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The mandate of Vibrant Lethbridge, an initiative of the City of Lethbridge Community and Social Development Committee, is to elevate the profile of poverty in Lethbridge, engage multi-sectoral partners and identify community assets and systemic/programmatic interventions that could strengthen the community’s response to poverty related issues.

Vibrant Lethbridge actively engages with people in our community who has lived experience and may be affected by the strategies we recommend. This serves to ensure we are building support within the community based on the needs and assets. Vibrant Lethbridge has ready access to an advisory group that can facilitate and support future proposed strategies and provide opportunities for collaborative approaches to reducing the effects of poverty in Lethbridge.

Vibrant Lethbridge engages a broad and diverse group of organizations; business sector and community leaders promoting a collaborative planning process to help integrate community efforts to address poverty in Lethbridge.

The development of this report combining the Low-Income in Lethbridge: A Profile with the You’re Trying To Go Up A Waterfall report provided a deeper understanding of the community’s experiences of poverty in Lethbridge. The Waterfall Report was a two-year project that involved the voluntary participation of community members across Lethbridge. We are grateful for their dedication and perseverance to complete. We are most grateful to the people who participated in the focus groups; for their trust, openness, courage and willingness to tell their stories. This research along with input from community agencies, will inform the development of bold new steps to reduce the impact of poverty experienced by Lethbridge citizens.

The Low-Income in Lethbridge: A Profile identifies Lethbridge as having the highest level of child poverty in the province with 1 in 5 children affected. This is clearly an incentive for continued advocacy for preventative and supportive programs that help families create financially sustainable living environments. This report added a new section this year highlighting a living wage specifically for Lethbridge. Living Wage is the amount of income an individual or family requires to meet their basic needs, to maintain a safe, decent standard of living in their communities, to save for future needs and goals and to devote quality time to friends, family and community (VCC, 2012). This calculation does not include special dietary needs, savings for retirement, hobbies, pet ownership, or entertainment.

When people live in persistent financial distress, the whole community pays in increased costs to the health care, education, social services and criminal justice systems as well as impacting our local economy in lower spending on goods and services. Sustained poverty reduction will improve the quality of life for all members of our community, in particular our children, and provide for a healthy and sustainable future.

I look forward to the next phases of this important work together.

Sincerely,
Renae Barlow
Chair, Vibrant Lethbridge Sub-committee
Chair, Community and Social Development Committee

For more information about our committee, please visit our website at www.vibrantlethbridge.com

**LETHERIDGE QUICK FACTS**

- Compared to other Alberta cities, Lethbridge has the second highest low-income rate, next to Medicine Hat.

- Living with a low-income is the reality for:
  - 12.0% of the total population
  - 1 in 5 children; the highest child poverty rate in Alberta
  - 31.7% of single-parent families (calculated for Lethbridge Region)
  - 24.5% of the total urban Aboriginal population

- 6.4% unemployment rate (June 2014 Lethbridge Region unemployment rate was 4.6%)

- A single individual at the current minimum wage will have to work more than 40 hours per week to reach the Low-Income Measure

- In 2013, 992 food hamper recipients were first time users

- Each month, over 1,100 food hampers are distributed

- Although the number of people relying on Food Banks is decreasing, in 2013 there is 27.6% increase in use among the indigenous population.

- There is a considerable increase in waitlists for access to affordable housing. Over 1,000 households living with low incomes are in need of housing


**HOW IS LOW-INCOME MEASURED?**

There is no official poverty line for Canada. In its absence, governments and non-governmental organizations use several different indicators to estimate poverty levels. The most commonly used are low income cut-offs (LICOs); Low Income Measures (LIM); and Market Basket Measure (MBM), each giving similar results.

Many of these indicators are said to measure “low income” as opposed to poverty. In the absence of an official poverty line, the National Council of Welfare, and many others, considers these low income indicators to be useful ways of examining poverty in Canada (National Council of Welfare, 2009).

