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## ABSTRACT
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This is the first 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 gives a description of the demographic, social and academic characteristics of the student population in the Toronto School System. It also illustrates how the 1975 student population differs from the one surveyed in 1970.

Almost 100,000 elementary and secondary school
students from 31 secondary and 114 elementary schools participated in this second survey. A number of special institutions also participated.

Some of the data presented provide a clear overview of relationships between students' background and class placement; other data are presented in more elaborate fashion. The organization of data was such thet the co-operation of many persons became necessary.

We gratefully acknowledge the co-operation of the principals and the teachers of the various schoois. We are also grateful to Dr. Jack Murray, Miss Val. McLeod, Miss Janis Gershman, and Mrs. Lynda Groves -- all of whom assisted in different but important ways.

## EXPLANATORY NOTE

Some of the groupings of countries and languages in the tables of this report may not reflect current solitical 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 couritries was developed first in 1970 prior to our knowing the origins of all students. For the inost 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.

At its meeting of February 13, 1975 the Board approved the recommendations that, "...the Toronto Board of Education initiate a research project to update the Every Student Survey of 1970" (p. 89). A second part of the motion dealt with "post-secondary expectations." The last part of the motion was, "That a copy of the research design be tabled at the School Programs Committee, the design to include budget implications and further recommendations as to alternate methods of funding the study before the research project proceeds" (p. 89).

In their report the officials proposed to respond to this request in two parts. One part dealt with updating the "Every Student Survey" and the other part dealt with the study of post-secondary expectations. The report from the officials noted some of the negative responses to the first Every Student Survey and also indicated that obtaining external fuids for updating the Every Student Survey seemed a remote possiblility. Having received this report the Board, on April 3, 1975, approved the following recommendation:
"(a) That $\$ 21,000$ be allocated in the 1975 budget to prepare an updated version of the Every Student Survey.
(b) That the Director of Education prepare and disseminate to the public a statement on the need and value of up-dating the Every Student Survey, which speaks to concerns raised during the 1971 data collection"
(Board Minutes, April 3, 1975, page 188)

## PROCEDURES

Because of the high mobility rate of students and the amount of time that had elapsed it seemed advisable to follow essentially the same procedures as used in 1970, namely, to collect information from every student in the school system.

The questionnaire was basically the same as that used in the previous study. One change was the inclusion of the following statement at the top of the page, "This information is not for the permanent school record." It was also necessary to prepare two additional questions for secondary school students asking them: "How many years have you been in high school, including this year?" This information, which was not requested five years ago, is a reflection of the new organizational patterns in secondary school programs."

In order to meet the second part of the request the Director of Education preparea a letter which went to all principals and teachers along with the forms. Brief explanatory letters were prepared for principals and teachers. As in the earlier study, respondents were asked to indicate the amount of time $r \in$ fquired by this project. (Apperdix A contains copies of the elementary and secondary questionnaires, the director's letter and copies of letters that were sent to principals and teachers.) Special Education Students

Ir 1970 it was possible to identify nearly all Special Education students from the master computer files. There were virtually no withdrawal classes and nearly all students could be identified from the regular class lists. Now that many students are served on a part time, withdrawal basis it is impossible to identify all of these students from the class lists.. Therefore, the project was extended to identify students receiving special education.

All special education teachers who served withdrawal classes were asked to list the names of every student they served, the student's I.D. number and the amount of time devoted to each student each week. This will obviously increase the number of students listed under special education in comparison to the 1970 study, because we are now including students served by such people as itinerant speech teachers. (Sample forms are also included in Appendix A.)

Students in Institutions
The school system provides services for a variety of students found in institutions such as the Hospital for Sick Children. The amount of time that these students receive instruction varies tremendously depending on the lengtn of their stay in the institution. Consequently it is not possible to treat them within the regular student record keeping system.

For these reasons such students were not included in the 1970 survey. However, in this study an attempt was made to collect information about students who were receiving instruction in an institutional setting on May l, 1975. While this data is less definitive than that for the rest of the school system it was hoped that the information would provide some clues about the proportion of non-Toronto students served in these programs and whether such students wexe generally similar in background to other Toronto students. Slight modifications were made to the form for these students to accommodate the fact that they did not live at home. (See Appendix A.)

## Adult Day School Students

The Adult Day School students were also not included in the 1970 survey because a separate record keeping procedure was used for these students. Again it seemed worthwhile to expand the 1975 survey to obtain background information for these students. The questionnaire was modified to include a
brief introductory paragraph explaining the study and to direct questions relating to occupation to the students rather than to their parents. (See Appendix A.)

## Data Collection

As in 1970, the schools were given a great deal of flexibility in the procedures used for collecting the data. In some schools, supplementary instructions were prepared for the teachers, by the principal. At least one school chose to send the forms home. At least one other school prepared a similar set of questions which were sent home; on return the appropriate information was then transferred : "he forms provided by the Research Department.

In the kindergarten and primary division, teachers usually completed the questionnaires for the students, obtaining information by questioning each student individually, checking office records, and/or telephoning parents. That this procedure took a great deal of teacher time is reflected in the information about "time" reported later.

Junior students and those at higher levels usually filled out their forms themselves. Many teachers reminded students to find out their parents' exact occupation a few days before the survey. For these older students, teacher effort seemed confined to obraining information for students who were absent and affixing labeIs to completed forms. Naturally, there were exceptions. One grade 5 teacher filled out all the forms because "my students can't spell." Others filled them out without providing reasons for doing so. On the other hand, one set of forms was received from a grade 1 class which had been entirely completed by the children themselves. The printing was wobbly and the letters uneven, but every form was legible and codeable.

As mentioned, many schools supplemented the instructions provided by the Research Department and the letter from the Director. This supplementary
material usually dealt with straight-forward matters of distribution and collection, etc., but some included value judgements about the survey (e.g., "this survey has proven of real value in the past in terms of obtaining additional services to meet specific needs." At least one high school suggested that teachers try to follow-up absentees on subsequent days; others insisted that completed forms be reiurned to the office by $3: 20 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. of the same day, which made it impossible for teachers to check absent students' record cards for some of the data.

One valiant elementary school principal personally completed all the forms for the kindergarten and primary pupils "to spare the over-burdened teachers."

Argentina Public School
The parents of Argentina Public School were concerned with the accurary of information about place of̃ origin, parental occupation, etc., provided by voung children, and asked for an opportunity to check this. We selected four forms at random from each class (kindergarten to grade 6), and returned them to the school. These forms were sent home, checked by the parents, corrected where necessary, and returned to the Research Department.

Only two important errors were located in the 45 forms* checked. One was a child who reported his place of birth incorrectly the reported being born in the country of his parents' birth and coming to Canada at age 1 when he had actually been born in Ontario), and another was a parent's occupation reported as R.N. instead of R.N.A.

The parents were concerned when pupils left out questions "that they ought to have been abie to answer" and when the pupils were not as

* 56 forms were drawn -- 9 children were absent on the day the sccond set of forms went home, and 2 had transferred to other schools.
precise as the parents would have been. Since the coding took into account omissions and poorly expressed replies, the "numerous errors" which the parents quite rightly questioned would have a minimal effect on the final data. Based on this instance and taking into account the number of questions, one would estimate an overall error rate that was considerably less than 1 per cent. Obviously the information required for this project is of quite a different character than would be needed for individual students' records. We are inost grateful to the principal and the Home and School Association both for their interest and for expressing their concerns. We are also grateful to the parents and staff at Argentina Public School who took the time and effort to edit and return the forms.


## Comments and Reactions

The general impression gained in the Research Department from the comments and reactions received was that the principals, teachers and secretaries were more willing to ask procedural questions (over 150 calls), more open in making written comments and, while perhaps no happier about the workload, at least somewhat more understanding about the need for the survey. Certainly there was ro wave of negative public reaction to this survey. Possibly the need was better explained this time because of the 1970 experience. Several principals reported explaining the study and its purpose either to Home and School Associations or to concerned individual parents. The response from Argentina Public School was a positive one from the researcher's point of view. The letter prepared by the Director undoubtedly contributed to setting the stage more positively.

The following comments from different groups of people should be taken into account but it must be recognized that they do not reflect widely expressed opinion.

Teacher's Comments
Eighty-one teachers took the time to write a note (73) or a letter (8) about the survey. These ranged from 2-3 words on the Teacher's Time Sheets, to carefully typed letters. Comments fell into five main categories.

Kindergarten teachers were most likely to question the validity of responses obtained from four and five-year-old children, especially about matters like parents' occupation.

Many of the comments were about the lack of information provided in present-day O.S.R. records. These came from teachers at all levels in the system.

The time involved was one concern mentioned frequently by teachers, especially by those who also reported that they spent many hours telephoning parents, checking files, etc. However, the actual time required was not closely correlated with negative comments, because some 乞eachers added phrases like "Too long" after reporting that the task took them only 10 or 15 minutes.

Of those teachers who made a comment, nany questioned the value of the study, wondering to what use the data might be put, and expressing vehement resistance to being asked to interrupt their programs or spend their own time doing clerical work. Finally, as before, there were a few objections from teachers who saw the survey as an invasion of students' privacy. Students' Responses

Responses of students who did not wish to prov. de the requested information ranged from the flair and finesse of some SEED students through the matter-of-fact "I do not wish to answer this" or "call my mother if you want information I have not filled out," "None or your business" (misspelled in many cases), to "Pimp" and "Prostitute" as answers to the questions about parents' occupations on the forms of three young men in the same class who were not at all deterred by the presence of their name and school on the
answer sheet. While such replies are attention-getting and highly visible, they were very rare and were coded as "no codeo" e information." Presumably some other forms which had missii.g data (e.g. fus parents' occupations) were also refusals, but there was no indicatim of thi: on the form.

There were a few identifiable two or more students
in the same class refused to complete $i_{a}$ wrote "refused" on it. In a few cases comnents such as "racist questions" and "invasion of privacy" were added. But these were actually very rare events. Total unusable forms $=39$ "refused", secondary

1 "refused", elementary 4 "joke" forms, secondary 44

In many other cases, students provided some codeable responses, but chose not to answer certain questions. Almost every question was refused by someone, as different students and/or parents objected to different questions. Some students felt free to volunteer the information that their parents were divorced, but felt their place of birth was "not relevant" etc. MOSt of the refusals were about parents' occupations, with place of origin a very distant second. There were only a few refusals about languages spoken by students, or spoken by parents at home. As noted above, a very few students provided "joke" responses. In one case, this was subtle enough that it was Partially coded before it was recognized as a put-on. These forms were discarded.

These few problems were exceptions; almost all forms appeared to be completed with care and honesty by the students or their teachers. parents' pesponses

Three parents telephoned the Research Department about the survey. The first caller identified herself as a parent, asked for an explanation of the study and of how the information was handled, thanked the senior author
for the answers and gave no indication of any concern. The second caller indicated that she had phoned five years before when the first Every Student Survey was undertaken. Although she did not disapprove of the study as such she wished to once again have it recorded that she did not approve of asking children for the information. She felt that such questionnaires should be completed only by parents. Sin. che third caller was not annoyed by the questions but by the fact h.. her child was asked to provide the answers.

In addition there was a letter from one Home and School Association member who expressed concern that her child had given inaccurate information. Again this was a situation where the additional clarification and detail provided would not have affected results because categories are combined in the analysis.

## Time

As in the firsi Every Student Survey, teachers and principals were asked to indicate the amount of time it took to collect the information. The data is tabulated in Table l. A careful comparison indicates that the average amount of class time required in both surveys was very similar. However, the additional time spent by teachers was reduced on the average. In 1970, the average secondary school teacher spent 16 minutes of class time and $351 / 2$ minutes of additional time completing tha Every Student Survey. The 1975 figures were respectively 17 minutes and 26 1/2 minutes. Part of the reduction in additional time is likely due to the reduced emphasis on checking school records. Much of the information required is no longer recorded on the O.S.R.

Total amount of time spent by principals and office staff seem similar in 1970 and 1975. In this survey, an adjustment was made for those
teachers who did not return a time sheet. For that reason the extimated number of class hours is increased over that reported in the previous study. While the total amount of time required for the survey was enormous, it is also apparent that the data collection was handled rapidly and efficiently in the typical classroom at the senior and secondary grade levels. The data collection required more than an hour of work of each principal; two hours of the typical elementary sch ice staff and five hours from the typical secondary school office sta.

For junior, primary, and kindergarten teachers, data collection required a considerable amount of class time. For both kindergarten teachers and teachers in New Canadian programs, approximately 1 hour of additional time was required.

TABLE 1
AMOUNT OF SCHOOL TIME REQUIRED FOR 1975 EVERY STUDENT SURVEY


TOTAL
2969.2

## RESULTS

Completion Rate

There were 94,646 students in the school system in April, 1975; 97.9 per cent of these students $(92,703)$ completed usable forms. This was similar to the completion rate for the 1970 Every Student Survey, in which 97.1 per cent $(103,818)$ of 106,921 students returned usable forms.

There were always some students who did not provide the information requested on each question consequently, the total " $N$ " varied somewhat from table to table. For instance, while 383 students did not indicate any country of birth, 58 others answered "Canada" but did not specify a province, and 196 others answered "outside Canada" but did not specify a country. The effect of such under-reporting can be safely ignored because of the overwhelming proportion who gave the information requested.

## Some General Characteristics of the 1975 Toronto School Population

Tables 2, 3 and 4 provide an overview by area of the school population with respect to country of birth, mother tongue and household occupation. More detailed information is presented in Appendix $G$; an area map is also provided.

As seen in Table 2 , over 60 per cent of the students in the system were born in Ontario, with 4 per cent being born in other provinces. Areas 5 and 6 are more likely than other areas to have Ontario-born students; in fact, 80 per cent of the students in these two areas are Canadian-born. In Areas 2 and 3,40 and 46 per cent of the students were born outside of Canada.

Table 3 indicates that almost half of the Toronto student population do not have. English as their mother tongue. Areas 5 and 6, again, are quite different from the other four areas in that the vast majority of students in these two areas have English as their mother tongue. For instance, over

80 per cent of the students in Area 6 have English as their mother tongue, as against 24 per cent in Area 3. Compared to other areas, Area 3 contains the highest proportion (21.6 per cent) of Portuguese-speaking students. Areas 2 and 3 contain the highest proportion of Italian-speaking students. Chinese-speaking students are more likely to be found in Areas 3 and 4. Area 1 contains the largest proportion of "other European" students; Areas 2 and 3 have the highest proportions of Italian-born students; Caribbean-born students are most likely to be found in Area 2.

As is apparent in Table 4, over 50 per cent of the students in the school system come from homes where the household heads are iabourers, truck drivers, barterilers, etc. On the other hand, 26 per cent of the students come from homes where the hoasehold heads are stenographers, engineers, physicians, etc.

In terms of the distribution of household occupation, Area 6 is quite unlike the other five areas. For instance, while Area 6 has 50 per cent of its students from homes where the household heads were clergymen, engineers, physicians, etc, Area 3 has over 62 per cent of its student population from homes where the household heads were labourers, truck drivers, etc. In fact, all areas, except Area 6 , have at least 40 per cent of their respective student population from such homes.

Comparison Between 1975 and 1970 Student Populations

From 1970 to 1975, there was a slight decrease ( 6 per cent)
in the prorortion of students born in Canada. The proportion of Canadian-born students who did not specify p:- $\operatorname{svince}$ of birth was reduced significantly in the 1975 survey. As is evident from Table 5, there was a slight increase (4 per cent) in the proportion of students born in Ontario. In both surveys, however, the proportion of students born in Ontaric exceeded 90 per cent.

TABLE ?
SELECTED COUNTRY/PROVINCE OF BIRTH OF STUDENTS IN SIX AREAS

| Country/Province | A R E A |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| Ontario | 9727* | 7737 | 7382 | 10631 | 13046 | 12453 | 60976 |
|  | 62.3 | 57.8 | 51.6 | 67.7 | 75.3 | 79.1 | 66.2 |
| Other Provinces | 463 | 356 | 324 | 864 | 660 | 961 | 3628 |
|  | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 5.5 | 3.8 | 61 | 3.9 |
| Portugal | 1654 | 1130 | 2284 | 166 | 124 | 22 | 5380 |
|  | 10.6 | 8.4 | 16.0 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 5.9 |
| Italy | 443 | 918 | 1141 | 95 | 508 | 41 | 3146 |
|  | 2.8 | 6.9 | 8.0 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 0.3 | 3.4 |
| China \& Hong Kong | 182 | 108 | 772 | 865 | 445 | 156 | 2528 |
|  | 1.2 | 0.8 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 2.8 |
| Caribbean | 861 | 1374 | 815 | 1034 | 620 | 208 | 4912 |
|  | 5.5 | 10.3 | 5.7 | 6.6 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 5.3 |
| Greece | 129 | 374 | 262 | 584 | 629 | 68 | 2046 |
|  | 0.8 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 2.2 |
| Other European | 1241 | 579 | 451 | 503 | 701 | 735 | 4210 |
|  | 7.9 | 4.3 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 4.7 | 4.6 |
| Asia \& Middle East | 488 | 339 | 318 | 615 | 342 | 210 | 2312 |
|  | 3.1 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 2.5 |
| Central \& S. America | 215 | 255 | 455 | 63 | 86 | 109 | 1183 |
|  | 1.4 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.3 |
| All others | 213 | 210 | 113 | 284 | 161 | 762 | 1743 |
|  | 1.4 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 4.9 | 1.9 |
| TOTAL | 15616 | 13380 | 14317 | 15704 | 17322 | 15725 | $92064{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| total per cent | $100 . \sim$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

* For each regics, the first row indicates number of students; the second row indicates percentage of $\exists$ tudents
a No information or missing $=639$

TABLE 3
SELECTED MOTHER TONGUES FOR STUDENTS IN SIX AREAS

| Mother Tongue | $A \quad \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{E} \quad \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| English Only | 6661* | 5158 | 3421 | 9667 | 11719 | 12743 | 19369 |
|  | 43.2 | 38.7 | 24.0 | 61.8 | 57.9 | 81 | 53.9 |
| English/Ttalian ${ }^{1}$ | 1127 | 3230 | 3404 | 268 | 1269 | 222 | 9520 |
|  | 7.3 | 24.3 | 23.9 | 1.7 | 7.4 | 1.4 | 10.4 |
| English/Greek ${ }^{1}$ | 522 | 1243 | 811 | 1741 | 1459 | 441 | 6217 |
|  | 3.4 | 9.3 | 5.7 | 11.1 | 8.4 | 2.8 | 6.8 |
| English/Chinese ${ }^{1}$ | 429 | 273 | 1924 | 1961 | 739 | 468 | 5794 |
|  | 2.8 | 2.1 | 13.5 | 12.6 | 4.3 | 3.0 | 6.3 |
| English/Portuguese ${ }^{1}$ | 2247 | 1441 | 3080 | ¿.? | 188 | 59 | 7227 |
|  | 14.6 | 10.8 | 21.6 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 7.9 |
| English/other ${ }^{2}$ | 4433 | 1967 | 1608 | 1781 | 1880 | 1764 | 13433 |
|  | 28.7 | 14.8 | 11.3 | 11.4 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 14.7 |
|  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL NO. | 15419 | 13312 | 14248 | 15630 | 17254 | 15697 | $91560{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| TOTAL PER CENT | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

* For each language, the first row indicates the number of students; the second row indicates the percentage of students.
a No information or missing: 1143 students
1 This includes students who reported learning English and this language at the same time and those who learned English as a second language to this language.

2 This includes students who reported learming English and languages other than Italian, Greek, Chirese and Portuguese at the same time; and those who learned English as a second language to such other languages.

TABLE 4

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS IN SIX AREAS


* See page 30 and Table 9.
** For each category, the first row indicates number of students, the second row indicates percentage of students.
a No information or missing $=4434$

TABLE :

| (Comp in | Every Student survey, Report No. 91) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Province | Per Cent of Students |  | Number in 1975 |  |
|  | 1970* | 1975** | Elementary | Secondary |
| Ontario | 90.70 | 94,30 | 41860 | 19116 |
| Quebec | 1.33 | 1.54 | 640 | 357 |
| Nova Scotia | 1.62 | 1.11 | 470 | 245 |
| Newfoundland | . 91 | . 67 | 328 | 105 |
| British Columbia | . 47 | . 60 | 236 | 151 |
| New Brunswick | . 85 | . 58 | 244 | 132 |
| Alberta | . 42 | . 44 | 147 | 136 |
| Manitoba | .43 | . 35 | 143 | - 84 |
| Saskatchewan | . 21 | . 18 | 68 | 47 |
| Prince Edward Island | . 20 | . 13 | 53 | 32 |
| No. Information | 2.83 | . 09 | 54 | 4 |
| North West Territorie | s . 01 | . 01 | 6 | 4 |
| TOTAL | 99.98\% | 100.00\% | 44249 | 20413 |

* In $1970,74.16$ per cent (i.e. 76,992 ) of all students were born in Canada. Total number of students for whom information was available $=103,818$.
** In 1975, 69.75 per cent (i.e. 64,662 ) of all students were born in Canada. Total number of students for whom information was available $=92,703$.

