. However, the West Indian category was still retained for students who reported "West Indies" as their country of origin.

The Board of Education is aware that some combinations are deemed inappropriate by some people. In future, every effort will be made to acknowledge, as fully as possible, significant political and cultural differences.
INTRODUCTION

This is the second in a series of four reports dealing with the 1975 Every Student Survey. The first report (Deosaran and Wright, 1976) touched on relationships between students' background and placement by type of class or programme. In that report, student's background was classified according to country or province of birth, mother tongue, and occupation of household head. Comparisons were also made with the results from a similar survey in 1970 (Wright, 1970). Almost 98 per cent of all the students (94,646) in the Toronto School System completed usable forms in the 1975 survey.

For the purpose of analysis, these students were classified into four immigrant/language groups:

(1) students born in Canada, English the first language;

(2) students born in Canada, English not the first language or another language and English learned at the same time;

(3) students not born in Canada, English the first language;

(4) students not born in Canada, English not the first language or another language and English learned at the same time.

The first report further established the general differences among the four immigrant/language groups in terms of grade and special class enrolment in the elementary school, and level of study in the secondary school. For instance, the proportion of students from group 1 (Canadian-born, English first language) and group 4 (non-Canadian-born, English as a second language) in Special Class A (opportunity class) were more similar than the proportion of students from group 2 (Canadian-born, English as a second language).

1 Throughout this report, students in groups 2 and 4 will be described as students having English as a second language.
second language) and group 3 (non Canadian born, English first language). In fact, group 1 and 4 both had a larger proportion in Special Class A than either of the other two groups. Also, the non-Canadian-born, English second language group (group 4) had the smallest proportion of students (56 per cent) enrolled in level 5 in the secondary school; the proportion for each of the other groups exceeded 60 per cent.

Other tables in the first report further established that the lower the occupational status of parents, the more likely students were to be in an "opportunity" class.* The opposite trend was found for students enrolled in level 5. While students whose parents were physicians, engineers, etc. appear to have 9 chances out of 10 to be in level 5, students with parents as packers, taxi drivers, etc. had only 5 chances out of 10. Such findings suggested the need for a closer look at the social and demographic background of students in the four immigrant/language groups.

In this second report further relationships are established among parents' occupation, students' mother tongue, and students' immigrant status. These relationships are not as school-related as those found in the first report. They do, however, provide an in-depth look at the sociological variations existing within the different student groups and the relationships among the different background factors.

Readers are cautioned to note that, unlike much census-type data, the data in this report are student-based -- not household-based. Thus households with several children in the school system contribute more to the results than those households with only one child in the system. This method of reporting reflects the school population rather than the population in the community. To facilitate comparisons between the two periods, two of the tables in this text include both 1975 and 1970 data. Another table from the 1970 survey is

* now referred to as Special Program (Primary, Junior and Senior).
included in the text, but because of the complexity of the data it is
kept separately from the relevant 1975 table. While statistical tests
have been applied to group differences in some tables, Appendix B contains
a special table to facilitate further comparisons between specific groups
within the same table.
Occupation and New Canadian Status

1975 Data

Occupations were coded according to the Blishen scale and then combined into eight categories (2 to 9). Seven special categories (10-16) were added to accommodate nonemployed persons such as pensioners, unemployed, welfare recipients etc. As seen in Table 1, over 50 per cent of the students in the school system come from homes where parents' occupations were described as labourers, repairmen, sales clerks, machinists etc. (categories 2-4); whereas 13 per cent described parents' occupations as managers, physicians, pilots etc. (categories 8-9). Another 20 per cent of the parents were employed in intermediate status occupations (categories 5-7).

It is quite clear from Table 1 that whether or not the students had English as the first language made a greater difference in terms of their parents' occupations, than whether or not they were born in Canada. For instance, 60 per cent of the non-Canadian-born students with English as second language had parents from the lowest occupational category (labourers, taxi drivers, porters etc.). The comparable figure for Canadian-born students with English as a second language was 57 per cent. On the other hand, the proportion of students in group 1 (Canadian-born, English first language) and group 3 (non-Canadian-born, English first language) with parents in the lowest occupational category was only 26 and 36 per cent respectively. As Table 1 further shows, groups 2 and 4 each had only 3 per cent in category 9 (engineers, lawyers, pilots etc.). Furthermore, in terms of having household heads in category 9 (engineers, lawyers, pilots etc.), the proportion of students from the two English first language groups was four times higher than that for students in the other two English second language group.
TABLE 1
HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD'S OCCUPATION AND PUPIL'S IMMIGRANT
STATUS EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category*</th>
<th>Born in Canada, English a First Language</th>
<th>Born in Canada, English a Second Language***</th>
<th>Not born in Canada, English a First Language</th>
<th>Not born in Canada, English a Second Language***</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=42020) (N=54963)</td>
<td>(N=22364) (N=21883)</td>
<td>(N=7280) (N=5508)</td>
<td>(N=20251) (N=21239)</td>
<td>(N=91915) (N=103818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1**</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENTAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 13620.7; df = 45; p < .01
a Number of students for whom no information on immigrant status available = 786
* See Appendix A for category description
** No information
*** Includes those who learned English and another language at the same time
It appears from Table 1 that, regardless of where they are born, students with English as first language were much more likely than those with English as second language to have parents in a higher occupational category and much less likely to have parents in the lowest occupational category.