While the first two lines were developed by Statistics Canada, the MBM is based on concepts developed by Human Resources and Skill Development Canada. Although these measures differ from one another, they give a generally consistent picture of low income status over time. None of these measures is the best; each contributes its own perspective and its own strengths to the study of low income so that cumulatively, the three provide a better understanding of the phenomenon of low income as a whole (Statistics Canada, 2013a).
LOW-INCOME CUT-OFF

- The low income cut-offs (LICO) are income thresholds below which a family will likely devote a larger share of its income to the necessities of food, shelter and clothing than the average family (Statistics Canada, 2013a).
- According to the most recent base for LICO, the 1992 Family Expenditures Survey, the average family spent 43% of its after-tax income on food, shelter and clothing (Statistics Canada, 2013a).
- Vary based on different family and community sizes.
- As defined by LICO, people living in low income spend at least 20% more of their income than the average household on basic necessities such as food, clothing and shelter (HRDC, 2008).
- The low-income gap measures how far below the low-income cut-offs the income of a family is (HRDC, 2013).

LOW-INCOME MEASURE

- Unlike LICO, they are the same in all parts of the country. This means they do not reflect the different costs of living across the country (National Council of Welfare, 2009).
- The Low Income Measure (LIM) is based on the cost of a specific basket of goods and services representing a modest, basic standard of living. It includes the costs of food, clothing, footwear, transportation, shelter and other expenses for a reference family of two adults aged 25 to 49 and two children aged 9 and 13 (Statistics Canada, 2013a).
- The LIM thresholds are calculated as the cost of purchasing the following items (Statistics Canada, 2013a):
  - A nutritious diet as specified in the 2008 National Nutritious Food Basket.
  - A basket of clothing and footwear required by a family of two adults and two children.
  - Shelter cost as the median cost of a two- or three-bedroom units including electricity, heat, water and appliances.
  - Transportation costs, using public transit where available or costs associated with owning and operating a modest vehicle where public transit is not available.
  - Other necessary goods and services.

MARKET BASKET MEASURE

- The Market Basket Measure (MBM) is based on the cost of a specific basket of goods and services representing a modest, basic standard of living. It includes the costs of food, clothing, footwear, transportation, shelter and other expenses for a reference family of two adults aged 25 to 49 and two children aged 9 and 13 (Statistics Canada, 2013a).
- The MBM thresholds are calculated as the cost of purchasing the following items (Statistics Canada, 2013a):
  - A nutritious diet as specified in the 2008 National Nutritious Food Basket.
  - A basket of clothing and footwear required by a family of two adults and two children.
  - Shelter cost as the median cost of a two- or three-bedroom units including electricity, heat, water and appliances.
  - Transportation costs, using public transit where available or costs associated with owning and operating a modest vehicle where public transit is not available.
  - Other necessary goods and services.

LOW INCOME LINES BY FAMILY SIZE

This chart shows the low income (poverty) lines for the different household sizes for both LIM and LICO, along with the MBM for a 4 member family. Data for MBM beyond a 4 member family is not available.

The Lethbridge population in 2011 was 81,390 (City of Lethbridge, 2014).
- 14.6% of the child population of Lethbridge experience low-income while adults is 12.4%.
- 19.2% of children less than 6 years old experience low-income.

MEASURING LOW-INCOME

In previous publications of this report LICOs were used as the measurement tool. However, due to a change in low-income reporting from the new use of the National Housing Survey (NHS), this report will use after tax Low-Income Measure (LIM-AT) unless otherwise noted.

HOW DOES LETHBRIDGE MEASURE UP?

THE INCIDENCE OF LOW-INCOME

- The Lethbridge population in 2011 was 81,390 (Statistics Canada, 2013a).
- The 2014 population is 93,004 (City of Lethbridge, 2014).
- Compared to other Alberta cities, Lethbridge has the second highest low-income rate.
- It remains among the highest in Alberta while other cities, namely Calgary and Edmonton, have moved down in ranking.
- There are more children (less than 18 years) than adults (18+ years), in low-income (Statistics Canada, 2013e).

- 14.6% of the child population of Lethbridge experience low-income while adults is 12.4%.
- 19.2% of children less than 6 years old experience low-income.