Only two other provinces -- Quebec and British Columbia -- showed a slight increase in the proportion of students between 1970 and 1975. The proportion for all the other provinces either showed a decrease or remained stable.

While 25 per cent of the students surveyed in 1970 (see Table 6) stated that they were born outside of Canada, 30 per cent of those surveyed in 1975 gave this response. In 1975, the highest proportions of non-Canadic born students came from Portugal, Italy, China and Hong Kong, Jamaica, Greece, and England in descending order. There were some notable shifts over the five years in country of origin. For instance, while in 1970 the highest proportion of foreign students came from Italy, in 1975 the highest proportion came from Portugal. In fact, on the 1970 base, the proportion of Italianborn students decreased by more than 50 per cent, while the proportion of Portuguese-born students increased by over 30 per cent. Similarily, there was an increase of over 50 and 75 per cent in the proportion of students born in China and Hong Kong and the West Indies. Although Table 6 shows other dramatic shifts, there are relatively small numbers of students from most of these countries.

Almost all countries showed a higher number of students in the elementary as compared to the secondary schools. The notable exception was Italy which in 1975 had twice as many students in secondary as in elementary school. Eight of the countries outside Canada were reported as country of origin by more than 1000 students in the Toronto school system. Moreover, 56 different countries were reported as place of birth by 25 or more students. All in all, over two-thirds of the students born outside of Canada came from Portugal, Italy, China and Hong Kong, Greece, England and the Caribbean.

TABLE 6
COUNTRY OF BIRTH FOR NON-CANADIAN BORN STUDENTS (Comparison with 1970 Every Student Survey, Report No. 91)

| Country of B.irth | Per Cent |  | Number in 1975 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1970 | 1975 | Elementary | Secondery |
| ```Portugal (includes Azores,1 Macao)``` | 14.81 | 19.48 | 3571 | 1815 |
| Italy 2 | 26.09 | 11.38 | 1047 | 2099 |
| China and Hong Kong | 6.00 | 9.14 | 1345 | 1183 |
| Jamaica* | --- | 8.87 | 1778 | 675 |
| Greece | 8.86 | 7.40 | 1455 | 592 |
| England | 7.00 | 5.24 | 1035 | 414 |
| Trinidad and Tobago* | --- | 4.22 | 765 | 401 |
| United States | 2.95 | 3.65 | 739 | 271 |
| ```Guyana (includes British Guiana)``` | . 79 | 3.03 | 633 | 206 |
| India and Ceylon | 1.10 | 2.98 | 644 | 179 |
| Yugoslavia | 3.25 | 2.62 | 457 | 267 |
| Poland | 3.28 | 1.68 | 160 | 305 |
| Ecuador and Peru** | . 07 | 1.50 | 347 | 68 |
| Philippines+ | . 26 | 1.29 | 253 | 104 |
| Korea | . 32 | 1.17 | 245 | 79 |
| Germany | 2.63 | 1.05 | 206 | 83 |
| Unclassified Countries+ | . 98 | 1.15 | 228 | 91 |
| Scotland | 2.32 | . 98 | 156 | 115 |
| No Information | . 76 | . 71 | 112 | 84 |
| France | . 87 | . 69 | 131 | 60 |
| Venezuela (and Colombia***) | ). 32 | . 68 | 138 | 49 |
| Brazil | . 54 | . 64 | 108 | 69 |
| Formosa and Taiwan | . 36 | . 59 | 113 | 49 |
| Tanzania | . 03 | . 54 | 92 | 56 |
| Australia | . 54 | . 53 | 114 | 33 |
| Barbados* | --- | . 52 | 92 | 51 |
| Argentina | . 52 | . 52 | 84 | 60 |
| Cyprus | . 38 | . 50 | 99 | 39 |
| Pakistan (and Bangladesh***). 10 |  | . 50 | 112 | 25 |
| Czechslovakia | 1.16 | . 42 | 63 | 53 |
|  |  | 25 |  | Cont'd |

TABLE 6
Continued


Eighty-one teachers took the time to write a note (73) or a letter (8) about the survey. These ranged from 2-3 words on the Teacher's Time Sheets, to carefully typed letters. Coments fell into five main categories.

Kindergarten teachers were most likely to question the validity of responses obtained from four and five-year-old children, especially about matters like parents' occupation.

Many of the comments were about the lack of information provided in present-day O.S.R. records. These came from teachers at all levels in the system.

The time involved was one ccncern mentioned frequently by teachers, especially by those who also reported that they spent many hours telephoning parents, checking files, etc. However, the actual time required was not closely correlated with negative comments, because some teachers added phrases like "Too long" after reporting that the task took them only 10 or 15 minutes.

Of those teachers who made a comment, nany questioned the value of the study, wondering to what use the data might be put, and expressing vehement resistance to being asked to interrupt their programs or spend their own time doing clerical work. Finally, as before, there were a few objections from teachers who saw the survey as an invasion of students' privacy.

## Students' Responses

Responses of students who did not wish to prov. de the requested information ranged from the flair and finesse of some SEED students through the matter-of-fact "I do not wish to answer this" or "call my mother if you want information I have not filled out," "None or your business" (misspelled in many cases), to "Pimp" and "Prostitute" as answers to the questions about parents' oooupations on the forms of three young men in the same class who were not at all deterred by the presence of their name and school on the
answer sheet. While such replies are attention-getting and highly visible, they were very fare and were coded as "no codeo" e information." Presumably some other forms which had missi:.y data (e.g. fJi parents' occupations) were also refusals, but there was no indicatim of th: on the form.

There were a few identifiable two or more students
in the same class refused to complete $\mathrm{i}_{1} \quad \mathrm{~d}$ wrote "refused" on it. In a few cases comu.ents such as "racist questions" and "invasion of privacy" were added. But these were actually very rare events.
rotal unusable forms $=39$ "refused", secondary
1 "refused", elementary
4 "joke" forms, secondary
44
In many other cases, students provided some codeable responses, but chose not to answer certain questions. Almost every question was refused by someone, as different students andor parents objected to different $q^{u e s t i o n s . ~ S o m e ~ s t u d e n t s ~ f e l t ~ f r e e ~ t o ~ v o l u n t e e r ~ t h e ~ i n f o r m a t i o n ~ t h a t ~ t h e i r ~}$ parents were divorced, but felt their place of birth was "not relevant" etc. MOSt of the refusals were about parents' occupations, with place of origin a very distant second. There were only a few refusals about languages spoken by students, or spoken by parents at home. As noted above, a very few students provided "joke" responses. In one case, this was subtle enough that it was Partially coded before it was recognized is a put-on. These forms were discarded.

These few problems were exceptions; almost all forms appeared to be completed with care and honesty by the students or their teachers.

## parents' pesponses

Three parents telephoned the Research Department about the survey. The first caller identified herself as a parent, asked for an explanation of the study and of how the information was handled, thanked the senior author
for the answers and gave no indication of any concern. The second caller indicated that she had phoned five years before when the first Every Student Survey was undertaken. Although she did not disapprove of the study as such she wished to once again have it recorded that she did not approve of asking children for the information. She felt that such questionnaires should be completed only by parents. Sial. the third caller was not annoyed by the questions but by the fact $u$.. her child was asked to provide the answers.

In addition there was a letter from one Home and School Association member who expressed concern that her child had given inaccurate information. Again this was a situation where the additional clarification and detail provided would not have affected results because categories are combined in the analysis.

## Time

As in the firsi Every Student Survey, teachers and principals were asked to indicate the amount of time it took to collect the information. The data is tabulated in Table l. A careful comparison indicates that the average amount of class time required in both surveys was very similar. However, the additional time spent by teachers was reduced on the average. In 1970, the average secondary school teacher spent 16 minutes of class time and $351 / 2$ minutes of additional time completing th. 2 Every Student Survey. The 1975 figures were respectively 17 minutes and 26 l/2 minutes. Part of the reduction in additional time is likely due to the reduced emphasis on checking school records. Much of the information required is no longer recorded on the O.S.R.

Total amount of time spent oy principals and office staff seem. similar in 1970 and 1975. In this survey, an adjustment was made for those
teachers who did not return a time sheet. For that reason the extimated number of class hours is increased over that reported in the previous study. While the total amount of time required for the survey was enormous, it is also apparent that the data collection was handled rapidly and efficiently in the typical classroom at the senior and secondary grade levels. The data collection required more than an hour of work of each principal; two hours of the typical elementary schc ice staff and five hours from the typical secondary school office sta.

For junior, primary, and kindergarten teachers, data collection required a considerable amount of class time. For both kindergarten teachers and teachers in New Canadian programs, approximately 1 hour of additional time was required.

TABLE 1
AMOUNT OF SCHOOL TIME REQUIRED FOR 1975 EVERY STUDENT SURVEY

$$
\frac{\text { Average Time Per Person (min.) }}{\text { Class Time Additional Time }}
$$

Estimated Total Time (hrs.) Class Time Additional Time

Teachers

| Kindergarten | 42.9 | 55.1 | 371.8 | 477.5 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Primary | 66.1 | 37.3 | 1043.3 | 588.7 |
| Junior | 0.7 | 30.1 | 556.5 | 358.7 |
| Intermedi | 2.2 | 27.5 | 236.1 | 201.7 |
| Mixed Grades | 47.5 | 29.7 | 29.3 | 18.3 |
| Secondary | 17.0 | 26.4 | 431.8 | 670.6 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  | 2668.8 | 2215.5 |

Teachers in Special Settings

Home Instruction
Adult Day School
Bloorview

SUBTOTAL

Teachers in Special Programs
Teachers in New Canadian Programs

Teachers in Various Special Programs

Teachers in Institutions

SUBTOTAL
Principals and Office Staff
Elementary Principals
Secondary Principals
Elementary School Office Staff

Secondary School Office Staff

SUBTOTAL
34.4
25.8
15.0
13.0
13.1
15.0
64.6
43.1
36.1

| 10.9 | 4.1 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 8.6 | 4.4 |
| .7 | 0.7 |

20.2
9.2
182.1
142.2
10.9
335.2
73.2
83.7
110.2
305.0
135.9
43.2
208.5
157.6

TOTAL $\qquad$ 2689.0
409.3
2969.2

RESULTS
Completion Rate

There were 94,646 students in the school system in April, 1975; 97.9 per cent of these students $(92,703)$ completed usable forms. This was similar to the completion rate for the 1970 Every Student Survey, in which 97.1 per cent $(103,818)$ of 106,921 students returned usable forms.

There were always some students who did not provide the information requested on each question consequently, the total "N" varied somewhat from table to table. For instance, while 383 students did not indicate any country of birth, 58 others answered "Canada" but did not specify a province, and 196 others answered "outside Canada" but did not specify a country. The effect of such under-reporting can be safely ignored because of the overwhelming proportion who gave the information requested.

## Some General Characteristics of the 1975 Toronto School Population

Tables 2, 3 and 4 provide an overview by area of the school population with respect to country of birth, mother tongue and household occupation. More detailed information is presented in Appendix $G$; an area map is also provided.

As seen in Table 2, over 60 per cent of the students in the system were born in Ontario, with 4 per cent being born in other provinces. Areas 5 and 6 are more likely than other areas to have Ontario-born students; in fact, 80 per cent of the students in these two areas are Canadian-born. In Areas 2 and 3,40 and 46 per cent of the students were born outside of Canada.

Table 3 indicates that almost half of the Toronto student population do not have. English as their mother tongue. Areas 5 and 6, again, are quite different from the other four areas in that the vast majority of students in these two areas have English as their mother tongue. For instance, over

80 per cent of the students in Area 6 have English as their mother tongue, as against 24 per cent in Area 3. Compared to other areas, Area 3 contains the highest proportion (21.6 per cent) of Portuguese-speaking students. Areas 2 and 3 contain the highest proportion of Italian-speaking students. Chinese-speaking students are more likely to be found in Areas 3 and 4. Area 1 contains the largest proportion of "other European" students; Areas 2 and 3 have the highest proportions of Italian-born students; Caribbean-born students are most likely to be found in Area 2.

As is apparent in Table 4, over 50 per cent of the students in the school system come from homes where the household heads are iabourers, truck drivers, barterilers, etc. On the other hand, 26 per cent of the students come from homes where the hcasehold heads are stenographers, engineers, physicians, etc.

In terms of the distribution of household occupation, Area 6 is quite unlike the other five areas. For instance, while Area 6 has 50 per cent of its students from homes where the household heads were clergymen, engineers, physicians, etc, Area 3 has over 62 per cent of its student population from homes where the household heads were labourers, truck drivers, etc. In fact, all areas, except Area 6, have at least 40 per cent of their respective student population from such homes.

Comparison Between 1975 and 1970 Student Populations

From 1970 to 1975, there was a slight decrease (6 per cent) in the profortion of students born in Canada. The proportion of Canadian-born students who did not specify p:ovince of birth was reduced significantly in the 1975 survey. As is evident from Table 5, there was a slight increase (4 per cent) in the proportion of students born in Ontario. In both surveys, however, the proportion of students born in Ontaric exceeded 90 per cent.

## TABLE ?

SELECTED COUNTRY/PROVINCE OF BIRTH OF STUENTS IN SIX AREAS

| Country/Province | $A \quad \mathrm{E}$ E A |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| Ontario | 9727* | 7737 | 7382 | 10631 | 13046 | 12453 | 60976 |
|  | 62.3 | 57.8 | 51.6 | 67.7 | 75.3 | 79.1 | 66.2 |
| Other Provinces | 463 | 356 | 324 | 864 | 660 | 961 | 3628 |
|  | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 5.5 | 3.8 | 61 | 3.9 |
| Portugal | 1654 | 1130 | 2284 | 166 | 124 | 22 | 5380 |
|  | 10.6 | 8.4 | 16.0 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 5.9 |
| Italy | 443 | 918 | 1141 | 95 | 508 | 41 | 3146 |
|  | 2.8 | 6.9 | 8.0 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 0.3 | 3.4 |
| China \& Hong Kong | 182 | 108 | 772 | 865 | 445 | 156 | 2528 |
|  | 1.2 | 0.8 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 2.8 |
| Caribbean | 861 | 1374 | 815 | 1034 | 620 | 208 | 4912 |
|  | 5.5 | 10.3 | 5.7 | 6.6 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 5.3 |
| Greece | 129 | 374 | 262 | 584 | 629 | 68 | 2046 |
|  | 0.8 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 2.2 |
| Other European | 1241 | 579 | 451 | 503 | 701 | 735 | 4210 |
|  | 7.9 | 4.3 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 4.7 | 4.6 |
| Asia \& Middle East | 488 | 339 | 318 | 615 | 342 | 210 | 2312 |
|  | 3.1 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 2.5 |
| Central \& S. America | 215 | 255 | 455 | 63 | 86 | 109 | 1183 |
|  | 1.4 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.3 |
| All others | 213 | 210 | 113 | 284 | 161 | 762 | 1743 |
|  | 1.4 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 4.9 | 1.9 |
| TOTAL | 15616 | 13380 | 14317 | 15704 | 17322 | 15725 | $92064{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| TOTAL PER CENT | $100 . n$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

* For each regics, the first row indicates number of students; the second row indicates percentage of ztudents
a No informaticr or missing $=639$


## TABLE 3

SELECTED MOTHER TONGUES FOR STUDENTS IN SIX AREAS

| Mother Tongue | $A \quad \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{E} \quad \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| English Only | 6661* | 5158 | 3421 | 9667 | 11719 | 12743 | $19369$ |
|  | 43.2 | 38.7 | 24.0 | 61.8 | 67.9 | 81 | $53.9$ |
| English/Italian ${ }^{1}$ | 1127 | 3230 | 3404 | 268 | 1269 | 222 | 9520 |
|  | 7.3 | 24.3 | 23.9 | 1.7 | 7.4 | 1.4 | 10.4 |
| English/Greek ${ }^{1}$ | 522 | 1243 | 811 | 1741 | 1459 | 441 | 6217 |
|  | 3.4 | 9.3 | 5.7 | 11.1 | 8.4 | 2.8 | 6.8 |
| English/Chinese ${ }^{1}$ | 429 | 273 | 1924 | 1961 | 739 | 468 | 5794 |
|  | 2.8 | 2.1 | 13.5 | 12.6 | 4.3 | 3.0 | 6.3 |
| English/Portuguese ${ }^{1}$ | 2247 | 1441 | 3080 | <.'? | 188 | 59 | 7227 |
|  | 14.6 | 10.8 | 21.6 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 7.9 |
| English/other ${ }^{2}$ | 4433 | 1967 | 1608 | 1781 | 1880 | 1764 | 13433 |
|  | 28.7 | 14.8 | 11.3 | 11.4 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 14.7 |
| , |  |  |  | , |  |  |  |
| TOTAL NO. <br> TOTAL PER CENT | 15419 | 13312 | 14248 | 15630 | 17254 | 15697 | 91560 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 . | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

* For each language, the first row indicates the number of students; the second row indicates the percentage of students.
a No information or missing: 1143 students

1 This includes students who reported learning English and this language at the same time and those who learned English as a second language to this language.

2 This includes students who reported learing English and languages other than Italian, Greek, Chirese and Portuguese at the same time; and those who learned English as a second language to such other languages.

TABLE 4

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS IN SIX AREAS

| Category Description* | 1 | 2 | 3 | $\mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{E}$ | A 5 | 6 | $\cdots+31$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 labourers, truck drivers | 7449 ** | 7554 | 8590 | 6463 | 72.76 | 1616 | 38948 |
|  | 49.7 | 58.4 | 62.5 | 43.8 | 44.0 | 10.5 | 44.1 |
| 3-4 bartenders, machinists | 1811 | 1429 | 1179 | 1532 | 1896 | 639 | 8486 |
|  | 12.1 | 11.0 | 8.6 | 10.4 | 11.5 | 4.2 | 9.6 |
| 5 electricians | 1633 | 976 | 835 | 1280 | 2335 | 1434 | 8493 |
| clerical workers | 10.9 | 7.6 | 6.1 | 8.7 | 14.1 | 9.4 | 9.6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6-7 actors } \\ & \text { stenographers } \end{aligned}$ | 1550 | 1069 | 1109 | 1493 | 2016 | 3348 | 10585 |
|  | 10.3 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 10.1 | 12.2 | 21.9 | 12.0 |
| ```8-9 clergymen, engineers, physicicis.j``` | 1068 | 600 | 475 | 1072 | 1366 | 7497 | 12078 |
|  | 7.1 | 4.6 | 3.4 | 7.3 | $8 \cdot 3$ | 49.0 | 13.7 |
| 10-1.6 pensioners, welfare, unemployed, housewife | 1482 | 1306 | 1562 | 2915 | 1647 | 767 | 9679 |
|  | 9.9 | 10.1 | 11.3 | 19.7 | 9.9 | 5.0 | 11.0 |
| TOTAL <br> TOTAL PER CENT | 14993 | 12934 | 13750 | 14755 | 16536 | 15301 | $88269{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100:0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

* See page 30 and Table 9.
** For each category, the first row indicates number of students, the second row indicates percentage of students.
a No information or missing $=4434$

TABLE:


| Province | Per Cent of Students |  | Number in 1975 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1970* | 1975** | Elementary | Secondary |
| Ontario | 90.70 | 94.30 | 41860 | 19116 |
| Quebec | 1.33 | 1.54 | 640 | 357 |
| Nova Scotia | 1.62 | 1.11 | 470 | 245 |
| Newfoundland | . 91 | . 67 | 328 | 105 |
| British Columbia | . 47 | . 60 | 236 | 151 |
| New Brunswick | . 85 | . 58 | 244 | 132 |
| Alberta | . 42 | . 44 | 147 | 136 |
| Manitoba | . 43 | . 35 | 143 | - 84 |
| Saskatchewan | . 21 | . 18 | 68 | 47 |
| Prince Edward Island | . 20 | . 13 | 53 | 32 |
| No. Information | 2.83 | . 09 | 54 | 4 |
| North West Territorie | s . 01 | . 01 | 6 | 4 |
| TOTAL | 99.98\% | 100.00\% | 44249 | 20413 |

* In $1970,74.16$ per cent (1.e. 76,992 ) of all students were born in Canada. Total number of students for whom information was available $=103,818$.
** In 1975, 69.75 per cent (i.e. 64,662 ) of all students were born in Canada. Total number of students for whom information was available $=92,703$.

Only two other provinces -- Quebec and British Columbia -- showed a slight increase in the proportion of students between 1970 and 1975. The proportion for all the other provinces either showed a decrease or remained stable.

While 25 per cent of the students surveyed in 1970 (see Table 6) stated that they were born outside of Canada, 30 per cent of those surveyed in 1975 gave this response. In 1975, the highest proportions of non-Canadia born students came from Portugal, Italy, China and Hong Kong, Jamaica, Greece, and England in descending order. There were some notable shifts over the five years in country of origin. For instance, while in 1970 the highest proportion of foreign students came from Italy, in 1975 the highest proportion came from Portugal. In fact, on the 1970 base, the proportion of Italianborn students decreased by more than 50 per cent, while the proportion of Portuguese-born students increased by over 30 per cent. Similarily, there was an increase of over 50 and 75 per cent in the proportion of students born in China and Hong Kong and the West Indies. Although Table 6 shows other aramatic shifts, there are relatively small numbers of students from most of these countries.