With respect to the special categories (10-16), there were only slight differences among the four "immigrant status" groups. Canadian-born students with English as first language were more likely than any of the other three groups to come from "mother-only" homes (category 14). The non-Canadian-born students with English as second language were slightly more likely to report household heads as unemployed (category 13).

1975 and 1970 Comparison

As indicated in Table 1, the distributions of students in the various occupational categories are quite similar for both periods. For example, in both surveys, over half of the student population had household heads in the lowest three occupational categories 2-4 (labourers, repairmen, sales clerks etc.).

Looking at these three occupational categories again, we observe that in 1975 the proportion of Canadian-born students with English as first language was decreased by almost 18 per cent over 1970. For this same group of students, there was an increase for the two highest occupational categories, 8 and 9 (managers, teachers, physicians etc.) from 18 per cent to 21 per cent.

Parents of students born in Canada for whom English was a second language showed a somewhat different occupational profile in 1975 than in 1970. There were almost twice as many in category 6 (technicians) and only one third as many in category 7 (stenographers). This probably reflects shifts in the occupational skills of different ethnic groups. No simple explanation for these changes is apparent although the same trend appears
among the parents of children not born in Canada for whom English was also a second language.

Table 1 further shows that for each group of students, there was a slight increase from 1970 in the proportion of household heads unemployed (category 13) and retired or on pension.

**Occupations of Working Mothers**

1975 Data

Table 1 revealed that mother tongue of students was more strongly related to parents' occupation than whether or not students were born in Canada. Table 2 goes further and shows the relationship between the mother tongue of students and the occupational status of mothers in two-parent homes.

Some of the differences between students with English as a first or as a second language are quite striking. For instance, 27 per cent of the students with English as first language had mothers as kitchen-helpers, packers etc., while the mothers of 72 per cent of those with English as a second language worked in such occupations. In every other occupational category, from 3 through 9, there was a higher proportion of mothers of students with English as their first language than for those with English as second language. In fact, Table 2 shows that less than 2 per cent of the students with English as a second language had mothers who were teachers, lawyers, physicians etc. as against 7 per cent of the students with English as a first language.

Tables 1 and 2 were developed by combining specific occupational categories from the Blishen scale. However, that method tended to mask the distribution of occupations in which women were predominant. Accordingly all occupational categories with 1 per cent or more of the students with working mothers were selected and a new table was created. Table 3 illustrates
TABLE 2
PERCENTAGES OF WORKING MOTHERS IN VARIOUS OCCUPATIONS
AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH WHETHER ENGLISH WAS STUDENT'S MOTHER TONGUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>packers, weavers, kitchen helpers</td>
<td>27.0 28.0</td>
<td>71.6 74.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>waitresses, sheet metal workers</td>
<td>2.3 3.9</td>
<td>1.8 2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>sales clerks, jewellers</td>
<td>6.3 10.5</td>
<td>3.6 5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>clerical, printing workers</td>
<td>17.8 15.9</td>
<td>6.2 4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>actresses, tool and diemakers</td>
<td>15.7 16.5</td>
<td>8.8 5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>musicians, stenographers</td>
<td>14.2 14.1</td>
<td>2.4 2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>various owners, librarians</td>
<td>5.9 4.1</td>
<td>0.9 1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>teachers, engineers</td>
<td>7.6 5.8</td>
<td>1.7 1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>pensioner, retired</td>
<td>0.1 0.0</td>
<td>0.2 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>welfare, mother's allowance</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>adult training or retraining</td>
<td>1.6 0.7</td>
<td>0.8 0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>1.4 0.4</td>
<td>1.9 0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PER CENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.9 99.9</td>
<td>99.9 99.8</td>
<td>16014a 15829 18817b 16199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 7844.3; df = 14; p<.01
a no. of missing observations = 470. Categories 14 and 16 together contain 6 students.
b no. of missing observations = 337. Categories 14 and 16 together contain 7 students.
Category 15 contains no students.
* This gives a few examples of occupations in each category.
the distribution of working mothers by occupational status for each of the four immigrant-status groups of students.