LOW INCOME LINES BY FAMILY SIZE

This chart shows the low income (poverty) lines for the different household sizes for both LIM and LICO, along with the MBM for a 4 member family. Data for MBM beyond a 4 member family is not available.

While many low income measures, including the LICO, are well suited to the analysis of trends in low income, the after-tax Low Income Measure (LIM-AT) is better suited to the analysis of low income in the NHS because the threshold level of income below which one is considered to have low income is itself derived from the household that responded to the survey (Statistics Canada, 2013a).

More national and provincial reports are using the LIM-AT to measure low income. The decision to discontinue use of the Low Income Cut-off is in part because, since 1992, LICO has only been updated for inflation and not other changes in the expenditures of Canadian families. Statistics Canada has no plans to update LICO, whereas LIM is updated every year (Campaign 2000, 2012).
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LOW-INCOME AND ABORIGINAL PEOPLE

- The Lethbridge Aboriginal population was 3,770 in 2011, a slight increase in urban population since 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2013d).
- In 2011, 24.5% of the total Lethbridge Aboriginal population lived under the Low-Income Measure (Statistics Canada, 2013d). This is:
  - A significant reduction in low-income rate since 2006.
  - The 5th highest rate of low-income among urban Aboriginal people in any Alberta City; a decrease from the 1st highest in 2006.
  - An accurate count of the decrease cannot be made due to two different measurements being used (LICO-AT, 2006 and LIM-AT 2011).
- In general terms, children (under 18 years) were experiencing low-income to a greater degree than that of adults (18+ years). However, the aboriginal population children and adults are relatively the same in rating.
- Young (under 18 years) females experience low-income (23.9%) far greater than males (17.8%), while it is adult males that experience low-income greater than females (Statistics Canada, 2013d).

VITALITY OF LETHBRIDGE AND AREA

The following are statistics collected by Vital Signs (2014), a Community Foundations initiative, reflecting the latest data collected for Southwestern Alberta in the year 2012, figures based on LIM:

- The overall poverty rate in the Lethbridge Region was 13.0%, down 2.0 percentage points from 15.0% in 2008, and down 3.1 percentage points from 16.1 per cent in 2011. The 2012 figure was 23.6 % below the national average (17.0%), and 6.5% above the provincial average (12.2%).
- The child poverty rate in the Lethbridge Region was 19.1%, down 3.2 percentage points from 22.3% in 2008, and down 2.7 percentage points from 21.8% in 2011. The 2012 figure was equal to the national average, and 18.5% above the provincial average (16.1%).
- The elderly poverty rate in the Lethbridge Region was 1.8%, equal to the rate in 2008, and down 0.2 percentage points from 2.0% in 2011. The 2012 figure was 69.2% below the national average (5.8%), and 58.4% below the provincial average (4.3%).
- The poverty rate of single-parent families in the Lethbridge Region based on the LIM, was 31.8%, up 0.9 percentage points from 30.9% in 2008, and up 0.1 percentage points from 31.7% in 2011. The 2012 figure was 1.3% lower than the national average (32.2%), and 3.2% higher than the provincial average (30.8%).

POVERTY STATUS IN LETHBRIDGE

In 2006 Statistics Canada mapped out low-income (after tax) in Lethbridge. Although this map is outdated it provides a picture of what low-income looks like, geographically, in Lethbridge. According to this map, low-income exists primarily in the neighbourhood of Varsity Village on the west side and parts of London Road (south) Westminster and Park Meadows (north) neighbourhoods on the north side.

“The cost of living is rising and the entry level position wage has not caught up.”

- CFLSA, 2013
LIVING ABOVE THE LOW-INCOME MEASURE

How much does a person need to earn to live above the Low-Income Measure (LIM)?