Almost all countries showed a higher number of students in the elementary as compared to the secondary schools. The notable exception was Italy which in 1975 had twice as many students in secondary as in elementary school. Eight of the countries outside Canada were reported as country of origin by more than 1000 students in the Toronto school system. Moreover, 56 different countries were reported as place of birth by 25 or more students. All in all, over two-thirds of the students born outside of Canada came from Portugal, Italy, China and Hong Kong, Greece, England and the Caribbean.

TABLE 6
COUNTRY OF BIRTH FOR NON-CANADIAN BORN STUDENTS
(Comparison with 1970 Every Student Survey, Report No. 91)

| Country of Birth | Per Cent |  | Number in 1975 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\overline{1970}$ | 1975 | Elementary | Secondary |
| Portugal (includes Azores, Macao) | $14.81$ | 19.48 | 3571 | 1815 |
| Italy | 26.09 | 11.38 | 1047 | 2099 |
| China and Hong Kong | 6.00 | 9.14 | 1345 | 1183 |
| Jamaica* | --- | 8.87 | 1778 | 675 |
| Greece | 8.86 | 7.40 | 1455 | 592 |
| England | 7.00 | 5.24 | 1035 | 414 |
| Trinidad and Tobago*, | --- | 4.22 | 765 | 401 |
| United States | 2.95 | 3.65 | 739 | 271 |
| Guyana (includes British Guiana) | . 79 | 3.03 | 633 | 206 |
| India and Ceylon | 1.10 | 2.98 | 644 | 179 |
| Yugoslavia | 3.25 | 2.62 | 457 | 267 |
| Poland | 3.28 | 1.68 | 160 | 305 |
| Ecuador and Peru** | . 07 | 1.50 | 347 | 68 |
| Philippinest | .26 | 1.29 | 253 | 104 |
| Korea | . 32 | 1.17 | 245 | 79 |
| Germany | 2.63 | 1.05 | 206 | 83 |
| Unclassified Countriest | . 98 | 1.15 | 228 | 91 |
| Scotland | 2.32 | . 98 | 156 | 115 |
| No Information | . 76 | . 71 | 112 | 84 |
| France | . 87 | .69 | 131 | 60 |
| Venezuela (and Colombia*** | +). 32 | . 68 | 138 | 49 |
| Brazil | . 54 | . 64 | 108 | 69 |
| Formosa and Taiwan | . 36 | . 59 | 113 | 49 |
| Tanzania | . 03 | . 54 | 92 | 56 |
| Australia | . 54 | . 53 | 114 | 33 |
| Barbados* | --- | . 52 | 92 | 51 |
| Argentina | . 52 | . 52 | 84 | 60 |
| Cyprus | . 38 | . 50 | 99 | 39 |
| Pakistan (and Bangladesh***). 10 |  | . 50 | 112 | 25 |
| Czechslovakia | 1.16 | . 42 | 63 | 53 |
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TABLE 6
Continued

| Country of Birth | Per Cent |  | Number in 1975 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1970 | 1975 | Elementary | Secondary |
| St. Kitts, St. Vincent, |  |  |  |  |
| Malta | . 67 | . 40 | 35 | 76 |
| Ireland | . 82 | . 37 | 54 | 49 |
| Scandinavia (Finland, Norway |  |  |  |  |
| Denmark, Sweden) | . 72 | . 34 | 62 | 32 |
| Spain | . 37 | . 30 | 62. | 20 |
| Japan | . 29 | . 30 | 63 | 19 |
| Holland (Netherlands) and Belgium | . 95 | . 29 | 39 | 41 |
| Hungary | 1.04 | . 25 | 28 | 40 |
| Chile** | . 13 | . 26 | 61 | 12 |
| South Africa | . 26 . | . 26 | 48 | 23 |
| Uganda*** | --- | . 22 | 35 | 26 |
| Grenada* | --- | . 18 | 24 | 27 |
| Switzerland | . 20 | . 17 | 31 | 15 |
| Burma*** | --- | . 17 | 33 | 15 |
| Uruguay | . 13 | . 17 | 38 | 10 |
| Austria | . 42 | . 16 | 14 | 31 |
| Russia (Inc1. Ukraine) | . 16 | . 16 | 24 | 21 |
| Malaya | . 04 | . 15 | 21 | 21 |
| Kenya | . 10 | . 15 | 24 | 17 |
| Turkey | . 25 | . 14 | 21 | 18 |
| Israel | . 23 | . 13 | 20 | 16 |
| Egypt | . 20 | . 13 | 18 | 17 |
| Fiji** | . 05 | . 12 | 21 | 13 |
| Antigua* | --- | . 11 | 13 | 18 |
| Indonesia | . 05 | . 11 | 11 | 20 |
| Rumania | . 06 | . 10 | 15 | 13 |
| Guatemala** | . 01 | . 10 | 24 | 3 |
| Morocco** | . 12 | . 09 | 9 | 15 |
| Mexico | . 02 | . 08 | 17 | 7 |

TABLE 6
Continued

| Country of Birth | Per Cent |  | Number in 1975 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1970 | 1975 | Elementary | Secondary |
| Honduras*** | --- | . 07 | 13 | 7 |
| New Zealand | . 05 | . 07 | 12 | 7 |
| Cuba*** | --- | . 06 | 9 | 8 |
| Wales** | . 05 | . 05 | 11 | 4 |
| Bahamas* | --- | . 05 | 14 | 1 |
| East Africa | . 04 | . 05 | 9 | 4 |
| Syr ${ }^{\text {a }}$ a | . 05 | . 03 | 4 | 5 |
| Iran** | --- | . 02 | 4 | 2 |
| Jordan | . 02 | . 02 | 3 | 3 |
| Paraguay*** | - | . 02 | 4 | 1 |
| Rhodesia | . 02 | . 01 | 2 | 2 |
| Dominican Republic** and Haiti*** | --- | . 01 | --- | 2 |
| Bolivia | . 01 | . 01 | 2 | - |
| Viet Nam** | . 02 | . 01 | 2 | 2 |
| こambodia** and Laos*** | --- | . 01 | 1 | 1 |
| West Indies* | 6.11 | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL PER CENT | 99.94\% | 100.00\% |  |  |
| TOTAL NUMBER | 26,886 | 27,654 | 17,356 | 10.298 |

* In the 1970 Survey (Report No. 91), these countries included in category "West Indies." In 1975, these countries were coded separately as shown above, and the category "West Indies" was used to include other unclassified countries in that region (see Appendix B).
** In 1970 Survey (Report No. 91), these countries were put in Appendix A.
*** In 1970 Survey, these countries were notspecifically coded.
+ See Appendix B.
Number of Students Missing $=4$.

While about 30 per cent of all students reported English as a second language, another 16 per cent reported learning English and their mother tongue at the same time. Hence, English was not the sole mother tongue of 46 per cent of the students in the Toronto school system. The comparable proportion for 1970 was 41 per cent.

Table 7. shows that of those learning English as a second language, more than 70 per cent reported Fortuguese, Italian, Greek, and Chinese as their mother tongue. This pattern is quite similar to that found in 1970. These same four languages are most frequently mentioned (over 60 per cent) by those who learned English and another language at the same time (Table 8).

In terms of parental background, 81.2 per cent of the students lived in homes where both parents were present; 14.3 per cent lived in motheronly homes; 1.9 per cent lived in father-only homes; and 2.2 per cent lived in homes where neither parent was present. This 1975 percentage for twoparent homes is two per cent less than that for 1970 , while the 1975 percentages for mother-only and father-only homes are greater by 2.1 and .2 per cent respectively.

## Analysis and Presentation of Results

The results of the survey could have been tabulated in many different ways. For instance, the students could have been classified by either their parents' occupation or their mcther tongue for each grade; or, they could have been classified by their country of birth for each age group. Such approaches would have obscured the broader patterns within the school system and would not answer the questions which originally led to this survey. Accordingly, results have been organized into tables to provide a clear overview of the majer demographic features in the school system and che relationships between
these features and students' characteristics. Those who may wish to examine the raw data will be provided access on request.

The interpretation of these results is facilitated by comparison with the 1970 survey. In some cases, the two comparisons are noted only in the text with the suggestion that the 1970 report (Wright, 1970) be consulted for more detailed or specific comparisons. Country of Birth and Language

The four categories established in 1970 were used for the 1975 survey to describe the "immigrant" status of the students. These are:
(1) students born in Canada, English the first language;
(2) students born in Canada, English not the first language (this category includes both those students who learned English as a second language and those who learned English and another language 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.

Of all the students in the school system, 45.3 per cent belonged to Category 1, while $24.1,7.9$, and 21.8 per cent belonged to Categories 2 , 3, and 4 respectively. There was no information for 1 per cent.

While these different categories are quite useful in describing overall patterns in the school system, they necessarily mask much relevant information. For instance, some students who reported learning English and another language at the same time may be much more fluent in one or the other: accordingly, one cannot assume that they are fully bilingual. Socio-Economic Status

The occupation of the students' parents or household heads was established in the survey. These occupations, in turn, were categorized according to the Blishen Scale (1967) for socio-economic status.

TABLE 7
MOTHER TONGUE OF STUDENTS WHO LEARNED ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (Comparison with 1970 Every Student Survey, Report No. 91)

| Mother Tongue | 1970 | 1975 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Portuguese | 14.23 | 21.08 |
| Itallan | 35.27 | 20.57 |
| Greek | 11.55 | 15.18 |
| Chinese | 9.69 | 14.05 |
| Spanish | 1.05 | 3.55 |
| Polish | 4.58 | 2.90 |
| Yugoslavian | 2.68 | 2.42 |
| Ukrainian | 3.79 | 2.20 |
| French | 1.96 | 1.71 |
| German | 3.32 | 1.71 |
| No Information | 1.41 | 1.14 |
| Unclassified | . 33 | 1.10 |
| Korea | . 26 | 1.09 |
| Macedonian | 1.28 | . 97 |
| Hungarian | 1.61 | . 93 |
| Indian* | . 57 | . 83 |
| Punjabi** | --- | . 82 |
| Hindi** | --- | . 62 |
| Philippines+ | --- | . 49 |
| Japanese | . 38 | . 47 |
| Jamaican Patois+ | --- | . 40 |
| Maltese | . 50 | . 37 |
| Czechoslovakian | . 84 | . 36 |
| Croatian | . 24 | . 36 |
| Lithuanian | . 59 | .34 .29 |
| Latvian |  |  |
| Estonian | . 69 | . 32 |
| Russian | . 27 | . 26 |
| Finnish | . 53 | . 24 |
| Gujurati+ | --- | . 24 |
| Urdu** | --- | . 24 |
| Tagolog+ | --- | . 22 |

TABLE 7
Continued

| Mother Tongue | Per Cent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1970 | 1975 |
| Pakistani* | --- | . 20 |
| Serbian | . 12 | . 19 |
| Greek and Macedonian** | --- | . 17 |
| Dutch | . 31 | . 15 |
| Arabic | . 13 | . 15 |
| Slovakian | . 24 | . 15 |
| Guyanese* | --- | . 12 |
| Turkish | . 11 | . 12 |
| Albanian+ | --- | . 11 |
| Mandarin** | --- | . 10 |
| Indian (North American) | . 06 | . 09 |
| Rumanian | . 08 | . 08 |
| Burmese+ | --- | . 07 |
| Kachi** | --- | . 07 |
| Swahili+ | --- | . 07 |
| Swedish | . 05 | . 07 |
| Taiwanese** | --- | . 06 |
| Hebrew | . 12 | . 06 |
| Slovenian | . 09 | . 06 |
| Bulgarian | . 05 | . 06 |
| Armenian | . 09 | . 05 |
| Brazilian+ | --- | . 05 |
| West Indian Language | . 03 | . 05 |
| Indonesian | . 01 | . 03 |
| Austrian | . 07 | . 03 |
| Africaans+ | --- | . 03 |
| Danish | . 06 | . 03 |
| Sign Language** | --- | . 02 |
| Yiddish | . 06 | . 01 |
| Norwegian | . 02 | . 01 |

...cont'd.

TABLE 7
Continued

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mother Tongue | Per Cent |  |
| Egyptiant | $-\ldots 70$ | 1975 |
| Gaelic | $\overline{.03}$ | .01 |
| TOTAL PER CENT | $\overline{99.99 \%}$ | $\overline{99.99 \%}$ |
| TOTAL NUMBER | $\overline{28,368}$ | $\overline{27,063}$ |

＊Classified as＂Indian－Pakistani＂in 1970，Report \＃91．
＊＊Not specifically classified in 1970，Report \＃91．

+ Classified in Appendix A in 1970，Report $⿰ ⿰ 三 丨 ⿰ 丨 三 91$.

TABLE B
MOTHER TONGUE OF STUDENTS WHO LEARNED ENGLISH AND MOTHER TONGUE AT THE SAME TIME
(Comparison with 1970 Every Student Survey, Report No. 91)

| Mother Tongue | Per Cent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1970 | 1975 |
| Italian | 25.79 | 25.34 |
| Greek | 9.07 | 13.53 |
| Chinese | 8.42 | 12.77 |
| Portuguese | 5.37 | 9.74 |
| French | 5.60 | 5.47 |
| German | 7.32 | 4.58 |
| Polish | 8.16 | 4.43 |
| Ukrainian | 8.35 | 4.19 |
| Yugoslavian | 2.01 | 1.83 |
| Spanish | 1.01 | 1.76 |
| Macedonian | 2.09 | 1.55 |
| Hungarian | 2.28 | 1.47 |
| Unclassified Languages | . 71 | 1.37 |
| No Information | . 99 | 1.01 |
| Japanese | 1.04 | . 81 |
| Lithuanian | 1.41 | . 79 |
| Maltese | 1.01 | . 71 |
| Indian* | . 92 | . 63 |
| Jamaican Patois+ | --- | 2 |
| Estonian | 1.29 | -2 |
| Latvian | 1.13 | - 36 |
| Russian | . 74 | 47 |
| Finnish | . 78 | 4 |
| Hindi** | --- | . 44 |
| Philippinest | --- | $-2$ |
| Dutch | . 63 | . 42 |
| Hebrew | . 72 | . 36 |
| Croatian | . 22 | . 34 |
| Tagalog+ | --- | . 29 |
| Korean | . 07 | . 26 |

...cont'd.
33

TABLE 8
Continued


TABLE 8 Continued

| Mother Tongue | Per Cent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1970 | 1975 |
| Taiwanese** | --- | . 01 |
| Burmese + | --- | . 01 |
| Indonesian | . 03 | . 01 |
| TOTAL PER CENT | 99.99\% | 99.96\% |
| TOTAL NUMBER | 14,515 | 15,598 |

* Classified as "Indian - Pakistani" in 1970, Report \#91.
** Not specifically classified in 1970.
+ Classified in Appendix A in 1970, Report $\# 91$.

This scale ranks over 300 occupations drawn from the 1961 Canadian Census by education, income and prestige. The Blishen Scale, while quite useful for grouping large numbers of individuals, does not distinguish, for instance, between the manager of a large entertainment centre such as the O'Keefe Centre, and the manager of a dance nall. Furthermore, the survey questionnaire did not specifically ask students to indicate the "place $=\bar{I}$ work" for their parents, making it difficult to distinguish between the manager of $a$ bank and the manager of a small store.

I: addition, the categories in the Blishen Scale could not accommodate some of the occupations reported by students; thus, special categories (10 - 16) were developed. One such category is "Group Home Head" which includes, for example, a social worker (see Table 9:

Blishen socio-econcmic categories were combined into 8 categories (2-9) for presentation in =is repc"t. As is apparent - Table 9, the proportion of ラEuden in ti. lowest and highest category $\{2$ and 9) remained relatively stible between 197 and 1975 . The most noticeajle shifts betwee. the two periods occurred in categories 6 and 7. Specifica: $y$, in 1575 the proportion fro- こategory : zncreased, while the proportion Erom Category 7 decreased.

As in $2970,0:-50$ per cent of the students in $1 \geq 75$ reported parents' occupations in $C$ Eterories 2,3 , and 4 , while about 13 per cent reported occupations in Categcties 8 or 9 . An overview of the special categories (1) to l6) shows that 4,297 students (4.6 per cent) reported "nowsewife" as the occupation for the household head. This proportion is quite sima_a: to the 1970 si=un on. Special Class::

In 1975, a =ew category, Special Class "C", was Aded to the two categories Lsed in $1.9^{\circ} 0$. Snecial Ciass "A" contains those students in
"Opportunity Classes"; Special Class "B" contains those in health-related classes (e.g., vision), wnile Speciaュ Class " $C$ " contains those in other special classes (e.g., behavioural).

In 1970, Special Class "B" incluäed students in health as well as non-health-related special classes. Thus, Special Class "B" in 1970 contained the type of stment grouped in " 3 " and " $C$ " in 1975.

In 1970, Speci玉̇ Class "A" included students from the special vocational classes in sezanaury schools; however, in 2975, only elementary school students were included in this group due to reorganization within the secondary schools. Essentially then, elementary schoo" students in 1975 were classified by kancergarten. grac̈es lo 8 , Special Class A, B, or C, New Canadian and ungradec classes. Where possible footnotes $=0$ some tables are used to clarify these eistinctions.
"New : maězans: ame Class Plincement.

These analyses st how the four "imongran graps are distributed in special and regular classes in $t=$ ementary schocis ws well as in the different levels of study i= जhe secmary schools. Stucsents in New Canadian classes were not included in the tables; however, studen= ir ungraded programes in the elementare schools were included in the category "grades 1 to 8."

## Elementary School

Table 10 shows mow the four megories of $s$ frems are dist ibuted across junior and ser-or kindergarten and grade l. canadian-born students are more likely to be in either junimr or senior kinmergarten than in grade 1 , whereas the opposite is true for non-Canacian-born sudents. Appendix $F$ shows no sex differences for the tremas seen in this fabie.

TABLE 9

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CODES FOR HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD
(COMPARISON WITH 1970 EVERY STUDENT SURVEY REPORT NO. 91)

| Category Number | Blishen's Category | Category Description | $\frac{\text { Per Cent }}{170} \frac{175}{10}$ |  | $\frac{\text { Number in }}{} \frac{1975}{\text { Elem. }} \frac{\text { Sec. }}{}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | No information or unknown | 2.86 | 4.78 | 2301 | 2130 |
| 2 | 25-31.99 | Labourers, truck drivers, porters | 42.74 | 42.01 | 27018 | 11931 |
| 3 | 32-34.99 | Bartenders, sheetmetal workers, repairmen | 7.68 | 6.05 | 3934 | 1676 |
| 4 | 35-38.99 | Sales clerks, jewellers, stationary engineers, machinists | 4.97 | 3.10 | 1939 | 938 |
| 5 | 39-42.99 | Pressmen, printing workers, electricians, members of the armed forces, clerical occupations | 9.27 | 9.16 | 5242 | 3251 |
| 6 | 43-49.99 | Actors, tool and diemakers, medical and dental technicians, embalmers, real estate salesmen | $6.09$ | 8.52 | 4865 | 3034 |
| 7 | 5c-54.99 | Musicians, stenographers, athletes | $4.35$ | 2.90 | 1777 | 910 |
| 8 | 55-65.99 | Clergymen, various owners and managers, finsurance salesmen, librarians | $4.68$ | 4.62 | 2806 | 1474 |
| 9 | 66-76.99 | Teacherss, professional engineers, physicians, computer programmers, air pilots | $8.00$ | 8.41 | 5345 | 2453 |
| 10 |  | Pensioner, retired, workman's compensation, disabled or 111 * | $\text { . } 70$ | 1.16 | 390 | 690 |
| 11 |  | Welfare, mother's allowance | . 37 | . 18 | 104 | 65 |
| 12 |  | Adult training or re-training | . 64 | . 68 | 491 | 136 |
| 13 |  | Unemployed | 3.15 | 3.42 | 2401 | 770 |
| 14 |  | Mother only, housewife | 4.40 | 4.64 | 2994 | 1303 |
| 15 |  | Respondent on his/her own | . 09 | . 16 | 6 | 144 |
| 16 |  | Group home head* (e.g., social worker, etc.) |  | . 20 | 75 | 110 |
| TOTAL PER | CENT |  | 99.99 | 99.99 |  |  |
| TOTAL NUM |  |  | 3,818 | 92,703 | 61688 | 31015 |

kindergartev and grade 1 attemdance catecorized as to WHETHER OR NOT STODENS BORN IN CANADA AND whether or vor engise vas motier toncor* (Comparison with 1970 Every Student Survey)

| Student Background Code* | PERCENTAGE OR STUDENTS |  |  |  |  |  | Total Per Cent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Junior Rindergarten |  | Senior Kindergarten |  | Grade 1 |  |  |  |
|  | 1975 | 1970 | 1975 | 1970 | 1975 | 1970 | 1975 |  |
|  | Nale Pemale | Male Pemale | Male Pemale | Male Pemale | Male Pemale | Male Female |  |  |
| 1 | 46.848 .6 | 47.3 51,6 | 46.645 .3 | 52.751 .9 | $40.0 \quad 42.2$ | 51,1. 50.5 | 44.3 | 50.8 |
| 2 | 32.733 .0 | 36.434 .2 | 31.431 .1 | 27.627 .9 | 26.229 .2 | 25.727 .1 | 30.1 | 26.3 |
| 3 | 6.45 .5 | 3.83 .2 | 6.17 .2 | 4.34 .6 | 8.96 .9 | 5.45 .2 | 7.0 | 5.3 |
| 4 | 13.712 .6 | 12.010 .8 | 15.415 .7 | 15.015 .0 | 23.420 .4 | 17.316 .8 | 17.7 | 17.1 |
| No <br> Information | . 4 . 3 | . 5 . 2 | . 5.7 | . 3.5 | 1.51 .3 | . 5.4 | . 9 | . 4 |
| Total <br> Per Cent | 100.0100 .0 | 100.0100 .0 | 100.0 100.0 | 99.999 .9 | 100.0 100.0 | 100.0100 .0 | 100.0 | 99.9 |
| TOTAL | 23012327 | 14221320 | 29982845 | 41253803 | 41403442 | 42843899 | 18051 | 18853 |

* Category description: 1) students bom in Canada, English the first language; 2) students bom in Canada, English not the first language; 3) students not bom in Canada, English the first language; 4) students not bom in Canada, English not the first language, or another language and English learned at the same time.