The trends already noted reappear in the more refined distribution in Table 3. Non-Canadian-born students who had English as a second language were generally more likely to have mothers in low occupational categories and less likely to have mothers in a high occupational category. The opposite was true for Canadian students who had English as their first language.

More specifically, Table 3 shows that 52 per cent of non-Canadian-born students with English as second language had mothers in the food industry while almost 40 per cent of Canadian-born students with English as second language had mothers in this industry. The comparable percentages for mothers of Canadian-born students with English as first language and mothers of non-Canadian-born students with English as first language are 12 and 26 per cent respectively.

The distribution for "typists" and "stenographers" accentuates the relationships observed for English-speaking background. For instance, while 30 per cent of the Canadian-born students from an English-speaking background had mothers as typists and stenographers, only 8 per cent of Canadian-born students with English as second language had mothers in such occupations. English proficiency is clearly a requirement for these occupations.

1975 and 1970 Comparison

Few differences are apparent between the 1970 and 1975 distributions in Table 2. For students with English as first language, there was a decrease from 10 to 6 in the percentage of mothers as sales clerks, jewellers etc. On the other hand, there was a slight increase in the proportion of students with English as first language whose mothers were librarians, teachers, physicians etc.
TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF MOTHERS IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES BY CHILD'S COUNTRY OF BIRTH AND MOTHER TONGUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>And Illustrative Occupations*</th>
<th>Born in Canada, English a first language (N=10841)</th>
<th>Born in Canada, English a second language (N=8507)</th>
<th>Not born in Canada, English a first language (N=2721)</th>
<th>Not born in Canada, English a second language (N=8513)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=30582)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textile occupations</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men helpers, food service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysitters</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales, graduate</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics and repairmen</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior decorators</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal technicians</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchmen and cashiers</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographers</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-clerical travel agents</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks and managers</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School teachers</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Those categories with more than 1 per cent of the 33861 students who had working mothers are included. Of these, 32022 students had working mothers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation category*</th>
<th>Italian** (N=9520)</th>
<th>Portuguese (N=7227)</th>
<th>Greek (N=6218)</th>
<th>Chinese (N=5794)</th>
<th>Polish (N=1476)</th>
<th>French (N=1318)</th>
<th>Ukrainian (N=1248)</th>
<th>Spanish (N=1238)</th>
<th>German (N=1177)</th>
<th>Serbo-Croatian (N=941)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix A for category description.
** Students in each language group include both those who have the language as their mother tongue and those who learned the language at the same time as English.
TABLE 4
HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD'S OCCUPATION FOR STUDENTS OF
VARIOUS LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE
Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category*</th>
<th>Macedonian** ((N=505))</th>
<th>Hungarian ((N=480))</th>
<th>Korean ((N=334))</th>
<th>Indian ((N=324))</th>
<th>Cantonese Uncl. ((N=280))</th>
<th>Punjabi ((N=257))</th>
<th>Japanese ((N=254))</th>
<th>Hindi ((N=235))</th>
<th>Lithuanian ((N=216))</th>
<th>Maltese ((N=211))</th>
<th>Jamaican Patois ((N=204))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PER CENT</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix A for category description.
** Students in each language group include both those who have the language as their mother tongue and those who learned the language at the same time as English.
For students with a second language there was a slight increase in the percent working as cleaners, workers, actresses, etc. (occupational categories #5 and 6).

Language Group and Occupation

1975 Data

In this section the relationships between students' language background and their parents' occupations are examined. Those languages reported by over 200 students as the mother tongue or as the languages learned at the same time as English were selected for Table 4. These 21 languages, ranging from Italian (9520 students) to Jamaican Patois (204 students), are presented in descending order of frequency in Table 4.

In ten of the 21 language groups the parents of more than 50 per cent of the students work in the lowest occupational category. Almost three quarters of the parents of Italian and Portuguese speaking students (71 and 74 per cent respectively) work as labourers, taxi drivers, kitchen helpers etc. (category 2). In all but two of the 21 language groups the parents of more than 30 per cent of the students work in the lowest occupational category. The two exceptions are Korean and French with 21 and 30 per cent respectively.

Only four of the 21 language groups had more than 10 per cent of the parents working as doctors, engineers, teachers etc. (category 9). These four groups are Hindi (15%), Japanese (14%), Hungarian (12%) and French (11%).