### Comparison of Hourly Wage to Low-Income Measure (LIM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hourly Wage</th>
<th>*Full-Time Income</th>
<th>LIM one person</th>
<th>LIM two persons</th>
<th>LIM three persons</th>
<th>LIM four persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$19,930</td>
<td>$27,902</td>
<td>$34,479</td>
<td>$39,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$19,930</td>
<td>$27,902</td>
<td>$34,479</td>
<td>$39,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$19,930</td>
<td>$27,902</td>
<td>$34,479</td>
<td>$39,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$19,930</td>
<td>$27,902</td>
<td>$34,479</td>
<td>$39,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$19,930</td>
<td>$27,902</td>
<td>$34,479</td>
<td>$39,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$19,930</td>
<td>$27,902</td>
<td>$34,479</td>
<td>$39,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$19,930</td>
<td>$27,902</td>
<td>$34,479</td>
<td>$39,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$19,930</td>
<td>$27,902</td>
<td>$34,479</td>
<td>$39,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$19,930</td>
<td>$27,902</td>
<td>$34,479</td>
<td>$39,860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOURLY WAGES**


- Alberta is ranked 10th (lowest minimum wage) out of all the provinces, with a before tax ranking.
- The after tax ranking places Alberta 2nd overall.

The minimum wage will be raised to $10.20 September 1, 2014 (Alberta Government, 2014d).

To earn an income over the Low-Income Measure (based on 2011 stats):

- Single individuals must work full-time at $9.97 per hour.
- A lone parent with two children must work full-time at $17.24 per hour.

12% of Lethbridge residents lived below the Low-Income Measure in 2011

---

**LETHBRIDGE HOUSEHOLD AND INDIVIDUAL INCOMES**

Family household annual income (after tax):

- 1,405 had income under $10,000
- 2,385 had income between $10,000 and $19,999

Individuals annual income (after tax):

- 2,370 without income
- 10,030 had income under $10,000
- 12,370 had income between $10,000 and $19,999 (18.9% of individuals with income)
- 24,770 (36.6%) of individuals earn under $20,000 income, after tax.

---

**LIVING WAGE**

This is a new section of the report, essential to fully understanding poverty in our community.

Living Wage is the amount of income an individual or family requires to meet their basic needs, to maintain a safe, decent standard of living in their communities, to save for future needs and goals and to devote quality time to friends, family and community (VCC, 2012).

A living wage is not the same as the minimum wage. A living wage reflects what earners in a family need to bring home based on the actual costs of living in a specific community (Living Wage Canada, 2013). It is calculated as the hourly rate at which a household can meet its basic needs, once government transfers have been added to the family’s income and deductions have been subtracted.

$14.74 per adult, per hour is Lethbridge’s 2014 Living Wage for a family with 2 working parents and 2 children without employer benefits.

---

**HOURLY WAGE**
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CALCULATING LETHBRIDGE’S LIVING WAGE

Lethbridge’s Living Wage estimates have been calculated using the Canadian Living Wage Framework which was released by Vibrant Communities Canada in 2014.

A LIVING WAGE:
- enables working families to have sufficient income to cover reasonable costs
- promotes social inclusion
- supports healthy child development principles
- ensures that families are not under severe financial stress
- is a conservative, reasonable estimate
- engages significant and wide ranging community support
- is a vehicle for promoting the benefits of social programs such as childcare

LIVING WAGE BENEFITS:
Community
- Poverty reduction
- Enhanced community pride
- Stimulation of local spending
Businesses
- Increased productivity
- Improved customer satisfaction
- Decreased internal shoplifting
- Decreased staff turnover
- Improved corporate image
Employees
- Improved health
- Better quality of life

M. Haener Consulting Services, 2014

CALCULATION METHOD - Living Wage is the hourly wage rate that allows this formula to balance:
Annual Family Expenses = Employment Income + Income from Government Transfers - Taxes

REFERENCE HOUSEHOLDS
- Couple, 2 children: Female parent age 34 & male parent age 36, both working full time
  1 female child age 4 & 1 male child age 7
- Lone parent, 1 child: Single Mom age 31 works full time
  1 male child age 5
- Single adult: Male age 25 works full time

ANNUAL FAMILY EXPENSES

Budget Exclusions: Special dietary needs  • Owning a home  • Credit card, loan or other debt/interest payments  • Savings for retirement  • Parking  • RRSP, RESP, or RDSP contributions  • Costs of caring disabled, seriously ill, or elderly family members  • Hobbies  • Pet ownership  • Alcohol or tobacco costs  • Personal life or disability insurance  • Remittances to family members living abroad