Table 11 shows how the four categories of students are distributed across the different grades and special classes. The 1975 results suggest that, compared to the students in the other three categories, students in Category 1 (i.e. Canadian-born, English mother tongue) are much more likely to be in a special class. In fact, while almost 10 pex cent of the Canadianborn English-speaking students are in special classes, the proportion is only about 6 per cent in each of the other three categories. This difference is more pronounced than it was in 1970.

In Appendix $F$ it can be seen that the proportion of males found in Special Class $C$ is more than twice that of females in each category -- the most noticeable difference being within Category 1. The proportion of females in special classes appears to have risen slightly between 1970 and 1975. Secondary School

Since 1970, the secondary schools have undergone major organizational
changes. In the present context, the most important is that there are no longer "programs" but rather "levels of study." The new system of levels allows for more flexibility in terms of both choice of courses and completion time. For example, a student can now take some subjects at one level and others at another level during the same year. Thus, while in 1970 a student was in either a 4-year or a 5-year program, in 1975 a student could take courses at both levels 4 and 5 during the same year, even if most of his subjects were at one of the two levels. Thus, comparable data from 1970 have not been included in the following tables. Students were initially assigned to 6 different levels and 3 combinations of levels of study; however, because the number of students recording a combination of levels was relatively small (e.g., only 32 recorded levels 3 and 4 while 3,282 recorded level 3), the 9 categories were combined into 5. Appendix $E$ illustrates how this was done and the number of student affected.

TABLE 11

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS (Categorized as to Whether or not Born in Canada and Whether or not English was Mother Tongue)


* Includes ungraded classes; does not include kindergarten and special English classes. ** In 1970, Specia? C1ass "B" included "C".
a Missing observations $=1209$ (includes students in special English classes).
b No information for 138 students.
c Approximately 100\% for 1970 totals.

The results in Table 12 show that the largest proportion of students taking level 5 courses came from Category 2 (i.e. Canadian-born, English not first language) while the smallest proportion taking such courses came from Category 4 (i.e. Non-Canadian-born, English not first language). Category 4 also provided the highest proportion for level 4, and was the only one in which the proportion of males exceeded that of females regarding enrolment in level 5 subjects (see Appendix F). Categories 1, 3, and 4 are quite similar in the proportion of students taking levels 1, 2, and 3 courses. In 1970, Category 2 also provided the largest proportion of students in the 5-year program. Age on Arrival

The 1970 survey revealed that students over 16 and under 6 , on arrival, were the "least likely to be found in special vocational programmes and most likely found in five-year programmes."

The 1975 distribution for students not born in Canada and for whom English was the mother tongue is illustrated in Table l3. It is apparent that students arriving in Canada both below the age of 6 and over 16 are more likely to be enrolled in level 5 subjects than those arriving between 7 and 15. The proportion of the "over 16" group exceeds the "under 6" group by 7.4 per cent. Students in the 12 to 15 age group are the most likely to be taking subjects at either levels 1,2 , or 3 when compared to those in the other groups.

The proportion of males in levels 1,2 , or 3 is consistently higher than that for females in each group (see Appendix F). Except for the 12 to 15 age group in level 4, the proportion of females in levels 4 or 5 is greater than that for males.

TABLE 12

LEVEL OF STUDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS (Categorized as to whether or not born in Canada and Whether or not English was mother tongue)

| Student <br> Background | SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL ** |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 and 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | TOTAL |
| Code * | N | $\xrightarrow{\text { - }}$ | \% | \% | $\%$ | PERCENT |
| 1 | 13059 | 4.6 | 12.4 | 22.7 | 60.3 | $\therefore 100.0$ |
| 2 | 6903 | 2.0 | 7.7 | 22.8 | 67.5 | 100.0 |
| 3 | 2196 | 4.8 | 11.7 | 18.8 | 64.6 | 99.9 |
| 4 | 7921 | 4.7 | 11.4 | 27.4 | 56.5 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | $30079^{\text {a }}$ | 4.1 | 11.0 | 23.7 | 61.3 | 100.1 |

* See page 23 for code description.
** See Appendix E
a No information for 936 students

TABLE 13

LEVEL OF STUDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS NOT BORN IN CANADA AND FOR WHOM ENGLISH WAS MOTHER TONGUE
(Categorized by age on arrival)

| Age on Arrival | N | SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEI*. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1 \underbrace{\text { and }}_{8} 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL PERCENT |
| $1-6$ | 520 | 2.7 | 5.8 | 23.5 | 68.1 | 100.1 |
| , 7-11 | 534 | 4.1 | 12.5 | 23.0 | 60.3 | 99.9 |
| 12-15 | 709 | 8.2 | 17.8 | 17.9 | 56.1 | 100.0 |
| over 16 | 359 | 3.4 | 9.7 | 11.4 | 75.5 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL PER CENT |  | 5.0 | 12.2 | 19.5 | 63.4 | 100.1 |
| TOTAL NO. | $2122{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 106 | 258 | 413 | 1345 |  |

* See Appendix E

No information for 21 students

Almost 90 per cent of the age group who were 16 and over on arrival, enrolled in level 5 courses, this proportion being much higher than for those who arrived at earlier ages. Thus, as is shown in Table l4, students whose mother tongue was not English and who arrived in Canada under 16 years of age are more likely to enrol in a level of study lower than level 5. While it seems that many "non-academic" students over 16 on arrival go directly to work, there are also a number of non-resident fee-paying students.

To the extent that a 1975 level 5 course of study is similar to the 1970 "5-year programme," the patterns (of participation) are similar.

Occupation and Special Class Placement

As explained earlier, the occupations of the household heads classified according to the Blishen Scale, were combined into 8 ordered groups (2 to 9), with additional groups (10 to 16) being used to describe the unemployed, pensioners, welfare recipients, etc. Category 16 was not coded in 1970.

## Elementary school

Table 15 illustrates the 1975 results, while allowing for comparisons with the 1970 data. As seen in Table 15, the proportion of students in Occupational Category 2 through 9 was similar in junior and senior kindergarten and grades 1 to 8 , approximately three-quarters being in the grades and somewhat less than 10 per cent in each of junior and senior kindergarten.

The lower occupational categories contribute significantly more students to Special Class "A" than do the higher categories .-- 4 to 5 per cent from Categories 2 to 4, as against less than 1 per cent from Category 9. No similar pattern was apparent in Special Class "B" or "C".

While fewer than 400 students came from households were the head was retired (10), more than 12 per cent of them were in Special Class "A". As might be expected, there were relatively few students in junior kindergarten or senior kindergarten from these households.

## TABLE 14

LEVEL OF STUDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS (Categorized by age on arrival, not born in Canada for whom English was not the mother tongue)

| Age on Arrival | N | SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL* |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ${ }^{1} \underbrace{\text { a }}_{\text {and }}$ 2 | 3 8 | 4 | 5 8 | TOTAL PER CENT |
| 1-6 | 2408 | 3.5 | 10.9 | 33.6 | 52.1 | 100.1 |
| 7-11 | 2634 | 6.9 | 15.9 | 31.7 | 45.6 | 100.1 |
| 12-15 | 1711 | 6.1 | 12.5 | 24.9 | 56.5 | 100.0 |
| $16+$ over | 928 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 10.7 | 87.9 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL PER CENT |  | 4.8 | 11.8 | -3.2 | 55.2 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL NO. | $7681{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 372 | 904 | 2167 | 4239 |  |

* See Appendix E
a No information $\mathrm{fc}=7 \mathrm{Z}$ studenis


## TABLE 15

PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS - CATEGORIZED BY OCCUPATION OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD (percentages)

| Occupational Code* |  |  | 2ROGRAM |  |  |  |  |  | SPECIAL CLASS |  |  |  |  | Total ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\mathrm{N}}{1975 \quad 1970}$ |  | 1975 |  |  | 1970 |  |  | 1975 |  |  | 1970 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Jr.K. | Sr.K. | 1-8** | JT.K. | Sr.K. | 1-8 | A | B | C | A | $\mathrm{B}^{\text {d }}$ |  |
| 2 | 26370 | 32160 | 7.3 | 9.2 | 77.0 | 4.1 | 10.9 | 79.8 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| 3 | 3878 | 5555 | 8.0 | 10.3 | 75.8 | 4.4 | 12.0 | 78.5 | 3.8 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 3.7 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| 4 | 1915 | 3402 | 6.5 | 9.3 | 77.0 | 3.9 | 10.4 | 81.0 | 4.8 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 3.4 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| 5 | 5211 | 6434 | 7.8 | 9.6 | 78.0 | 3.6 | 10.0 | 81.5 | 2.3 | 11 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| 6 | 4817 | 3935 | 7.5 | 9.4 | 78.3 | 3.5 | 9.4 | 83.2 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 2.) | 100.0 |
| 7 | 1769 | 2983 | - 0 | 9.9 | 78.4 | 3.8 | 21.2 | 81.6 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| 8 | 2803 | 3150 | $\therefore 8$ | \% 8 | 77.3 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 81.2 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 100.0 : |
| 9 | 530 | 5630 | 9.2 | 10.2 | 78.2 | 2.4 | $-1.8$ | 84.3 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.3 | $100.0 \%$ |
| 10 | 31 | 263 | 1.6 | 4.5 | 78.5 | 2.7 | 8.4 | 78. | 12.6 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 8.0 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| 11 | 1.74 | 283 | 14.4 | 11.5 | 56.7 | 3.5 | 12.0 | 70.0 | 6.7 | 5.8 | 4.8 | 13.4 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| 12 | 468 | 529 | 13.7 | 19.9 | 63.9 | 10.2 | 18.5 | 68.2 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| 13 | 2326 | 2118 | 4.6 | 5.9 | 77.5 | 2.7 | 7.7 | 79.7 | 9.7 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 8.7 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| 14 | 2959 | 3690 | 9.0 | 11.0 | 67.3 | 2.9 | 11.1 | 77.4 | 9.5 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 7.1 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| 16 | 75 | - | 0.0 | 1.3 | 77.3 | - | - | - | 14.7 | 5.3 | 1.3 | - | - | $100.0$ |
| TOTAL | 58406 | 70141 | 7.6 | 9.6 | 76.5 | 3.8 | 11.0 | 80.3 | 4.1 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 100.0 |

* See Table 9 for code description.
** In 1975, no information for 2242 students.
*** In 1970, no information for 1965 students.
a In 1970, Special Class "B" included "C".
b Approximately 100 per cent in some cases. In 1975, Category $\# 15$ (respondent on his/her own) contained only 3 studerts.

Some 1.7 pex cent of the 104 students from households where the head was on welfare or mother's allowance (11) were in special classes. This was in sharp contrast to the 468 pupils from households where the head was in job training (12); 2.6 per cent vere in special classes. More than 9 per cent of the children from these householes were in Special Class "A". The proportion in special classes of all types increased slightly over 1970. While only 75 students were from group homes (16), more than 20 per cent of these were in special classes.

As explained earlier, Special Class "B" in 1970 included students in both health and non healtr-related classes. In 1975 the category was separated into Special Class "B" (health-related classes) and Special Class "C" (non health-related classes). Still, if one is interested in making reasonable comparisons between 1970 and 1975 on students from Special Class " $B$ " in Table 15, one could combine the 1975 percentages in " $B$ " and "C" (for any row) and compare this total with the corresponding 1970 percentage under "B". For instance, this would indicate that 1.8 per cent of the students from Category 2 (1.2 plus .6) we:" into "B" in 1975 as against 1.1 per cent in 1970. Once such a comparison is done, it becomes clear that for every category, the 1975 proportion in Special Class " $B$ " is higher - sometimes as much as four times higher - than the corresponding 1970 proportion. Table 15 further shows no particular trend among the different categories within Sperial Class "C".

As one moves up from Category 2 to 9, the proportion of students in "A" steadily diminishes. This trend is obvious for both 1970 and 1975.

Table 24 (Appendix F) provides a breakdown by sex. There are no comparable results by sex for 1970 . With respect to regular classes, the sex differences within Categories 2 to 9 are minimal, except within Categories 4 and 7 for grades 1 to 8 . For all occupational categories, there is a strong tendency for a higher proportion of males than females to be in a special class.

## Secondary School

The majority of students in each of occupatsonal Categories 2 to 9 in Table 16 are enrolled in level 5 courses. Nevertheress, there are some clear-cut patterns among those different socio-economi= categories. For instance, as one moves up from Category 2 to 9 , the proportion of students in level 5 courses increases steadily from 50.5 per cent to 90.4 per cent.

To the extent that the level 5 courses are wimilar to the 5-year programs of 1970 , this trend is similar in both pericis. The above patterns are not as clear-cut for the special categories 10 to 16 . For instance, students from group homes or where the household heads are on "welfare or mother's allowance" are somewhat evenly distributed among levels 2 to 5. Students from Category 12 (household head at university or in adult retraining) and Category 15 (student on his/her own were the ones most likely to be in a level 5 course. While other comparisons from Categories 10 to 16 may seem quite striking, it should be noted that four of these categories have relatively small numbers of students.

The distribution by sex is given in Table 25 in Appendix F. That table shows that as one moves from Category 2 to 9, there is a higher proportion of females than males in each category enrolled in level 5 courses. In fact, the largest differences are found for Category 3 ( 9 per cent) and Category 4 (10.9 per cent). There were few other differences except for a general tendency for a higher proportion of males to be in levels $1,2,3$ or 4 rather than level 5 .

Generally, the chances of a student being in a level 5 course increase sharply with higher household occupational status, and even more so if the student is female.

## DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

This report provides an overview of some demographic and educational characteristics of students in the Toronto school system. This survey is, in most respects, identical to that done in 1970 to allow comparisons with that report. While the pattern of results was generally similar for both periods, some differences were found. For instance, the school population is more pluralistic, displaying a wider distribution of countries of birth and mother tongues.

In 1970, the proportion of non-Canadian-born students was 25 per cent. By 1975 this portion had increased to 30 per cent. In 1970, the proportion of students whose mother tongue was not English was 40 per cent, while in 1975 the proportion amounted to 46 per cent. In terms of actual numbers, this increase is important.

At the same time, almost 70 per cent of the students in Toronto came from homes where household heads were in the lower occupational categories or in Special Category 13 (unemployed) and 14 (mother only, housewife). There has been a slight increase in the proportion of students in special classes between 1970 and 1975; the proportion remaining higher for males than for females.

In both 1970 and 1975 a much higher proportion of students from high-income homes as compared to students from low income homes were enrolled in level 5 courses. At every socio-economic level a higher proportion of females than males is enrolled in level 5 courses. This is an interesting trend especially since a higher proportion of males actually do go on to university.

As stated earlier, the Board's request for a 1975 update of the Every Student Survey contained a supplementary proposal for a study on Toronto students' post-secondary educational expectations. That study would consider, among other things, students' sex, socio-economic and demographic characteristics in relation to their expectations.

TABLE 16

LEVEL OF STUDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL Fr UDENTS (categorized by occupation of head of household)


## This report presents a reasonably clear picture of some relation-

 ahips between those characteristics and enrolment in the secondary school levels. For instance, students whose parents are labourers, taxi drivers, etc. appear to have a 50:50 chance of enrolling in a level 5 course of study, while students whose parents are lawyers, engineers, etc. appear to have 9 chances out of 10 of enrolling in such a course.To the extent that enrolment in a particular level of study in the secondary school is connected to post-secondary options, the relationships established in this report could help contribute to an understanding of students' post-secondary expectations.

These results do not establish causal relationships between students' characteristics and class placement. Rather, they describe the situation as it existed in 1975 as completely and accurately as possible. The existence of strong relationships between home background and schcol placement has again been demonstrated. Such relationships will be reviewed more completely in another report in this series.

Table 11 shows how the four categories of students are distributed across the different grades and special classes. The 1975 results suggest that, compared to the students in the other three categories, students in Category 1 (i.e. Canadian-born, English mother tongue) are much more likely to be in a special class. In fact, while almost 10 per cent of the Canadianborn English-speaking students are in special classes, the proportion is only about 6 per cent in each of the other three categories. This difference is mure pronounced than it was in 1970.

In Appendix $F$ it can be seen that the proportion of males found in Special Class $C$ is more than twice that of females in each category -- the most noticeable difference being within Category 1. The proportion of females in special classes appears to have risen slightly between 1970 and 1975. Secondary School

Since 1970, the secondary schools have undergone major organizational changes. In the present context, the most important is that there are no longer "programs" but rather "levels of study." The new system of levels allows for more flexibility in terms of both choice of courses and conpletion time. For example, a student can now take some subjects at one level and others at another level during the same year. Thus, while in 1970 a student was in either a 4-year or a 5-year program, in 1975 a student could take courses at both levels 4 and 5 during the same year, even if most of his subjects were at one of the two levels. Thus, comparable data from 1970 have not been included in the following tables. Students were initially assigned to 6 different levels and 3 combinations of levels of study; however, because the number of students recording a combination of levels was relatively small (e.g., only 32 recorded levels 3 and 4 while 3,282 recorded level 3), the 9 categories were combined into 5. Appendix $E$ illustrates how this was done and the number of student affected.

## TABLE 11

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS
(Categorized as to Whether or not Born in Canada and Whether or not English was Mother Tongue)

| Student Background | N |  | P ERCIE NTAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Grade 1-8* |  | Special Class |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1975 | 1970 | 1975 | 1970 | 1975 | 1970 | 1975 | 1970 | 1975 | Per Ce |
| 1-Canada-English | 23865 | 33249 | 90.2 | 93.8 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2- Canada-not } \\ \text { English } \end{gathered}$ | 12027 | 14013 | 94.8 | 95.2 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| 3- Not CanadaEnglish | 4295 | 3044 | 94.5 | 95.4 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| 4- Not CanadaNot English | 9874 | 10968 | 94.0 | 94.0 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | $50061^{\text {a }}$ | $61.412^{\text {b }}$ | 92.5 | 94.2 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 100.0 |

* Includes ungraded classes; does not include kindergarten and special English classes. ** In 1970, Specia? C1ass "B" included "C".
a Missing observations $=1209$ (includes students in special English classes).
b No information for 138 students.
c Approximately $100 \%$ for 1970 totals.

The results in Table 12 show that the largest proportion of students taking level 5 courses came from Category 2 (i.e. Canadian-born, English not first language) while the smallest proportion taking such courses came from Category 4 (i.e. Non-Canadian-born, English not first language). Category 4 also provided the highest proportion for level 4, and was the only one in which the proportion of males exceeded that of females regarding enrolment in level 5 subjects (see Appendix F). Categories 1, 3, and 4 are quite similar in the proportion of students taking levels 1, 2, and 3 courses. In 1970, Category 2 also provided the largest proportion of students in the 5-year program.

Age on Arrival
The 1970 survey revealed that students over 16 and under 6 , on arrival, were the "least likely to be found in special vocational programmes and most likely found in five-year programmes."

The 1975 distribution for students not born in Canada and for whom English was the mother tongue is illustrated in Table 13. It is apparent that students arriving in Canada both below the age of 6 and over 16 are more likely to be enrolled in level 5 subjects than those arriving between 7 and 15. The proportion of the "over $16^{\prime \prime}$ group exceeds the "under 6" group by 7.4 per cent. Students in the 12 to 15 age group are the most likely to be taking subjects at either levels 1,2 , or 3 when compared to those in the other groups.

The proportion of males in levels 1,2 , or 3 is consistently higher than that for females in each group (see Appendix F). Except for the 12 to 15 age group in level 4, the proportion of females in levels 4 or 5 is greater than that for males.