Some perspective for these percentages can be gained by comparing the groups in Table 4 with the Canadian-born, English first language group of students in Table 1. Twenty-six percent of those students' parents worked
TABLE 5

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD'S OCCUPATION FOR STUDENTS OF VARIOUS LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE (1970 SURVEY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Language Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERCENTAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No information
** Students in each language group include both those who have the language as their mother tongue and those who learned the language at the same time as English.
### TABLE 5 (continued)

**HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD's OCCUPATION FOR STUDENTS OF VARIOUS LANGUAGE BACKGROUNDS EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE**

(1970 SURVEY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

**PERCENTAGE**

99.7 100.1 99.9 100.1 100.0 99.9 100.0 99.5 99.9 100.0

* No information

** Students in each language group include both those who have the language as their mother tongue and those who have the language at the same time as English.
as labourers, taxi drivers, porters etc. Thus, the group of Korean-speaking students was the only one with a lower proportion of parents (21%) in this occupational category. Moreover, the proportion of parents in occupational category 2 for most of the other language groups was two to three times greater than for English-speaking students.

Only two language groups had a higher proportion of parents working as doctors, engineers etc. (category 9) than the English-speaking students. The proportion for English-speaking students was 13 per cent while it was 14 and 15 per cent for Japanese and Hindi-speaking students respectively.

1975 and 1970 Comparison

The comparable data from the 1970 survey are contained in Table 5. With 200 or more students as the criterion, the 1970 classification had twenty language groups. In 1975 there were 21 language groups with this same criterion. A comparison of the two lists reveals that five language groups in 1970 had to be dropped because they each contained fewer than the criterion of 200 or more students. These groups were Yugoslavian, Estonian, Czechoslovakian, Latvian and Finnish. The six new language groups which satisfied the criterion in 1975 were Serbo-Croatian, Korean, Cantonese, Hindi, Punjabi and Jamaican Patois.

There are some other important differences in the data from the two surveys. A look at category 2 (labourers, taxi drivers, porters etc.) and category 9 (physicians, engineers, pilots etc.) reveals some striking differences.

Let us first look at category 2. French, German, Japanese and Lithuanian-speaking students all experienced a decrease in the proportion of

---

2 This group includes both those who have Korean as their mother tongue and those who learned Korean and English at the same time. A similar classification is used for the other language groups.
parents in this category. Between 1970 and 1975, the French group moved
down from 37 to 30 per cent, the German from 39 to 31 per cent, the Japanese
from 45 to 37 per cent and Lithuanian from 48 to 39 per cent. On the other
hand, during this period the proportion of parents of the Spanish-speaking
students in category 2 increased from 39 to 53 per cent while for the
Macedonian-speaking students the proportion went from 52 to 63 per cent.

Let us now look at the differences within category 9 (physicians,
engineers, pilots etc.). Of those language groups classified in both periods,
French, German, Hungarian, and Japanese-speaking students experienced a
noticeable increase in the proportion of parents in such occupations. The
French group increased from 8 per cent in 1970 to 11 per cent in 1975; the
German group increased from 7 to 9 per cent, Hungarian from 9 to 12 per cent
and Japanese from 10 to 14 per cent.
This report elaborated on some of the demographic and social characteristics of students in a Toronto school system. While some of the data resorted parental backgrounds, it must be noted that the data were compiled on the basis of students' responses only. This limitation notwithstanding, the report illustrates the wide variations among the four "immigrant" groups and, more specifically, among the many language groups.

In terms of their parental occupations, whether or not students have English as their first language makes a bigger difference than whether or not they were born in Canada. Compared to students with English as a second language, students with English as their mother tongue are much more likely to have parents in the professions. This holds whether or not the students were born in Canada.

However, one cannot generalize for every language group. This report shows clear distinctions among the various language groups. For instance, Japanese and Hindi-speaking students have the highest proportion of parents in the professional category. This proportion is even higher than that for students with English as their mother tongue. On the other hand, Italian and Portuguese-speaking students have the highest proportion of parents in the lowest occupational category.

Generally, one should interpret the occupational status of immigrant parents as conservative estimates. For instance, certification problems faced on arrival in Canada may reduce an immigrant's initial occupational status. Furthermore, occupational status as described in this report may not accurately reflect the actual educational attainment of some new arrivals in Canada, such attainment in the native country possibly being higher than the occupation would indicate.
While working mothers has increased over 1970, occupational diversity among mothers remained relatively stable in the two surveys. It is interesting to note that as a group, non-Canadian-born students with English as their second language are much more likely than students in other groups to have their mothers in a low occupational status category (e.g. kitchen workers).