## TABLE 12

LEVEL OF STUDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS (Categorized as to whether or not born in Canada and Whether or not English was mother tongue)

| Student Background | SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL ** |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 and 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | TOTAL |
| Code * | N | \% | \% | 9 | 8 | PERCENT |
| 1 | 13059 | 4.6 | 12.4 | 22.7 | 60.3 | $\because 100.0$ |
| 2 | 6903 | 2.0 | 7.7 | 22.8 | 67.5 | 100.0 |
| 3 | 2196 | 4.8 | 11.7 | 18.8 | 64.6 | 99.9 |
| 4 | 7921 | 4.7 | 11.4 | 27.4 | 56.5 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | $30079^{\text {a }}$ | 4.1 | 11.0 | 23.7 | 61.3 | 100.1 |

* See page 23 for code description.
** See Appendix E
a No information for 936 students

TABLE 13
LEVEL OF STUDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS NOT BORN IN CANADA AND FOR WHOM ENGLISH WAS MOTHER TONGUE (Categorized by age on arrival)

| Age on Arrival | N | SECONDARYSCHOOLIEVEL** |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\underbrace{\text { and } 2}_{\%_{0}}$ | 3 | 4 | 5 | TOTAL PERCENT |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% |  |
| $1-6$ | 520 | 2.7 | 5.8 | 23.5 | 68.1 | 100.1 |
| - 7-11 | 534 | 4.1 | 12.5 | 23.0 | 60.3 | 99.9 |
| 12-15 | 709 | 8.2 | 17.8 | 17.9 | 56.1 | 100.0 |
| over 16 | 359 | 3.4 | 9.7 | 11.4 | 75.5 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL PER CENT |  | 5.0 | 12.2 | 19.5 | 63.4 | 100.1 |
| TOTAL NO. | $2122{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 106 | 258 | 413 | 1345 |  |

* See Appendix E
a No information for 21 students

Almost 90 per cent of the age group who were 16 and over on arrival, enrolled in level 5 courses, this proportion being much higher than for those who arrived at earlier ages. Thus, as is shown in Table l4, students whose mother tongue was not English and who arrived in Canada under 16 years of age are more likely to enrol in a level of study lower than level 5 . While it seems that many "non-academic" students over 16 on arrival go directly to work, there are also a number of non-resident fee-paying students.

To the extent that a 1975 level 5 course of study is similar to the 1970 "5-year programne," the patterns (of participation) are similar.

Occupation and Special Class Placement

As explained earlier, the occupations of the household heads classified according to the Blishen Scale, were combined into 8 ordered groups (2 to 9), with additional groups (10 to 16) being used to describe the unemployed, pensioners, welfare recipients, etc. Category 16 was not coded in 1970.

## Elementary school

Table 15 illustrates the 1975 results, while allowing for comparisons with the 1970 data. As seen in Table 15, the proportion of students in Occupational Category 2 through 9 was similar in junior and senior kindergarten and grades 1 to 8 , approximately three-quarters being in the grades and somewhat less than 10 per cent in each of junior and senior kindergarten.

The lower occupational categories contribute significantly more students to Special Class "A" than do the higher categories $-\frac{1}{}$ to 5 per cent from Categories 2 to 4, as against less than 1 per cent from Category 9. No similar pattern was apparent in Special Class "B" or "C".

While fewer than 400 students came from households were the head was retired (10), more than 12 per cent of them were in Special Class "A". As might be expected, there were relatively few students in junior kindergarten or senior kindergarten from these households.
table 14
Level of study attended by secondary school students (Categorized by age on arrival, not born in Canada for whom English was not the mother tongue)

| Age on Arrival | N | SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL* |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 and 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | TOTAL <br> PER CENT |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% |  |
| 1-6 | 2408 | 3.5 | 10.9 | 33.6 | 52.1 | 100.1 |
| 7-11 | 2634 | 6.9 | 15.9 | 31.7 | 45.6 | 100.1 |
| 12-15 | 1711 | 6.1 | 12.5 | 24.9 | 56.5 | 100.0 |
| $16+$ over | 928 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 10.7 | 87.9 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL PER CENT |  | 4.8 | 11.8 | 23.2 | 55.2 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL NO. | $7681{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 372 | 904 | 2167 | 4238 |  |

* See Appendix E
a No information foェッ students

TABLE 15
PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS - CATEGORIZED BY OCCUPATION OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD (percentages)

| Occupational code* |  |  | PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |  | SPECIAL CLASS |  |  |  |  | Total ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\overline{1975}$ | N 1970 | 1975 |  |  | 1970 |  |  | 1975 |  |  | 1970 |  |  |
|  | 1975 |  | Jr.K. | Sr.K. | 1-8** | Jr.R. | Sr.X. | 1-8 | A | B | C | A | $\mathrm{B}^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| 2 | 26370 | 3260 | 7.3 | 9.2 | 77.0 | 4.1 | 10.9 | 79.8 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| 3 | 3878 | 5555 | 8.0 | 10.3 | 75.8 | 4.4 | 12.0 | 78.5 | 3.8 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 3.7 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| 4 | 1915 | 3402 | 6.5 | 9.3 | 77.0 | 3.9 | 10.4 | 81.0 | 4.8 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 3.4 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| 5 | 5211 | 6434 | 7.8 | 9.6 | 78.0 | 3.6 | 10.0 | 81.5 | 2.3 | 11 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| 6 | 4817 | 3935 | 7.5 | 9.4 | 78.3 | 3.5 | 9.4 | 83.2 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 2.) | 100.0 |
| 7 | 1769 | 2983 | -. 0 | 9.9 | 78.4 | 3.8 | 11.2 | 81.2 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| 8 | 2803 | 3150 | 3.8 | ". 8 | 77.3 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 81.2 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 100.01 |
| 9 | 53.0 | 5630 | 9.2 | 10.2 | 78.2 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 84.3 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 100.0 \% |
| 10 | E1 | 263 | 1.6 | 4.5 | 78.5 | 2.7 | 8.4 | 78. ${ }^{-}$ | 12.6 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 8.0 | 2.3 | $100.0{ }^{\prime}$ |
| 11 : | 134 | 283 | 14.4 | 11.5 | 56.7 | 3.5 | 12.0 | 70.0 | 6.7 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 13.4 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| 12 | 468 | 529 | 13.7 | 19.9 | 63.9 | 10.2 | 18.5 | 68.2 | 0.9 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| 13 | 2326 | 2118 | 4.6 | 5.9 | 77.5 | 2.7 | 7.7 | 79.7 | 9.7 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 8.7 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| 14 | 2959 | 3690 | 9.0 | 11.0 | 67.3 | 2.9 | 11.1 | 77.4 | 9.5 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 7.1 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| 16 | 75 | - | 0.0 | 1.3 | 77.3 | - | - | - | 14.7 | 5.3 | 1.3 | - | - | $100.0$ |
| TOTAL | 58406 | 70141 | 7.6 | 9.6 | 76.5 | 3.8 | 11.0 | 80.3 | 4.1 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 100.0 |

* See Table 9 for code description.
** In 1975, no information for 2242 students.
*** In 1970, no information for 1965 students.
a In 1970, Special Class "B" included "C".
b Approximately 100 per cent in some cases. In 1975, Category \#15 (respondent on his/her own) contained only 3 studerts.

Some 17 pex cent of the 104 students from households where the head was on welfare or mother's allowance (ll) were in special classes. This was in sharp contrast to the 468 pupils from households where the head was in job training (12); 2.6 per cent vere in special classes. More than 9 per cent of the children from these householes were in Special Class "A". The proportion in special classes of all types increased slightly over 1970. While only 75 students were from group homes (16), more than 20 per cent of these were in special classes.

As explained earlier, Special Class "B" in 1970 included students in both health and non health-related classes. In 1975 the category was separated into Special Class "B" (health-related classes) and Special Class "C" (non health-related classes). Still, if one is interested in making reasonable comparisons between 1970 and 1975 on students from Special Class "B" in Table 15, one could combine the 1975 percentages in " $B$ " and "C" (for any row) and compare this total with the corresponding 1970 percentage under "B". For instance, this would indicate that 1.8 per cent of the students from Category 2 (1.2 plus .6) we:" into "B" in 1975 as against 1.1 per cent in 1970. Once such a comparison is done, it becomes clear that for every category, the 1975 proportion in Speciəl Class " B " is higher - sometimes as much as four times higher - than the corresponding 1970 proportion. Table 15 further shows no particular trend among the different categories within Sperial Class "C".

As one moves up from Category 2 to 9 , the proportion of students in "A" steadily diminishes. This trend is obvious for both 1970 and 1975.

Table 24 (Appendix F) provides a breakdown by sex. There are no comparable results by sex for 1970. With respect to regular classes, the sex differences within Categories 2 to 9 are minimal, except within Categories 4 and 7 for grades 1 to 8 . For all occupational categories, there is a strong tendency for a higher proportion of males than females to be in a special class.

Secondary School
The majority of students in each of occupatonal Categories 2 to 9 in Table 16 are enrolled in level 5 courses. Neverthens, there are some clear-cut patterns among those different socio-economi= categories. For instance, as one moves up from Category 2 to 9 , the praportion of students in level 5 courses increases steadily from 50.5 per cent to 90.4 per cent.

To the extent that the level 5 courses are similar to the 5-year programs of 1970 , this trend is similar in both pericis. The above patterns are not as clear-cut for the special categories 10 to 16 . For instance, students from group homes or where the household heads are on "welfare or mother's allowance" are somewhat evenly distributed among levels 2 to 5. Students from Category 12 (household head at university or in adult retraining) and Category 15 (student on his/her own; were the ones most likely to be in a level 5 course. While other comparisons from Categories 10 to 16 may seem quite striking, it should be noted that four of these categories have relatively small numbers of students.

The distribution by sex is given in Table 25 in Appendix $F$. That table shows that as one moves from Category 2 to 9, there is a higher proportion of females than males in each category enrolled in level 5 courses. In fact, the largest differences are found for Category 3 ( 9 per cent) and Category 4 (10.9 per cent). There were few other differences except for a general tendency for a higher proportion of males to be in levels 1, 2, 3 or 4 rather than level 5 .

Generally, the chances of a student being in a level 5 course increase sharply with higher household occupational status, and even more so if the student is female.

## DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

This report provides an overview of some demographic and educational characteristics of students in the Toronto school system. This survey is, in most respects, identical to that done in 1970 to allow comparisons with that report. While the pattern of results was generally similar for both periods, some differences were found. For instance, the school population is more pluralistic, displaying a wider distribution of countries of birth and mother tongues.

In 1970, the proportion of non-Canadian-born students was 25 per cent. By 1975 this portion had increased to 30 per cent. In 1970 , the proportion of students whose mother tongue was not English was 40 per cent, while in 1975 the proportion amounted to 46 per cent. In terms of actual numbers, this increase is important.

At the same time, almost 70 per cent of the students in Toronto came from homes where household heads were in the lower occupational categories or in Special Category 13 (unemployed) and 14 (mother only, housewife). There has been a slight increase in the proportion of students in special classes between 1970 and 1975; the proportion remaining higher for males than for females.

In both 1970 and 1975 a much higher proportion of students from high-income homes as compared to students from low income homes were enrolled in level 5 courses. At every socio-economic level a higher proportion of females than males is enrolled in level 5 courses. This is an interesting trend especially since a higher proportion of males actually do go on to university.

As stated earlier, the Board's request for a 1975 update of the Every Student Survey contained a supplementary proposal for a study on Toronto students' post-secondary educational expectations. That study would consider, among other things, students' sex, socio-economic and demographic characteristics in relation to their expectations.

TABLE 16
LEVEL OF STUDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL $F$ CUDENTS (categorized by occupation of head of household)


This report preaente a reasonably clear picture of zome relationships between those characteristics and enrolment in the secondary school levels. For instance, students whose parents are labourers, taxi drivers, etc. appear to have a 50:50 chance of enrolling in a level 5 course of study, while students whose parents are lawyers, engineers, etc. appear to have 9 chances out of 10 of enrolling in such a course.

To the extent that enrolment in a particular level of study in the secondary school is connected to post-secondary options, the relationships established in this report could help contribute to an understanding of students' post-secondary expectations.

These results do not establish causal relationships between students' characteristics and class placement. Rather, they describe the situation as it existed in 1975 as completely and accurately as possible. The existence of strong relationships between home background and schcol placement has again been demonstrated. Such relationships will be reviewed more completely in another report in this series.

## REFERENCES

Blishen, B. R. A socio-economic index for occupations in Canada. The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 1967, 4(1).
veosaran, R. Educational aspirations, what matters? A literature review. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Research Department, 1975 (\#135).

Wright, E. N. Student's background and its relationship to class and programe in school (The every student survey). Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Research Department, 1970 (\#91).

## APPENDIX A

## Forms and Letters Used for Data Collection

1. Director's letter which was distributed to all principals and teachers along with appropriate forms.
2. Principal's letter for all elementary school principals.
3. Principal's letter for all secondary school principals.
4. Teacher's letter for all regular class teachers.
5. Teacher's letter for teachers of withdrawal classes.
6. Teacher's letter for teachers of New Canadian programs.
7. Record sheet used for listing students receiving instruction on a wi"hdrawal basis.
8. Teacher's letter for teachers of adult day school students.
9. Teacher's letter for teachers of institutional programs.
10. Every Student Survey form for elementary school pupils.
11. Every Student Survey form for secondary school pupils.
12. Every Student Survey form for adult day school students.
13. Every Student Survey form for elementary students in institutional programs.
14. Every Student Survey form for secondary students in institutional programs.

April 18, 1975

Dear Principals and Teachers:
Here is the material for updating the Every Student Survey. I know it will mean a lot of work for all of you, and I know that you may feel uneasy about asking students for personal information. The trustees are aware of the amount of work this involves, and of the possibility the survey could be construed as an invasion of privacy. However, their reasons for requeiting this information are sound. Toronto is such a mobile city with its shifting population, occupation and immigration patterns that we must have this information to identify the changing needs of our children. The data from the 1970 survey has been one of our best weapons in fighting for additional resources for the city.

I want to stress that the information is not for the student's record. Nothing specific to any student will every be used or noted anywhere.

I know that May 1 is a bad time to impose on you. That day was selected to do the survey because it is one of the times when the system is relatively stable.


## 57

the board of education for the city of toronio

## TO ALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ERINCIPALS:

On April 3rd the Board asked to have the Every Student Survey up-dated. The necessary materials are enclosed for distribution to the staff. So that every student in the City is included once and only once, the information is to be reported for all the students on the roll as of May l, 1975. The actual data collecting, of course, can be done a few days on either side of that date.

A (1) The home room teacher of each class will receive the envelope with his/her name on it. This envelope contains a computer label for each student who was listed for that class, two blank computer labels (a few extra are enclosed with this letter), and a letter "To All Teachers" (copy attached).
(2) In order to make the data in this survey more complete, we are identifying students receiving assistance on a withdrawal basis from both the special Education and the New Canadian departments. Teachers we have identified will recoive an envelope addressed to them with a letter (copy attached) and a reque-t to list students receiving their help.
(3) Sufficient blank questionatire are enclosed for every student. The nome room teachers are to receive enough copies of the questionnaire for their students, along with their envelope of instructiors and labels.

NOIE: To slightly reduce the worl load, coloured paper is inserted to break lilem into vacikaues of 30 .

B The teachers will collect the student information.
C The teachers will place the completed forms in the original envelope, if possible, including their letter with the amount of time required recorded.

D Please arrange to collect all the completed forins in these envelopes and have them returned to the Research Department by May 12th.

E In order to report again the amount of time such a project takes, please wecord the amount of time this task required.

Time spent by principal (and vice-principal)
I'ime spent by school's office staff
NAME OF SCHOOL:
please thank the staff for their work. My thanks to you also; I know, because I was told five years ago, that this task disrupts the school.
$/ 1 \subset g$
Enclosures


## TO ALL SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS:

On April 3rd the Board asked to have the Every Student Survey up-dated. The necessary materials are enclosed for distribution to the staff. So that every student in the City is included once and only once, the information is to be reported for all the students on the roll as of May 1,1975 . The actual data collecting, of course, can be done a few days on either side of that date.

A (1) The home room teacher of each class will receive the envelope with his/her class identification code. This envelope contains a computer label for each student who was listed for that class, two blank computer labels (a few extra are enclosed with this letter), and a letter "To All Teachers" (copy attached).
(2) In order to make the data in this survey more complete, we are identifying students receiving assistance on a withdrawal basis from both the special Education and the $N \in W$ Canadian departments. Teachers we have identified will receive an envelope addressed to them with a letter (copy attached) and a request to list students receiving their help.
(3) Sufficient blank questionnaire are enclosed for every student. The home room teachers are to receive enough copies of the questionnaire for their students, along with their envelope of instructions and labels.

NOTE: To slightly reduce the work load, coloured paper is inserted to break them into packages of 30 .
$B$ The teachers will collect the student information.
$C$ 'the teache si will place the completed forms in the original envelope, if possible, including their letter with the amount of time required recorded.

D Please arrange to collect all the completed forms in these envelopes and have them returned to the Research Department by May l2th.

E In order to report again the amount of time such a project takes, please record the amount of time this task required.

Time spent by principal (and vice-principal)
Time spent by school's office staff

NAME OF SCHOOL:

Please thank the staff :or their work. Mv thanks to you also; I know, because I was told five yoars ago, that this task disrupts the school.

Sincerely,

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO

Research Department, April, 1975

TO ALI TEACHERS:
On April 3rd the Board asked to have the Every Student survey updated. This requires your assistance. Every student in the City is to be included (and included only once) in this study; therefore, please include all students on the roll May 1,1975 .

The forms are to be completed by all the students in your class. For those of you with young students, you will have to fill the form in for them. Collect the completed sheets, check the responses, then and only then, place the computer label on the form. This ensures that all labels are returned and that none are lost because of spoiled forms. For students who are absent, please complete the form yourself as accurately as possible, using office records or other sources.

If there is a label for a student who is not in your class on May list, please place the label on a blank form and write the reason, egg., "TRANSFERRED" across the questionnaire. If there is a student in your class for whom you do not have a label, place a blank label on the form and fill in sex and birthdate. We can complete the rest of the label.

NOTE: Please ask the students to specify the kind of job the parent does, not the name of the employer. A full description of the job will help make sure there is no confusion between such jobs as civil engineer, stationary engineer and railway engineer.

Once again, we want an accurate report of the amount of time this task takes. Please complete the following two questions:

How much class time was spent in completing the questionnaires? $\qquad$
How much additional time did it take you to check replies, complete forms for absentees, check office records, etc.
please place this letter and the Every Student Survey sheets in the envelope for your class and return it to your principal, whom we have asked to arrange for the collection and the return of this letter and the completed student questionnaires.

Thank you,
/log
Enclosures

E. N. WRIGHT, Ed.D., Director of Research.

THI: BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO

Dear Teacher:

On April 3rd the Board asked to have the Every Student Survey up-dated. When the first study was done five years ago, there were very few Special Education programmes offered on a withdrawa? basis and resources centres and learning centres were rare or non-existent. Today there are many students who receive Special Education assistance who spend part of their time in regular classrooms.

Due to the present record-keeping procedures, there are many students to whom you are providing special assistance who are not identified within the records as Special Education students. In addition, it is probably that there are some students who have been assigned to your class but who spend part of their time in a regular classroom. In order to sort this out, and to make an accurate report, it is necessary to ask you to prepare a list on the enclosed sheets, of all the students for whom you provide regular help, as of May 1, 1975.

I realize that you may have to go to the office records in order to locate the I.D. number for the student, but this piece of information is essential in order to properly match this sheet with the Every Student Survey data.

In addition to this envel ope I expect that most of you have also received an envelope containing a set of labels such as have gone to every classroom teacher in the system. Please be sure --
(a) that the students for whom you received labels complete their forms and also include their names on this list;
(b) so that we may have an accurate record of the amount of time that this task takes, please record how much time it takes you to make up the list. $\qquad$ (amount of time)

Place the completed list and this letter back in the envelope and return it to your principal, whom we have asked to arrange for the collection of this material.

Thank you,
/lcg
Enclosure


## Dear Teacher:

On April 3rd the Board asked to have the Every Student Survey up-dated. When the first study was done five years ago, the only New Canadian students recorded were those in self-contained classrooms. To improve the quality and completeness of the data, we are including students who receive help on a withdrawal. basis as receiving Special English assistance.

Because of the present record-keeping procedures, most if not all of the students to whom you are providing Special English are not identified within the computer records as special Linglis'! (N.C.) students. In order to sort this out, and to make an accurate report, it is necessary to ask you to prepare a list on the ferciosed sheets of all the students for whom you provide regular help, as of May $1,1975$.

I realize that you will likely nave to go to the office records in order to locate the I.D. number for each student, but this piece of informatinn is essential in order to properly match this sheet with the Every Student Survey data.

In addition to this envelope, I expect that some of you have also received an envelope containing a set of labels such as have gone to every classroom teacher in the system. Please be sure --
(a) that the students for whom you received labels complete their forms and also include their names on this list;
(b) so that we may have an accurate record of the amount of time that this task takes, please record how much time it takes you to make up the list ....

Place the completed list and this letter back in the envelope and return it to your principal, whom we have asked to arrange for the collection of this material.
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TYPE OF PROGRAMME
 Pupil's Name
Last Name, First Name

Student I.D. Number
Number of Times Seen Per Week

Average Length of Each Visit in Minutes Bn,
リm...

## Dear Teacher:

The enclosed form is, I believe, self-explanatory. We would appreciate your help in having the forms completed by the students in your schonl. The information we are asking for will give us some kind of a profile to add to the profile we are obtaining about students in the regular programmes. Your help in this matter is appreciated.

Please attempt to have the forms completed for those students who are in the school on May 1, 1975.

Please indicate the amount of class time that this
task takes

How much additional time of yours did it take to organize the materials, package them, etc. $\qquad$
Please return this letter with your answers to the above questions when you return the above questionnaires. This information enables us to report the amount of work involved in collecting this information.


```
/lcg
Enclosures
```

E. N. WRIGHT, Ed.D., Director of Research.


Dear Teacher:

On April 3rd the Board asked to have the Every Student Survey up-dated. When the first study was done five years ago, the only Special Education students recorded were those in self-contained classrooms. To improve the quality and completeness of the data, we are including students who receive service in institutional settings.

Because of the present record-keeping procedures, most if not all of the students to whom you are providing special assistance are not identified within the computer records. In order to sort this out, and to make an accurate report, it is necessary to ask you to have information about the students for whom you are providing help, as of May $1,1975$.

Please ask each student to complete the form -- of if necessary, help them complete it. For parents' occupations $I$ am interested in their parents at home. Please place the completed forms in the return envelope supplied and mail to the Research Department by May $12,1975$.

* So that we will know and can accurately report the time that such a task takes, please record how much time it takes to have the forms completed $\qquad$ (amount of time)

Thank you,

En cc.

E. N. WRIGHT, Ed.D., Director of Research.

```
* p.S. Please return this letter with the completed forms so that we can
    compute the amount of time for everyone.
```

Note: This information is not for the permanent school record.
Name: $\qquad$ School: $\qquad$

PLACE LAEEL HERE ON COMPLETED FORMS


Note: This information is not for the permanent school record.
Name: $\qquad$ School:

## PLACE LABEL HERE ON COMPLETED FORMS

Was English the first language you learned to speak? . . . . . . . . . . . . YES NO $\square$

Check the boxes and fill in the blanks that apply to you.
How many years have you been in high school, including this year? $\qquad$ years.

At what level are you taking most of your courses this year?...... Level $\qquad$ Were you born in Canada? YES What province?
No What country?
If you answered "No," how old were you
when you came to Canada? ............... $\qquad$


No What country?
If you answered "No," how old were you
when you came to Canada? ...............
No What country?
If you answered "No," how old were you
when you came to Canada? ............ $\qquad$
$\qquad$ years old.

Do not write in this space.

## the every student survey data sheet, may 1975

Five years ago the Every Student Survey helped to provide us with a picture of the different students in the school system so that we could better know their needs and services required. We are repeating this survey. To make it more complete, we are inviting your help by giving us the information we ask for below. The information is for the use of the school system; none of it appears on any individual's record.

Name: $\qquad$ Sex:

Date of Birth:

## School:

Check the boxes and fill in the blanks that apply to you.

Were you born in Canada? YES

$\square$
What province? $\qquad$

No

ryWhat country? $\qquad$
If you answered "NO," how old were you when you came to Canada? $\qquad$ years old.

Do not write in this space.

If you were ',rn in Canada, how many years of formal
education did you have before you came
to the Adult Day School? ............
$\qquad$ years

If you were not born in Canada, how many years of formal education did you have before you came tc Canada? ... $\qquad$ years
and How many years of formal education did you have after you came to Canada, but before you came to the Adult Day School? ........... $\qquad$ years


Was English the first language you learned to speak? YES
 If you answered "NO," what language did you learn to speak first? .. $\qquad$

Did you learn to speak English and another
language at the same time? YES


NO


> If you answered "YES," what was the other language?

What was your last occupation before coming
to the Adult Day School? .............. $\qquad$ 1920
If you were born in another country and worked
there, what was the last job you had before
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## THE EVERY STUDENT SURVEY DATA SHEET, MAY 1975

Vote: This information is not for the permanent school record.
Name: $\qquad$ Name of last school attended:

In what town on city is this bchool located:
Date of Birth:
day month year

Sex: $\qquad$
What grade are you in now:


THE EVERY STLUDENT SURVEY DATA SHEET, MAY 1975
Note: This information is not for the permanent school record.
Name:
Name of lest

In what town or city is this school located:
Date of Birth:
day month year

Sex: $\qquad$
What grade are you in now:

| Check the boxes and fill in the blanks that apply to you. | Do not urite inthis space. |
| :---: | :---: |
| How many years have you been in high school, including this year? ___ years. |  |
| At that level are you taking most of your courses this year?....... Level $^{\text {che }}$ |  |
|  | $\square$ |
| If you answered "NO," how old were you when you came to Canada? $\qquad$ $\qquad$ years old. | Lis |
| ```Was English the first language you learned to speak? ............. yes \square] No I If you answered "NO," what language did you learn to speak first? ..``` $\qquad$ | لـLl |
| ```Did you leam to speak English and another language at the same time? ...................................... yes \square\square no \square If you answered "YES," what was the other language?``` | $\underline{L}$ |
| How often do your parents speak English at home? (check one) NEVER | $L_{17}$ |
| always |  |
| Are both parents alive and living with you? (check one) BOTH | $L_{18}$ |
| ONLY FATHEF |  |
| NEITHER |  |
| What is your father's job now? |  |
| What is your mother's job now? | L |
| If neither parent lives with you, what is the job of the head of the household where you live? $\qquad$ | $L_{21 \frac{22}{}}$ |
| O1C 70 |  |
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Table 17 - Other Unclassified Countries of Birth
Table 18 - Two Language Combinations Reportied by Students as First Language Learned
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TABLE 17
OTHER COUNTRIES OF BIRTH INCLUDED IN E.S.S.

| Country of Birth | Elementary | Secondary | Total Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aden | . - | 1 | 1 |
| Albania | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Angola | 7 | 3 | $10^{*}$ |
| Antigua . | 2 | - | 2 |
| Arabia | . - | 3 | 3 |
| Aruba | - | 2 | $\cdots$ |
| Bermuda | 8 | 1 | 9 |
| Borrneo ... | . 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Bulgaria | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| Cameroons ... | 2 | - | 2 |
| Casablanca | 2 | - | 2 |
| Channel Islands | . - | 1 | 1 |
| Curacao ..... | 1 | - | 1 |
| Congo - | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Costa Rica ... | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Croatia ... | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Dominica | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| El Salvador | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| Estonia | 1 | - | 1 |
| Ethiopia | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Ghana . . | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| Guinea .... | 4 | - | 4 |
| Iraq ........ | $\cdots 1$ | 1 |  |
| Isle of Man .. | .. 1 | - | 1 |
| Kenya .... | 1 | - | 1 |
| Kampala | . 1 | - | 1 |
| Kuwait | - 2 | - | 2 |
| Latvia | . | 1 | 1 |
| Lebanon | 5 | 6 | 11 |
| Liberia | 2 | $\bar{\square}$ | 2 |
| Lithuania | . - | 6 | 6 |
| Macedonia | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| Madeira .... | .. - | 2 | 2 |
| Martinique | 1 | - | 1 |
| Mauritius | . 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Mozambique . | - 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Nairobi . . . . . . | . 2 | - | 2 |
| Nauru . . . . | . 2 | $\bar{\square}$ | 2 |
| Nevis | .. - | 4 | 4 |
| New Guinea | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Nicaraugua . | ... - | 3 | 3 |
| Nigeria .... | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| Fuerto Rico | 6 | - | 6 |
| Ruwanda .. | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Saint George | 1 | - | 1 |
| Saint Thomas . | . 1 | - | 1 |
| Santa Cruz ... | ... l | - | 1 |

*included in Portugal

TABLE 17
(continued)

| Country of Birth | Elementary | Secondary | Total Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saudi Arabia | 1 | - | 1 |
| Sicily | 5 | 18 | $23 *$ |
| Singapore | 9 | - | 9 |
| Slovenia | 1 | - | 1 |
| Sudan | 1 | - | 1 |
| Surinam | . - | 1 | 1 |
| Tasmania | 1 | - | 1 |
| Thailand | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Timor | - | 1 | 1 |
| Tonga | 1 | - | 1 |
| Tunisia | . - | 1 | 1 |
| Vir in Is.lands | 1 | - | 1 |
| Wesc Africa | 1 | - | 1 |
| Zanzibar | 1 | - | 1 |
| Zaire | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Zambia | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| GRAND TOTAL |  |  | 231 |

*included in Italy
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TABLE 18
TWO LANGUAGE COMBINATIONS REPORTED BY STUDENTS AS FYRST LANGUAGE LEARNED


TABLE 18 (continued)


TABLE 18

## (Continued)

| Language |  | Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chinese plus: | Bicol | 1 |
|  | Burmese | 7 |
|  | Filipino | 3 |
|  | Hindi | 3 |
|  | Indian | 1 |
|  | Indonesian | 1 |
|  | Japanese | 1 |
|  | Malay | 1 |
|  | Taiwanese | 2 |
|  | Trinidadian | 1 |
| TOTAL |  | 21 |
| Finnish plus: | Swedish | 1 |
|  | Turkish | 1 |
| TOTAL |  | 2 |
| Hindi plus: | Bengali | 3 |
|  | Malayalam | 1 |
|  | Punjabi | 11 |
|  | Sanskrit | $\geq$ |
| TOTAL |  | 16 |
| Swahili plus: | Gujarat: | 5 |
|  | Indian | 1 |
| TOTAL |  | 6 |
| Kachi plus: | Gujarati | 1 |
|  | Surahili | $\underline{7}$ |
| TOTAL |  | 2 |
| Other Combinations |  |  |
| Turkish + Swedish |  | 1 |
| Mandarin + Cantonese |  | 2 |
| Arabic + Armenian |  | 1 |
| Arabic + Hawaian |  | 1 |
| Korean + Japanese |  | 1 |
| Punjabi + Urdu |  | 2 |
| Tagalog + Vis a |  | 1 |
| Swedish + Albarian |  | 1 |
| Africans + Portuguese |  | 1 |
| Ẏddish + Hebrew |  | 3 |
| TOTAL |  | 14 |

TABLE 18 (continued)


## APPENDIX C <br> Summary of Results for Adult Day School

## Adult Day School

There were a total of 339 students in the Adult Day Schcol who completed the forms.

## Place of Origin

Of these 339 students $45.7 \%$ were born in Canada. Of this group, 81.3\%.
came from Ontario and 18.7\% from other provinces; $86.5 \%$ spoke English as a first language.

There were $54.0 \%$ of the Adult Day School students who were born outside of Canada. Of this group $58.3 \%$ of this group came from the West Indies. With the largest percentage (34.9\%) from Jamaica.

## Languages

1) Born in Canada, English first language
39.5\%
2) Born in Canada, English not first language 6.2\%
3) Not born in Canada, English first language
34.2\%
4) Not born in Canada, English not first language 19.8\%

Years of Formal Education for Students, Born in Canaaa, Before Attending Day School
Almost $1 / 2$ of this group have no high school education at all.
8 and under 43.98
9-10
$31.0 \%$
11-12
18.18

Years of iormal Education for Students, not Born in Canada, Defore Attending Day School

| 3 and under | $43.5 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $9-10$ | $25.5 \%$ |
| $11-12$ | $15.8 \%$ |

Years of Formal Education After Arrival in Canada, but Before Day School
0 years of additional education
42.9\%

1-2
38.0\%

3 ... 4
6.0\%

Age on Arrival
Of the students not born in Canada, $15.2 \%$ arrived in Canada before
they were 16 and $69.0 \%$ were between the ages of $16-30$ when they came.
Employment Before Day School
Of those who had been employed before coming to Adult Day School,
$36.0 \%$ of the total group were in occupational category $2 ; 9.4 \%$ were in category 3;
$20.4 \%$ were in categories 5 and 6 combined. Of the students $20.1 \%$ either had not been employed or provided no information, with $70.6 \%$ of this group being female.

Of those not born in Canada, $13.6 \%$ reported their last job held in their homeland as occupational category 2, while $23.4 \%$ were in categories 5 and 6 . Age of Students (as of May 1,1975 )

Of the tota group of students, $15.3 \%$ were aged $16-20,20.4 \%$ were
21-25, $17.4 \%$ were $26-30,12.7 \%$ were $31-35$ and 12.1 were $36-40$. Sex of Students

The percentage of male Adult Day School students was 40.1 and the
percentage of female Adult Day School students was 59.9.

APPENDIX D

Summary of Results for Students in Institutions
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## Institurions

This group was divided into five sections. They were as follows:

1) Group Homes (total of 35 students)

- Clifton House
- Bethany Girls Home
- Earlscourt
- Tempus

2) Hospitals (total of 61)

- Sick Children's
- St. Michael's
- Princess Margaret
- Lyndhurst Lodge

3) Youthdale (total of 13)
4) Detention Home (total of 13)
5) Emotional (total of 56)

- Clarke Institution
- Hincks
-     - zueen St.

There are a total of 178 students reported in varying institutions. Hospitals have the highest representation, reporting 34.3\%.

Hospitals
Emotional
Group Homes
Detention Homes
Youthdale
34. 3\%
31.5\%
$19.7 \%$
7. 3\%
7. 3 \%

Place of Origin
Of the 178 students in institutions $85.4 \%$ were born in Canada. Of
the total group, 74.2 q came from Ontario and $11.2 \%$ from other provinces. The majority, $82.9 \%$, spoke English as their first language.

Of the $14.6 \%$ students who were born outside of Canada no country was significantly represented.

## -61 - <br> the every student survey data sheet, may 1975

(special elementary form)

Note: This information is not for the permanent school record.
Name:
Name of last
$\qquad$
In what town or city is this school located:
Date of Birth:
day month year

Sex: $\qquad$
What grade are you in now:
Check the boxes and fill in the blanks that apply to you.

Did you learn to speak English and another

What is your father's job now?
What is your, mother's job now?
If neither parent lives with you, what is the
job of the head of the household where you live?


No $D$ What country? $\qquad$
If you answered "NO," how old were you when you came to Canada? years old.


If you answered "YES," what was the other language? .........

How often do your parents speak English at home? (check one)

| NEVER | $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| SOMETIMES | $\square$ |
| ALWAYS | $\square$ |
|  |  |
| BOTT: | $\square$ |
| ONLY MOTHER | $\square$ |
| ONLY FATHER | $\square$ |
| NEITHER | $\square$ |

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Do not write inthis space.


1 | 1213 |
| :--- |

$\xrightarrow[14]{L_{14}}$ did you lean to speak first? .. $\qquad$


Note: This information is not for the permanent school record.
Name: $\qquad$ Name of last

In what town or city is this school located: $\qquad$
Date of Birth:
day month year

Sex: $\qquad$
What grade are you in now:
Check the boxes and fill in the blanks that apply to you.
How many years have you been in high school, including this year? $\qquad$ years.

At that level are you taking most of your courses this year?....... Level $\qquad$
Were you born in Canada? yES $\square$ What province? no

$\square$what country? $\qquad$
If you answered "NO," how old were you when you came to Canada? $\qquad$ years old.

Was English the first language you learned to speak? $\square \mathrm{m} \square$
If you answered "NO," what language did you lear to speak first? ..

Did you learn to speak English and another
language at the same time


If you answered "Yes," what was the other language? .........

How often do your parents speak English at home? (check one)

Are both parents alive and living with you? (check one)

| NEVER | $\square$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| SOMETIMES | $\square$ |
| always | $\square$ |
| BOTH | $\square$ |
| ONLY MOTHER | $\square$ |
| ONLY FATHER | $\square$ |
| NEITHER | $\square$ |

What is your father's job now?
$\square$
What is your mother's job now?
If neither parent lives with you, what is the
job of the head of the household where you live? $\qquad$


Do not write in this space.

$\xrightarrow[14]{\square}$

APPENDIX B
(Tables 17 and 18)

Table 17 - Other Unclassified Countries of Birth
Table 18 - Two Language Combinations Reported by Students as
First Language Learned

TABLE 17

OTHER COUNTRIES OF BIRTH INCLUDED IN E.S.S.

| Country of Birth | Elementary | Secondary | Total Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aden .......... | - | 1 | 1 |
| Albania | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Angola | 7 | 3 | 10* |
| Antigua | 2 ' | - | 2 |
| Arabia | . - | 3 | 3 |
| Aruba | - - | 2 | $\stackrel{\square}{*}$ |
| Bermuda | . 8 | 1 | 9 |
| Borneo | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Bulgaria | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| Cameroons | 2 | - | 2 |
| Casablanca | 2 | - | 2 |
| Channel Islands | . - | 1 | 1 |
| Curacao | 1 | - | 1 |
| Congo . | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Costa Rica | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Croatia | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Dominica | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| El Salvador | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| Estonia . | 1 | - | 1 |
| Ethiopia | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Ghana . . | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| Guinea | 4 | - | 4 |
| Iraq ....... | 1 | 1 |  |
| Isle of Man | 1 | - | 1 |
| Kenya ... | 1 | - | 1 |
| Kampala | 1 | - | 1 |
| Kuwait | 2 | - | 2 |
| Latvia | . - | 1 | 1 |
| Lebanon | 5 | 6 | 11 |
| Liberia | - 2 | - | 2 |
| Lithuania | .. - | 6 | 6 |
| Macedonia | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| Madeira | - | 2 | 2 |
| Martinique | 1 | - | 1 |
| Mauritius | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Mozainbique | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Nairobi . . . | 2 | - | 2 |
| Nauru . . . . | 2 | - | 2 |
| Nevis . | ... - | 4 | 4 |
| New Guinea . | 1 | - | 1 |
| Nicaraugua | .. - | 3 | 3 |
| Nigeria . | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| Puerto Rico | 6 | - | 6 |
| Ruwanda .... | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Saint George | 1 | - | 1 |
| Saint Thomas | . 1 | - | 1 |
| Santa Cruz . | .. 1 | - | 1 |

*included in Portugal

TABLE 17
(continued)

| Country of Birth | Elementary | Secondary | Total Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saudi Arabia | 1 | - | 1 |
| Sicily | 5 | 18 | 23* |
| Singapore | 9 | - | 9 |
| Slovenia | 1 | - | 1 |
| Sudan | 1 | - | 1 |
| Surinam | - | 1 | 1 |
| Tasmania | 1 | - | 1 |
| Thailand | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Timor | . - | 1 | 1 |
| Tonga | 1 | - | 1 |
| Tunisia | - | 1 | 1 |
| Vir in Islands | 1 | - | 1 |
| Wesc Africa | 1 | - | 1 |
| Zanzibar | 1 | - | 1 |
| Zaire | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Zambia | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| GRAND TOTAL |  |  | 231 |

*included in Italy

TABLE 18
TWO LANGUAGE COMBINATIONS REPORTED BY STUDENTS AS FIRST LANGUAGE LEARNED


TABLE 18 (continued)


TABLE 18
(Continued)

| Language |  | Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chinese plus: | Bicol | 1 |
|  | gurmese | 7 |
|  | Filipino | 3 |
|  | Hindi | 3 |
|  | Indian | 1 |
|  | Indonesian | 1 |
|  | Japanese | 1 |
|  | Malay | 1 |
|  | Taiwanese | 2 |
|  | Trinidadian | $\underline{1}$ |
| TOTAL |  | 21 |
| Finnish plus: | Swedisin | $1$ |
|  | Turkish | $1$ |
| TOTAL |  | 2 |
| Hindi plus: | Bengali | 3 |
|  | Malayalam | 1 |
|  | Punjabi | 11 |
|  | Sanskrit | 2 |
| TOTAL |  | 16 |
| Swahili plus: | Gujarat ${ }^{\text {: }}$ | 5 |
|  | Indian | $\underline{1}$ |
| TOTAL |  | 6 |
| Kachi plus: | Gujarati | 1 |
|  | Surahili | $\geq$ |
| TOTAL |  | 2 |

Other Combinations
Turkish + Swedish 1
Mandarin + Cantonese 2
Arabic + Armenian $\quad 1$
nrabic + Hawaian !
Korean + Japanese 1
Punjabi + Urdu 2
Tagalog + Vis ra 1
:Swedish + Albarian l
Africans + Portuguest 1
Yiddish + Hebrew 3

TOTAL

TABLE 18
(continued)


## APPENDIX C

Summary of Results for Adult Day Schoos

Adult Day School

There were a total of 339 students in the Adult Day Schcol who completed the forms.

Place of Origin
Of these 339 students $45.7 \%$ were born in Canada. Of this group, 81.3\% came from Ontario and 18.7\% from other provinces; $86.5 \%$ spoke English as a first language.

There were $54.0 \%$ of the Adult Day School students who were born outside of Canaria. Of this group $58.3 \%$ of this group came from the West Indies. With the largest percentage (34.9\%) from Jamaica.