This report refines some of the comparisons made in the previous report and helps provide a clearer understanding of the demographic and social background of the Toronto school population. It is also essential to note that the relationships established here, as in the other reports in this series, do not infer causality. In fact, the reader is cautioned to bear in mind the few limitations pointed out when interpreting the data. The third report will take a close look at relationships between students' country of birth and mother tongue, and program placement.
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APPENDIX A

Socio-economic Codes for Household Head
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Number</th>
<th>Blsisheld Category</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
<th>Per Cent '70</th>
<th>Per Cent '75</th>
<th>Number in 1975 Elem.</th>
<th>Number in 1975 Sec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-31.99</td>
<td>No information or unknown</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>2301</td>
<td>2130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25-31.99</td>
<td>Labourers, truck drivers, porters</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>42.01</td>
<td>27018</td>
<td>11931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32-34.99</td>
<td>Bartenders, sheetmetal workers, repairmen</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>3934</td>
<td>1676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35-38.99</td>
<td>Sales clerks, jewelers, stationary engineers, machinists</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39-42.99</td>
<td>Pressmen, printing workers, electricians, members of the armed forces, clerical occupations</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>5242</td>
<td>3251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>43-49.99</td>
<td>Actors, tool and diemakers, medical and dental technicians, embalmers, real estate salesmen</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>4865</td>
<td>3034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50-54.99</td>
<td>Musicians, stenographers, athletes</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>55-60.99</td>
<td>Clergymen, various owners and managers, insurance salesmen, librarians</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2806</td>
<td>1474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>61-66.99</td>
<td>Teachers, professional engineers, physicians, computer programmers, air pilots</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>5345</td>
<td>2453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>67-71.99</td>
<td>Pensioner, retired workman's compensation, disabled or ill*</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>72-75.99</td>
<td>Welfare, mother's allowance</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult training or re-training</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother only, housewife</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>2994</td>
<td>1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent on his/her own</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group home head* (e.g., social worker, etc.)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PER CENT** | 99.99 | 99.99

**TOTAL** | 103,818 | 61,688 | 31,015
APPENDIX B

Statistical Table
The statistical table on page 25 can be used to facilitate comparisons which the reader may want to make between different groups in the same table. The following example may be helpful.

In Table 4, we see that 12.5 per cent of the Hungarian group are in category 9 and 7.5 per cent of the Korean group are in this same category. The percentage difference is 5. To test whether this difference is significant we look at the number of students in each group. There are almost 500 students in the Hungarian group and a little over 300 in the Korean group.

Since the difference is 5 per cent we use the fourth section of the table. The number of Hungarian students is almost 500 so we read across the fourth line of the table. Since there are about 300 in the Korean group we stop at where the sixth column cuts the fourth line in the table.

A value of 3.2 - 4.0 is listed. Since our observed difference of 5 per cent is greater than the .05 listed, we can say there is a significant difference (at the .05 level) between the two groups in the percentage found in category 9.

Please note that if the observed difference falls within the listed range the significance of this difference is questionable since the upper limit is a "safety" factor.
TABLE 7

APPROXIMATE SAMPLING ERROR* OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCENTAGES OBTAINED FOR TWO DIFFERENT GROUPS OF STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>For Percentages from 35 to 65</th>
<th>For Percentages around 20 or 80</th>
<th>For Percentages around 10 or 90</th>
<th>For Percentages around 5 or 95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>3.2-1.6</td>
<td>3.9-1.6</td>
<td>4.4-1.1</td>
<td>5.0-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4.0-1.8</td>
<td>4.5-1.9</td>
<td>5.1-1.7</td>
<td>5.6-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>5.0-2.4</td>
<td>5.7-2.5</td>
<td>6.3-2.6</td>
<td>6.9-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>6.0-3.0</td>
<td>6.5-3.1</td>
<td>7.1-3.2</td>
<td>7.6-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>7.0-3.6</td>
<td>7.6-3.7</td>
<td>8.2-3.8</td>
<td>8.8-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>8.0-4.2</td>
<td>8.6-4.3</td>
<td>9.2-4.4</td>
<td>9.8-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.0-4.8</td>
<td>9.6-4.9</td>
<td>10-5.0</td>
<td>10-5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The values shown are the differences required for significance (two standard errors) in comparisons of percentages derived from two different subgroups of a survey. Two values—low and high—are given for each cell. The low value is based on the formula \(2\sqrt{p(1-p)/n}\). The high value is about 1.25 greater than the low value and provides a "safety factor" to allow for departures from representativeness of the sample.