## Languages

1) Born in Canada, English first language 39.5\%
2) Born in Canada, English not first language
3) Not born in Canada, English first language
34.2\%
4) Not born in Canada, English not first language 19.8\%

Years of Formal Education for Students, Born in Canaaa, Before Attending Day School
Almost $1 / 2$ of this group have no high school education at all.
8 and under 43.9\%
9-10 31.0\%
11-12 18.1\%
Years of rormal Education for Studenis, not Born in Canada, Before Attending Day School
3 and under 43.5\%
9-10 25.5\%
11-12
15.8\%

Years of Formal Education After Arrival in Canada, but Before Day School
0 years of additional education $42.9 \%$

1-2
38.0\%

3 ... 4 6.0\%

Age on Arrival

Of the students not born in Canada, $15.2 \%$ arrived in Canada before they were 16 and $69.0 \%$ were between the ages of $16-30$ when they came. Employment Before Day School

Of those who had been employed before coming to Adult Day School, 36.0\% of the total group were in occupational category 2; 9.4\% were in category 3; $20.4 \%$ were in categories 5 and 6 combined. Of the students $20.1 \%$ either had not been employed or provided no information, with $70.6 \%$ of this group being female.

Of those not born in Canada, $13.6 \%$ reported their last job held in their homeland as occupational category 2, while $23.4 \%$ were in categories 5 and 6 . Age of Students (as of May 1, 1975)

Of the tota group of students, 15.38 were aged $16-20,20.4 \%$ were 21-25, $17.4 \%$ were $26-30,12.7 \%$ were $31-35$ and $12.1 \%$ were $36-40$. Sex of Students

The percentage of male Adult Day School students was 40.1 and the percentage of female Adult Day School students was 59.9.

```
    APPENDIX D
Summary of Results for Students in Institutions
```

This group was divided into five sections. They were as follows:

1) Group Homes (total of 35 students)

- Clifton House
- Bethany Girls Home
- Earlscourt
- Tempus

2) Hospitals (total of 61)

- Sick Children's
- St. Michael's
- Princess Margaret
- Lyndhurst Lodge

3) Youthdale (total of 13)
4) Detention Home (total of 13)
5) Emotional (total of 56)

- Clarke Institution
- Hincks
…- - -
There are a total of 178 students reported in varying institutions.
Hospitals have the highest representation, reporting 34.3\%.

Hospitals
Emotional
Group Fiomes
Detention Homes
Youthdale
34. 3\%
31.5\%
$19.7 \%$
$7.3 \%$
7. 3\%

Place of Origin
Of the 178 students in institutions $85.4 \%$ were born in Canada. Of
the total group, $74.2 \%$ came from Ontario and $11.2 \%$ from other provinces. The majority, 82.9\%, spoke English as their first language.

Of the $14.6 \%$ students who were born outside of Canada no country was significantly represented.

Of these studerits $46.6 \%$ previcusly attended Toronto schools and 53.4\% came from schools outside of Toronto.

## Languages

The majority of the students were born in Canada and spoke English as their first language.

1) Born in Canada, English first language
$70.8 \%$
2) Born in Canada, Engiish not first language
3) Not born in Canada, English first language
$6.2 \%$
4) Not born in Canada, English not first language

Of those students who were borm in Canada, but are not English-speaking, 26.9\% speak French and 23.1\% speak German. Students who were not born in Canada and who are not English-speaking are not significantly represented in any one language group.

## Sex oi Students

In every category, there were more males than females. Of the students who were in the "emotional" institutions, $76.8 \%$ were male. Group homes also had a high representation of males, having 75.3\%. Youthdale reporced 69.2\% males, hospitals 59.is and detention homes 33.8\%.

## Age of Arrival

There is no na for age of arrival, given the small number of students born outside of Can a. Ages of Students (as of May 1 .975)

The ages of the stur snts varied according to the individual institucions.

In the group homes, $45.7 \%$ of the students were aged $14-16$. In the detention home, all of the students were between $13-15$ years of age. Similarily, in Youthdale, all students weze between ll-15 years of age.

It is easier to examine the ages of the students in hospitals and "emotional" institutions through reference to the following chaxt.

|  | Hospitals | Emotional |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 8 and under | $27.9 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ |
| $9-12$ | $36.1 \%$ | $23.2 \%$ |
| $13-16$ | $24.6 \%$ | $46.4 \%$ |

Levels of High School

Of the five institutions involved, few reported students at the
high school level.

| Youthdale | $15.4 \%$ - in high school |
| :--- | :--- |
| Hospitals | $18.0 \%$ |
| Emotional | $39.3 \%$ |
| Group nome | $9.5 \%$ |
| Detention home | $80.0 \%$ |

In the group home, $52.9 \%$ of the students wert in levels $1,2,3$ or a combination of 2 and 3. In the "emotional" institutions, $68.2 \%$ were in levels 3, 4 or 5 . None of the other institutions reported any $\dot{\text { itstinct trends at any }}$ of the levtis.

Parents' Jobs
In four of the five institutions (they being the detention home, hospitals, "emotional" irs -itutions and group homes) approximately $1 / 4$ of the fathers had jobs in category 2.

Detention Home 23.1\%
Hospitals 25.4\%
Emotional 26.8\%
Group ilomes 28.6\%

No other categories had significant representation.

One interesting finding refers to the single parent household. Amost all these institutions, with the exception of the hospitals, reported approximately $1 / 3$ cf their families to be of a single parent status. Youthdale, in fact, reported over l/2.

| Hospitals | $18.2 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Detention home | $30.8 \%$ |
| Group home | $31.4 \%$ |
| Emotional | $32.1 \%$ |
| Youthciale | $69.2 \%$ |

(N.B. It should be kept in mind that the total number of students in Youthdale and the detention home are very small.)

## APPENDIX E

Table 19 - Level of Study Recorded by Secondary School Students

TABLE 19
LEVEL OF STUDY RECORDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS (Recorded levels collapsed into five codes)

| LEVEL RECORDED bY STUDEIT | NO. OF STUDENTS | CODED IEVEL* | NO. OF STUDENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1, 1 and 2 | 174 | 1 | 174 |
| 2 | 998 | 2 | 1049 |
| 2 and 3 | 51 |  |  |
| 3 | 3282 | 3 | 3314 |
| 3 and 4 | 32 |  |  |
| 4 | 6945 | 4 | 7113 |
| 4 and 5 | 168 |  |  |
| 5 | 16907 | 5 | 18420 |
| 5 and 6, 6 | 1513 |  |  |
| TOTAL | 3007C |  | 30070 |

* These five codes used in tabies in text.

> APPENDIX F
> Sex Distributi
> (Tables $20-25$

Table 20 - Classes Attended by Elementary School Students
Table 23 - Level of Study Attended by Secondary School Students
Table 22 - Level of Study atterded by Secondary School Students Not Born in Canada for Whom English Mocher Tongue (categorized by age on arrival)

Table 23 - Level of Study Attended by Secondary School Students Not Born in Cansia for Whom English iscic Mother Tongue (categorızed by age on arrival)

Table 24 - Classes Attended by Elementary School Students (categorized by occupation of household head)
Table 25 - Level of Study Attended by Secondary School Students (categorized by occupation of household head)

TABLE 20

CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS
(Categorized as to whether or not born in Canada and whether or not English was mother tongue, and by sex)

| Student <br> Back ground Code* | N |  | PERCENTAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Grade 1-8** |  | Specia |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } 1 \\ \hline 1970 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & s \mathrm{~s} \\ & \frac{\mathrm{c}^{* * *}}{1975} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 1975 | 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1975 | 1970 | 1975 | 1970 | 1975 |  |  |
| 1-Male | 12333 | 17109 | 87.9 | 92.5 | 6.9 | 5.2 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 3.0 |
| 1-Fema 1.e | 11532 | 16140 | 92.8 | 95.2 | 5.1 | 3.7 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| 2-Male | 6006 | 7081 | 93.8 | 94.1 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 0.7 |
| 2-Female | 6021 | 6932 | 95.9 | 96.3 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 0.1 |
| 3-Male | 2186 | 1564 | 93.1 | 94.2 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.0 |
| 3-Female | 2109 | 1480 | 95.9 | 96.8 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| 4-Male | 5114 | 5628 | 93.2 | 92.7 | 5.6 | 6.2 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.3 |
| 4-Female | 4760 | 5340 | 95.0 | 95.5 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.1 |
| TOTAL | $50061{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $61412^{\text {b }}$ | 92.5 | 94.2 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 1. 5 | 1.7 | 1.0 |

```
* See page 23 for cavr!m.." description
** Includes ungraded clseses; does not include Kindergarten and Special English
    Class.
*** In 1970, Special Class "B" included "C".
a Missing observations = 1209 (includes students in special English classes).
b No information for }138\mathrm{ students.
```

table $2 i$
LEVEL OF STUDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS (Categorized as to whether or nol born in Canada, whether or not English mother tongue, and by sex)

| Backgrow 1 |  | SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL** |  |  |  | TOTAL <br> Per Cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code * | N | 1 and | 3 |  | 5 |  |
|  |  | \% | , \% | \% | \% |  |
| 1-Male | 6802 | 5.9 | 13.1 | 23.9 | 57.2 | 100.1 |
| 1-Female | 6257 | 3.3 | 11.6 | 21.4 | 63.7 | 100.0 |
| 2-Male | 3556 | 2.2 | 8.6 | 23.3 | 65.9 | 100.0 |
| 2-Female | 3347 | 1.9 | $\bullet .7$ | 22.2 | 69.1 | 99.9 |
| 3-Male | 1103 | 6.2 | 13.2 | 18.4 | 62.1 | 99.9 |
| 3-Female | 1093 | 3.4 | 10.2 | 19.2 | 67.2 | 100.0 |
| 4-Male | 4244 | 4.5 | 11.3 | 26.9 | 57.3 | 100.0 |
| 4-Female | 3677 | 4.9 | 11.6 | 27.9 | 55.6 | 100.0 |
| total per cent |  | 4.1 | 11.0 | 23.7 | 61.3 | 100.1 |
| TOTAL | $30079{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1223 | 3314 | 7113 | 18420 |  |

* See text for code desctiption.
** See Appendix E.
a No information for 936 students.


## TABLE 22

LEVEL OF STUDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS NOT BORN IN CANADA FOR WHOM ENGLISH WAS THE MCTHER TONGUE (categorized by age on arrival. and sex)


* See Appendix E.
a No information for 21 students

TABLE 73

LEVEJ, OF STTJDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS
(categorized by sex, age on arrival, and not borr in Canacia, English not mother tongue)

| Age on |  | SECONDASY SCHOOL LEVEL* Total |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arrival | N | 1 dra 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Per Cent |
|  |  | $\%$ | \% | \% | $\%$ |  |
| $1-6 \mathrm{Male}$ | 1242 | 3.2 | 21.6 | 33.1 | 52.1 | 100.0 |
| i-6 Female | 1166 | 3.8 | 10.1 | 34.0 | 52.1 | 100.0 |
| 7-11 Male | 1383 | 6.5 | 16.5 | 30.9 | 46.1 | 100.0 |
| 7-11 Female | 1251 | 7.2 | 15.3 | 32.5 | 45.0 | 100.0 |
| 12-15 Male | 920 | 6.1 | 11.2 | 27.2 | 55.5 | 100.0 |
| 12-15 Female | $79^{7}$ | 6.1 | 14.0 | 22.3 | 57.6 | 100.0 |
| $16+$ over (M) | 556 | U. 8 | 0.7 | 9.5 | 89.0 | 100.0 |
| $16+$ over (F) | 372 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 12.4 | 86.3 | '00.0 |
| TOTAL PER CENT |  | 4.8 | $11.8$ | $28.2$ | $55.2$ | 100.0 |
| TOTAL NO. | $7681{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 372 | 904 | 2167 | 4238 |  |

* See Appendix E
a No information for 72 students

TABLE 24

CIASSYS ATTENED BY LLEMENTARY SCHOOL STDDENTS
(categori: 1 by occuparion of head of household and sex)

| OCCUPATION | SEX | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Grade |  |  |  |  |  | TotalPer Cent |  |
|  |  |  | Jr. Kind | Sr. Kind | 1-8 | A | B | C |  |  |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | $\%$ | 8 | 8 | $\%$ |  |  |
| 2 labourers, taxi drivers | male <br> female | $\begin{aligned} & 13539 \\ & 12832 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.4 \\ & 7.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.1 \\ & 9.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75.8 \\ & 78.2 \end{aligned}$ | 5.3 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 100.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 100.0 |  |
| 3 sheetmetal workers mechanics | male | 1959 | 7.2 | 10.5 | 75.5 | 4.3 | 1.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.4 \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |  |
|  | female | 1918 | 8.9 | 10.2 | 76.2 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 1 |
| 4 sales clerks, machinists | male <br> female | $\begin{aligned} & 977 \\ & 939 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.3 \\ & 6.6 \end{aligned}$ | 10.0 | 74.2 | 5.93.5 | 1.61.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 99.8 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ | 0 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 8.5 | 80.0 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 5 printing workers, electricians | male <br> female | $\begin{aligned} & 2703 \\ & 2508 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.2 \\ & 8.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.8 \\ 10.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77.2 \\ & 78.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.1 \\ & 1.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.9 \\ & 0.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 99.9 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 dental technicians embalmers | male female | 2457 | 6.8 | 9.4 | $\begin{aligned} & 77.7 \\ & 78.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.0 \\ & 2.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \\ & 1.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.9 \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | 2360 | 8.2 | 9.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 musicians, athletes | male <br> female | $\begin{aligned} & 885 \\ & 884 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.8 \\ & 7.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.1 \\ 9.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75.9 \\ & 80.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.3 \\ & 1.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \\ & 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.3 \\ & 0.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.1 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 clergymen, Librarians | male <br> female | $\begin{aligned} & 1465 \\ & 1338 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.9 \\ & 9.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.0 \\ 9.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76.8 \\ & 79.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.9 \\ & 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.5 \\ & 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99.9 \\ & 99.9 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 accountants, engineers lawyers | male <br> female | $\begin{aligned} & 2715 \\ & 2617 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.2 \\ & 9.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.6 \\ 3.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77.0 \\ & 79.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \\ & 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \\ & 0.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.5 \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 retired, Horkman's Compensation | male <br> female | $\begin{aligned} & 189 \\ & 192 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 1.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.3 \\ & 2.6 \end{aligned}$ | 78.378.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 10.6 \\ & 14.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.1 \\ & 2.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.1 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 94 |

TABLIZ 24
Continued


Of these studerts $46.6 \%$ previcusly attended Toronto schools and
53.4\% came from schools outside of Toronto.

## Languages

The majority of the students were born in Canada and spoke English as their first language.

1) Born in Canada, English first language 70.8\%
2) Born in Canada, Engiish not first language 14.6\%
3) Not born in Canada, English first language 6.2\%
4) Not borm in Canada, English not first language 7.3\%

Of those students who were born in Canada, but are not English-speaking, 26.9\% speak French and 23.1\% speak German. Students who were not born in Canada and who are not English-speaking are not significantly represented in any one language group.

Sex oi Students
In every category, there were more males than females. Of the students who were in the "emotional" institutions, $76.8 \%$ were male. Group homes also had a high representation of males, having 75.3\%. Youthdale reported 69.2\% males, hospitals 59.i\% and detention homes $33.8 \%$.

## Age of Arrival

There is no ni for age of arrival, given the small number of students born outside of Can a. Ages of Students (as of May 1 975)

The ages of the stursnts varied according to the individual institucions.
In the group homes, $45.7 \%$ of the students were aged $14-16$. In the detention home, all of the students were between $13-15$ years of age. Similarily, in Youthdale, all students we-z between ll-15 years of age.

It is easier to examine the ages of tre students in hospitals and "emotional" institutions through reference to the following chaxt.

8 and under
27.9\%
14.3\%

9-12
13-16
36.1\%
24.6\%
23.2\%
46.4\%

## Levels of High School

Of the five institutions involved, few reported students at the
high school level.

| Youthdale | $15.4 \%$ - in high school |
| :--- | :--- |
| Hospitals | $18.0 \%$ |
| Emotional | $39.3 \%$ |
| Group nome | $9.5 \%$ |
| Detention home | $80.0 \%$ |

In the group home, 52.9\% of the students wert in levels $1,2,3$ or a combination of 2 and 3. In the "emotional" institutions, $68.2 \%$ were in levels 3, 4 or 5. None of the other institutions reported any $2 i s t i n c t$ trends at any of the levels.

Parents' Jobs
In four of the five institutions (they being the detention home, hospitals, "emotional" irs-itutions and group homes) approximately $1 / 4$ of the fathers had jobs in category 2.

| Detention Home | $23.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hospitals | $25.4 \%$ |
| Emotional | $26.8 \%$ |
| Group Zomes | $28.6 \%$ |

No other categories had significant representation.
One interesting finding refers to the single parent household. Amost
all these institutions, with the exception of the hospitals, reported approximately $1 / 3$ of their families to be of a single parent status. Youthdale, in fact, reported over $1 / 2$.

| Hospitals | $18.2 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Detention home | $30.8 \%$ |
| Group home | $31.4 \%$ |
| Emotional | $32.1 \%$ |
| Youthciale | $69.2 \%$ |

(N.B. It should be kept in mind that the total number of students in Youthdale and the detention home are very small.)

## APPENDIX E

Table 19 - Level of Study Recorded by Secondary School Students

## TABLE 19

LEVEL OF STUDY RECORDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS
(Recorded levels collapsed into five codes)

| LEVEL RECORDED BY STUDEITT | No. OF STUDENTS | CODED LEVEL* | NO. OF STUDENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1, 1 and 2 | 174 | 1 | 174 |
| 2 | 998 | 2 | 1049 |
| 2 and 3 | 51 |  |  |
| 3 | 3282 | 3 | 3314 |
| 3 and 4 | 32 |  |  |
| 4 | 6945 | 4 | 7113 |
| 4 and 5 | 168 |  |  |
| 5 | 16907 | 5 | 18420 |
| 5 and 6, 6 | 1513 |  |  |
| TOTAL | 3007 C |  | 30070 |

* These five codes used in tabies in text.

```
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Table 20 - Classes Attended by Elementary School Students
Table 23 - Level of Study Attended by Secondary School Students
Table 22 - Level of Study atterded by Secondary School Students Not Born in Canada for Whom English Mocher Tongue (categorized by age on arrival)

Table 23 - Level of Study Attended by Secondary School Students Not Born in Canida for Whom English ict Mother Tongue (categorızed by age on arrival)

Table 24 - Classes Attended by Elementary School Students (categorized by occupation of household head)

Table 25 - Level of Study Attended by Secondary School Students (categorized by occupation of household head)

TABLE 20

CLASSES ATTEENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS (Categorized as to whether or not born in Canada and whether or not English was mother tongue, and by sex)


## TABLE 21

LEVEL OF STUDY ATTENDED BY SECOMDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS (Categorized as to whether or noi born in Canada, whether or not English mother tongue, and by sex)

| Backgrow: 1 |  | SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEI** |  |  |  | TOTAL Per Cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code * | N | 1 and | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
|  |  | 8 | \% | $\%$ | $\%$ |  |
| 1-Male | 6802 | 5.9 | 13.1 | 23.9 | 57.2 | 100.1 |
| 1-Female | 6257 | 3.3 | 11.6 | 21.4 | 63.7 | 100.0 |
| 2-Male | 3556 | 2.2 | 8.6 | 23.3 | 65.9 | 100.0 |
| 2-Female | 3347 | 1.9 | 6.7 | 22.2 | 69.1 | 99.9 |
| 3-Male | 1103 | 6.2 | . 13.2 | 18.4 | 62.1 | 99.9 |
| 3-Female | 1093 | 3.4 | 10.2 | 19.2 | 67.2 | 100.0 |
| 4-Male | 4244 | 4.5 | 11.3 | 26.9 | 57.3 | 100.0 |
| 4-Female | 3677 | 4.9 | 11.6 | 27.9 | 55.6 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL PER CENT |  | 4.1 | 11.0 | 23.7 | 61.3 | 100.1 |
| TOTAL | $30079{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1223 | 3314 | 7113 | 18420 |  |

* See text for code description.
** See Appendix $E$.
a No information for $93 E$ students.

TABLE 22

LEVEL OF STUDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS NOT RORN IN CANADA FOR WHOM ENGLISH WAS THE MCTHER TONGUE (categorized by age on arrival. and sex)

| Age on Arrival | N | SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL* |  |  |  | Total <br> Per Cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\frac{S E C O N}{1-\frac{\text { and }}{3}}$ | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
|  |  |  |  | \% | \% |  |
| 1-6 Male | 271 | 4.1 | 5.9 | 22.5 | 67.5 | 100.0 |
| 1-6 Female | 249 | 1.2 | 5.6 | 24.5 | 68.7 | 100.0 |
| 7-11 Male | 267 | 6.7 | 15.0 | 22.5 | 55.8 | 100.0 |
| 7-11 Female | 267 | 1.5 | 10.1 | 23.6 | 64.8 | 100.0 |
| 12-15 Male | 335 | 9.9 | 19.1 | 18.8 | 52.2 | 100.0 |
| 12-15 Female | 374 | 6.6 | 16.6 | 17.1 | 59.6 | 99.9 |
| $16+$ over (M) | 185 | 3.7 | 14.1 | 10.3 | 71.9 | 100.0 |
| $16+$ over (F) | 174 | 2.9 | 5.2 | 12.6 | 79.3 | 100.0 |
| TCTAL PER CENT |  | 5.0 | $12.2$ | $19.5$ | $63.4$ | 100.1 |
| TOTAL NO. | $2122^{\text {a }}$ | 106 | 258 | 413 | 1345 |  |

* See Appendix E.
a No information for 21 students

TABLE 33

LEVET, OF STTJDY ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCICOL STUDENTS (cateqorized by sex, age on arrival, and not borr in Canacia, English not mother tongue)

| Age on |  | SECONDATY SCHOOL LEVEL* Total |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arrival | N | ard 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Per Cent |
|  |  | 8 | \% | \% | 8 |  |
| $1-6 \mathrm{Male}$ | 1242 | 3.2 | 11.6 | 33.1 | 52.1 | 100.0 |
| 1-6 Female | 1166 | 3.8 | 10.1 | 34.0 | 52.1 | 100.0 |
| 7 - 11 Male | 1383 | 6.5 | 16.5 | 30.9 | 46.1 | 100.0 |
| 7-11 Female | 1251 | 7.2 | 15.3 | 32.5 | 45.0 | 100.0 |
| 12-15 Male | 920 | 6.1 | 11.2 | 27.2 | 55.5 | 100.0 |
| 12-15 Female | $79^{7}$ | 6.1 | 14.0 | 22.3 | 57.6 | 100.0 |
| $16+$ over (M) | 556 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 9.5 | 89.0 | 100.0 |
| $16+$ over (F) | 372 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 12.4 | 86.3 | 700.0 |
| TOTAL PER CENT |  | 4.8 | 11.8 | 28.2 | 55.2 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL NO. | 7681 | 372 | 904 | 2167 | 4238 |  |

* See Appendix E
a No information for 72 students


## TABIE 24

CLASSYS MTTENUED BY LLEMENTARY SCHOOL STTDENPS (categoris i by occupacion of head of household and sex)


TABLE 24
Continued

CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS


* See table 15 footnotes
** Category 15 contained only 3 students.


## TABLE 25

LEVEL OF STUDY MAKEN BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS (categorized by occupation of household head and sex)

| OCCUPATION |  | SEX | N | SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL |  |  |  |  | Total <br> Per Cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
|  |  | \% |  | \% | $\%$ | 8 | \% |  |
| 2 | labourers, truck drivers |  | male | 6273 | 1.0 | 4.5 | 14.4 | 30.6 | 49.6 | 100.1 |
|  | porters |  | female | 5541 | 1.0 | 3.4 | 13.2 | 30.8 | 51.6 |  |
| 3 | bartenders, sheetmeさal | male | 870 | 0.6 | 4.4 | 13.2 | 28.3 | 53.6 | 100.1 |
|  | workers, repairmen | female | 784 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 7.8 | 26.9 | 62.6 | 100.0 |
| 4 | sales clerks, jewellers, | male | 511 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 11.2 | 25.2 | 58.9 | 100.0 |
|  | stationary engineers, machinists | female | 417 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 6.5 | 19.9 | 69.8 | 100.0 |
| 5 | pressmen, printing workers, | male | 1763 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 8.9 | 27.0 | 61.7 | 100.0 |
|  | electricians, members of armed forces | female | 1455 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 7.2 | 21.7 | 69.3 | 100.0 |
| 6 | actors, tool and diemaker | male | 1518 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 6.4 | 16.5 | 75.4 | 100.0 |
|  | medical and dental technician | female | 1487 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 5.0 | 17.3 | 76.2 | 100.0 |
| 7 | musicians, stenographers | male | 459 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 6.8 | 12.4 | 79.5 | 100.0 |
|  | athletes | female | 442 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 3.8 | 14.5 | 81.4 | 99.9 |
| 8 | clergymen, various owners and | male | 720 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 3.5 | 12.5 | 83.5 | 100.0 |
|  | managers, insurance salesmen | female | 736 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 1.5 | 8.2 | 89.5 | 100.0 |
| 9 | teachers, professional engineers, | male | 1.198 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 7.6 | 89.0 | 100.0 |
|  | physicians, computer programmers | female | 1235 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 6.1 | 91.7 | 100.0 |
| 10 | pensioner, retired, workmen's | male | 354 | 0.3 | 3.4 | 11.9 | 21.2 | 63.3 | 100. 1 |
|  | compensation, disabled or ill | female | 330 | 0.3 | 3.6 | 14.8 | 22.4 | 58.8 | 99.9 |
| 11 | welfare, mother's allowance | male | 30 | 3.3 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 16.7 | 26.7 | 100.1 |
|  |  | female | 33 | 0.0 | 21.2 | 36.4 | 24.2 | 18.2 | 100.0 |
| 12 | adult training or retraining | male | 69 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 1.4 | 13.0 | 82.6 | 99.9 |
|  |  | female | 63 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 6.3 | 7.9 | 84.1 | 99.9 |
| 13 | unemployed | male | 380 | 1.8 | 11.3 | 18.2 | 25.5 | 43.2 | 100.0 |
|  |  | female | 382 | 0.5 | 7.3 | 24.1 | 27.2 | 40.8 | 99.9 |
| 14 | mother only, housewife | male | 617 | 0.6 | 12.5 | 20.6 | 27.9 | 38.4 | 100.0 |
|  |  | female | 669 | 0.4 | 8.5 | 22.9 | 23.5 | 44.7 | 100.0 |
| 15 | respondent on his/her own | male | 78 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 2.6 | 19.2 | 73.1 | 100.0 |
|  |  | female | 63 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 6.3 | 31.7 | 58.7 | 99.9 |
| 16 | group home head | male | 56 | 0.0 | 26.8 | 32.1 | 16.1 | 25.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | female | 50 | 4.0 | 18.0 | 38.0 | 16.0 | 24.0 | 100.0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | $28583{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.6 | 3.4 | 10.7 | 23.8 | 61.5 | 100.0 |

a No of missing observations $=2432$.

APPENDIX G
(Tables 26-28 and Map)
Table 26 - Province/Country of Birth of Students for Six School Areas in Toronto

Table 27 - Mother Tongue of Students for Six School Areas in Toronto (includes those learning English first as well as those learning English and another language at the same time)

Table 28 - Socio-economic Codes for Household Head

Map of the Six School Areas

TABLE 26

PROVINCE/COUNTRY OF BIRTH OF STUDENTS IN SIX AREAS


PROVINCE/COUNTRY OF BIRTH OF STIJDENTS
IN SIX AREAS
(continued)


100

PROVINCE/COUNTRY OF BIRTH OF STUPENTS IN SIX AREAS (continued)


PROVINCE/COUNTRY CF BIRTH OF STUDENTS IN SIX AREAS
(continued)

| 'ROVINCE/COUNTRY OF BIRTH |  |  | A | E | A | 6 | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\overline{1}$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | Elem. | Sec. |
| scandinavia | 6 | 8 | 4 | 21 | 27 | 28 | 62 | 32 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |  |  |
| Japan | 26 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 22 | 63 | 19 |
|  | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Spain | 11 | 29 | 27 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 62 | 20 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Benelux (Belgium, | 12 | 10 | 20 | 8 | 10 | 20 | 39 | 41 |
| Netherlands, Luxembourg).l |  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 |  |  |
| West Indies | 13 | 11 | 12 | 21 | 14 | 5 | 50 | 26 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Chile | 13 | 12 | 13 | 3 | 11 | 21 | 61 | 12 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |
| South Africa | 9 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 7 | 32 | 48 | 23 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  |  |
| Hungary | 7 | 11 | 22 | 11 | 5 | 12 | 28 | 40 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Uganda | 23 | 14 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 35 | 36 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Granada | 11 | 20 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 24 | 27 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Uruguay | 8 | 12 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 38 | 10 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Burma | 2 | 1 | 17 | 19 | 5 | 4 | 33 | 15 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Unclassified (South America) | 10 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 35 | 11 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Switzerland | 12 | 13 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 31 | 15 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Soviet Union | 14 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 24 | 21 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |  |

PROVINCE/COUNTRY OF BIRTH OF STUDENTS
IN SIX AREAS
(continued)

| PROVINCE/COUNTRYOF BIRTH |  |  | A. | E A |  |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Elem. | Sec. |
| = Austria | 7 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 14 | 31 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |  |
| - Malaya | 10 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 11 | 21 | 21 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Kenya | 2 | 8 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 13 | 24 | 17 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Turkey | 3 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 21 | 18 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Israel | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | - | 22 | 20 | 16 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 |  |  |
| Egypt | 16 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 17 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Fiji | 1 | 4 | 3 | 20 | 6 | - | 21 | 13 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - |  |  |
| Antigua | 4 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 18 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Indonesia | 4 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 20 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Rumania | 3 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 11 | 15 | 13 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Unclassified | 7 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 15 |
| (Europe) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Guatemala | 1 | 12 | 12 | - | 2 | 2 | 24 | 3 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Mexico | 1 | - | 7 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 7 |
|  | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Morocco | 1 | - | - | 2 | - | 21 | 9 | 15 |
|  | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.1 |  |  |
| Unclassified (Australia) | 4 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 18 | 5 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |



```
'PROVINCE/COUNTRY OF BIRTH OF STUDENTS
IN SIX AREAS
(continued)
```

| PROVINCE/COUNTRY OF BIRTH | $A \quad \mathrm{~B} \quad \mathrm{E}$ A |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Elem. | Sec. |
| Haiti \& | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | 2 |
| Dominican Republic | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - |  |  |
| Bolivia | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 2 | - |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Martinque | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - |
|  | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - |  |  |
| Nicaragua | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - |
|  | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - |  |  |
| RRAND TOTAL ** | 15724 | 13444 | 14446 | 15819 | 17493 | 15777 | 61694 | 31009 |
| OTAL PER CENT | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

* For each country, the sirst row indicates the number of students while the second row indicates the percentage for students.

TABLE 27

MOTHER TONGUE OF STUDENTS
IN SIX AREAS

| MOTHER TONGUE | $A \quad R \quad E \quad A$ |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Elem. | Sec. |  |
| English | 6561* | 5158 | 3421 | 9667 | 11719 | 12743 | 33876 | 15493 |  |
|  | 42.4 | 38.4 | 23.7 | 61.1 | 67.0 | 80.8 |  |  |  |
| Italian | 1127 | 3230 | 3404 | 268 | 1269 | 222 | 4920 | 4600 |  |
|  | 7.2 | 24.0 | 23.6 | 1.7 | 7.3 | 1.4 |  |  |  |
| Portugese | 2247 | 1441 | 3080 | 212 | 188 | 59 | 5184 | 2043 |  |
|  | 14.3 | 10.7 | 21.3 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 0.4 |  |  |  |
| Greek | 522 | 1243 | 811 | 1741 | 1459 | 441 | 5222 | 995 |  |
|  | 3.3 | 9.2 | 5.6 | 11.0 | 8.3 | 2.8 |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 429 | 273 | 1924 | 1961 | 739 | 468 | 3838 | 1956 |  |
|  | 2.7 | 2.0 | 13.3 | 12.4 | 4.2 | 3.0 |  |  |  |
| Polish | 1138 | J. 30 | 85 | 34 | 48 | 41 | 753 | 723 |  |
|  | 7.2 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 |  |  |  |
| French | 167 | 142 | 110 | 262 | 280 | 357 | 674 | 644 |  |
|  | 1.1. | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 2.3 |  |  |  |
| Ukrainian | 801 | 183 | 144 | 33 | 38 | 49 | 621 | 527 |  |
|  | 5.1 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |  |  |  |
| Spanish | 211 | 280 | 407 | 100 | 93 | 147 | 931 | 307 |  |
|  | 1.3 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.9 |  |  |  |
| German | 394 | 117 | 89 | 114 | 244 | 219 | 646 | 531 |  |
|  | 2.5 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 1.4 |  |  |  |
| Missing Data | 304 | 132 | 198 | 189 | 239 | 80 | 517 | 625 |  |
|  | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Serbo-Croatian | 301 | 198 | 94 | 121 | 171 | 56 | 693 | 248 |  |
|  | 1.9 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.4 |  |  |  |
| Macedonian | 27 | 47 | 7 | 108 | 270 | 46 | 335 | 170 |  |
|  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 0.3 |  |  |  |
| Hungarian | 60 | 76 | 106 | 56 | 36 | 146 | 267 | 213 |  |
|  | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.9 |  |  |  |
| Korean | 72 | 50 | 68 | 80 | 30 | 34 | 257 | 77 |  |
|  | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| ERIC |  |  |  | 106 |  |  |  |  |  |

MOTHER TONGUE OR STUDENTS
IN SIX AREAS
(continued)

| MOTHER TONGUE |  |  | A R E A |  |  | 6 | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | Elem. | Sec. |
| Indiall | ${ }^{18}$ | 62 | 35 | 83 | 43 | 13 | 292 | 32 |
|  | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Cantonese | 15 | 12 | 83 | 64 | 86 | 20 | 106 | 174 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Punjabi | 33 | 102 | 34 | 44 | 40 | 4 | 217 | 40 |
|  | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Japanese | 52 | 39 | 17 | 55 | 57 | 34 | 184 | 70 |
|  | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |  |  |
| Hindi | 41 | 66 | 35 | 44 | 35 | 14 | 177 | 58 |
|  | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Lithuanian | 139 | 46 | 16 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 59 | 157 |
|  | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Maltese | 158 | 20 | 14 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 93 | 118 |
|  | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Jamaican Patois | 37 | 57 | 21 | 57 | 22 | 10 | 180 | 24 |
|  | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Filipino | 53 | 10 | 16 | 93 | 11 | 15 | 163 | 35 |
|  | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Estonian | 30 | 11 | 4 | 28 | 36 | 73 | 73 | 109 |
|  | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Latvian | 51 | 10 | 9 | 26 | 28 | 42 | 68 | 98 |
|  | 0.3 | $0 . ?$ | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |  |  |
| Unclassified | 46 | 24 | 15 | 25 | 25 | 28 | 113 | 50 |
|  | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |  |  |
| Croatian | 76 | 41 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 81 | 69 |
|  | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Russi̇a | 54 | 19 | 18 | 7 | 16 | 31 | 78 | 67 |
|  | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 |  |  |
| Finnish | 10 | 7 | 4 | 28 | 28 | 59 | 91 | 45 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 |  |  |

MOTHER TONGUE OF STUDENTS
IN SIX AREAS
(continued)

| MOTHER TONGUE | $A \quad R \quad E \quad A$ |  |  |  |  |  | - Totalin |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Elem. | Sec. |
| Czechoslovakian | 60 | 18 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 30 | 86 | 48 |
|  | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  |  |
| Tagalog | 52 | 7 | 12 | 25 | 10 | 1 | 60 | 47 |
|  | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Dutch | 18 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 27 | 27 | 63 | 44 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |  |  |
| Gujurati | 32 | 20 | 6 | 21 | 12 | 6 | 49 | 48 |
|  | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Urdu | 7 | 17 | 10 | 27 | 16 | 9 | 57 | 29 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Serbian | 23 | 7 | 5 | I1 | 21 | 9 | 49 | 27 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Hebrew | 1 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 49 | 41 | 33 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |  |  |
| Greek Macedonian | 10 | 10 | 2 | 17 | 27 | 5 | 36 | 35 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Pakistani | 11 | 7 | 16 | 16 | 13 | 6 | 63 | 6 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Arabic | 19 | 7 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 8 | 38 | 19 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Slovakian | 36 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 18 | 38 |
|  | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Indian American | 7 | 8 | 5 | 20 | 9 | 6 | 35 | 20 |
|  | 0.0 | -0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Swahili | 8 | 10 | - | 13 | 3 | 11 | 22 | 23 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Guyanese | 16 | 5 | 3 | 14 | 7 | - | 43 | 2 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - |  |  |
| Mandarin | 5 | 1 | 19 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 23 | 20 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |

MOTHER TONGUE OF STUDENTS
IN SIX AREAS
(continued)


MOTHER TONGUE

$\frac{\text { TOTAL }}{\text { Elem. }}$


```
MOTHER TONGU" OF STUDENTS
    IN SI; :REAS
    (conti:ıued)
```

| MOTHER TONGUE | A. $\quad \mathrm{E}$ E A |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | $\wedge$ |  | 6 | Elem. | Sec. |
| Norwegian | 2 | 2 | - |  |  | 11 | 13 |  |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | - |  | - | 0.1 |  |  |
| Brazilian | 2 | 4 | 8 | 1 | - | - | 13 | 2 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | - |  |  |
| Gaelic | - | - | - | 2 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 3 |
|  | - | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Indonesian | 3 | - | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 2 |
|  | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Egyptian | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | - | - | 6 | 2 |
|  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | = | - |  |  |
| TOTAL ** | 15724 | 13444 | 14446 | 15819 | 17493 | 15777 | 61695 | 31008 |
| PER CENT | 99.6 | 100.3 | 99.4 | 100.0 | 99.6 | 100.5 | 66.6 | 33.4 |

* For each language the first row indicates the number of students while the second row indicates the percentage of students

TABLE 28
SOCIO-ECONONIC CODES FOR HEAD OF HOUSE-HOLD (IN SIX AREAS)

| Category Number | Category Description | Area |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Elementary | Secondary |
| 1 | No information or unknown | 731 | 510 | 696 | 1064 | 957 | 476 | 2301 | 2130 |
|  |  | 4.6 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 6.7 | 5.5 | 3.0 |  |  |
| 2 | Labourers, truck drivers, porters | 144.3 | . 54 | 8590 | 6463 | 7276 | 1616 | 27018 | 11931 |
|  |  | 474 | 56.2 | 59.5 | 40.9 | 41.6 | 10.2 |  |  |
| 3 | Bartenders, sheetmetal workers, repairmen | 1259 | 1012 | 790 | 991 | 1229 | 328 | 3934 | 1676 |
|  |  | 8.0 | 7.5 | 5.5 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 2.1 |  |  |
| 4 | Sales clerks, jewellers, stationary engineers, machinists | 552 | 417 | 389 | 541 | 667 | 311 | 1939 | 938 |
|  |  | 3.5 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 2.0 |  |  |
| 5 | Pressmen, printing workers, electricians, members of the armed forces, clerical occupations | 1633 | 976 | 835 | 1280 | 2335 | 1434 | 5242 | 3251 |
|  |  | 10.4 | 7.3 | 5.8 | 8.1 | 13.3 | 9.1 |  |  |
| 6 | Actors, tool and diemakers, medical and dental technicians, enbalmers, real estate salesmen | 1174 | 876 | 937 | 1120 | 1525 | 2266 | 4865 | 3034 |
|  |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 7.1 | 8.7 | 14.4 |  |  |
| 7 | Musicians, stenographers, athletes | 376 | 193 | 172 | 373 | 491 | 1082 | 1777 | 910 |
|  |  | 2.4 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 6.9 |  |  |
| 8 | Clergymen, various owners and managers, insurance salesmen, librarians | 397 | 218 | 202 | 458 | 638 | 2367 | 2806 | 1474 |
|  |  | 2.5 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 15.0 |  |  |
| 9 | Teachers, professional engineers, physicians, computer programners, air pilots | 671 | 382 | 273 | 614 | 728 | 5130 | 5345 | 2453 |
|  |  |  |  | 1.9 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 32.5 |  |  |

TABLE 28
Continued
SOCIO-ECONOMIC CODES FOR HEAD OF HOUSE-HOLD (IN SIX AREAS)

| Category Number | Category Description | AREA |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Elementary | Secondary |
| 10 | Pensioner, retired, worknan's | 191 | 138 | 202 | 196 | 239 | 114 | 390 | 690 |
|  | compensation, disabled or ill | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.4 | . 7 |  |  |
| 11 | Welfare, nothers's allowance | 13 | 22 | 28 | 73 | 25 | 8 | 104 | 65 |
|  |  | . 1 | . 2 | . 2 | . 5 | . 1 | . 1 |  |  |
| 12 | ig or re-training | 85 | 48 | 88 | 137 | 87 | 182 | 491 | 136 |
|  |  | . 5 | . 4 | . 6 | . 9 | . 5 | $1: 2$ |  |  |
| 13 | Unemployed | 515 | 548 | 673 | 892 | 435 | 108 | 2401 | 770 |
|  |  | 3.3 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 5.6 | 2.5 | . 7 |  |  |
| 14 | Mother only, housewife | 646 | 501 | 523 | 1508 | 791 | 328 | 2994 | 1303 |
|  |  | 4.1 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 9.5 | 4.5 | 2.1 |  |  |
| 15 | Respondent on his/her own | 20 | 18 | 36 | 36 | 26 | 14 | 6 | 144 |
|  |  | . 1 | . 1 | . 2 | . 2 | . 1 | . 1 |  |  |
| 16 | Group home head (e.g., social | 12 | 31 | 12 | 73 | 44 | 13 | 75 | 110 |
|  | worker, etc.) | . 1 |  | . 1 | . 5 | .3 | . 1 |  |  |
| GRAND TOTAL |  | 1572413 |  | . 4446 | 15819 | 7493 | 5777 | 61688 | 31015 |
| TOTAL PER CEE |  | 100.010 |  | 100.01 | 100.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 |  |  |

* For each =egory, the first $工 w$ indicates the numer of students while the secomi number indicates the perce age.
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