ANNUAL FAMILY EXPENSES

Food
Clothing & Footwear
Shelter
Transportation
Other Household Costs
Child Care
Health Care
Social Inclusion
Contingency

ANNUAL FAMILY EXPENSES

The CLWF recommends that the number of hours used to reflect a full-time work week in a Living Wage calculation is determined based on what typically reflects full-time hours in the province/territory. Statistics Canada data indicates that working 40 hours or more per week is typical of Albertans employed fulltime; therefore a 40 hour work week is used in the calculation.

MEETING NEEDS

How many people’s basic needs are met through government assistance and community services?

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

AISH
- Assured Income for the Severely Handicapped (AISH) provides financial, supplementary, and health related assistance to adults with permanent disabilities that limit their ability to earn a livelihood.
- AISH currently provides $1,588 per month maximum monthly living allowance to qualified individuals (AISH, 2012).
- At the maximum AISH support of $1,588 per month, an individual receives an income 5% below the LIM.
  • To earn over the Low-Income Measure an individual must have an income of $1,660 per month.

In 2013, approximately 3,193 Lethbridge residents were receiving AISH
INCOME SUPPORT ALBERTA (IS)
- Provides financial benefits to individuals and families in Alberta who do not have the resources to meet their basic needs, including food, clothing, and shelter.
- In May 2014, the IS caseload was composed of single individuals (66.0%), lone-parent families (27.9%), couples with children (3.8%) and couples without children (2.3%).
- Albertans who were expected to work (ETW) represented 48.7% of the IS caseload in May 2014. Of the ETW caseload, 14.8% were working, 36.3% were not working and 48.9% were temporarily unavailable for work.
- Specific Lethbridge data not available.

ALBERTA AND LETHBRIDGE REGION EMPLOYMENT/UNEMPLOYMENT RATES
- In 2011 the Lethbridge unemployment rate was 6.4% (Statistics Canada, 2013e).
- In 2013, Alberta had the highest employment rate and participation rate in Canada, and Alberta’s unemployment rate of 4.6% was lower than the national average by 2.5 percentage points and was the second lowest in Canada, (Alberta Government, 2014a).
- In 2013, the Lethbridge Region had the largest decline in its labour force of 3.1% (Alberta Government, 2014a).
- In June 2014, the Lethbridge Regions unemployment rate was 4.6%, on par with the provincial rate (Statistics Canada, 2014).
- Historically the Lethbridge region has had some of the lowest unemployment rates in the province and the nation (CMHC, 2014).
- In June 2014, the Lethbridge Regions unemployment rate was 4.6%, on par with the provincial rate (Statistics Canada, 2014).

COMMUNITY SERVICES: FOOD
LETHBRIDGE SOUP KITCHEN
- On average, 85 persons are served each day at their facility. As well, the Soup Kitchen supplies on average 12 liters of soup every evening to the Emergency Shelter (4,248 liters in 2013).
- The Soup Kitchen used to provide soup to the Streets Alive, but this program no longer exists.
- There has been a decrease in soup prepared and meals served since 2010.

LETHBRIDGE FOOD BANK
- A total of 6,471 food hampers were provided to Lethbridge residents in 2013.
- 8,102 adults and 6,001 children were first time users, a 19.6% decrease from 2012.
- An average of 540 hampers distributed per month.

INTERFAITH FOOD BANK
- In 2013, 6,928 food hampers were provided to assist 9,655 Adults and 7,455 Children in Lethbridge.
- In 2013, 432 food hamper recipients were first time users.
- An average of 577 hampers are distributed every month.

MONTHLY BREAKDOWN OF FOOD BANK USERS IN MARCH 2013:
- 555 children (under 18), 778 adults (18+ yrs) and 26 seniors (65+ yrs).
- 85 immigrants / 215 Aboriginal People (18+ yrs)
- 40 post-secondary students.
- There has been a significant increase in use by our Aboriginal population (27.63% of clientele).
- There has also been an increase in clients reporting they received employment income, suggesting an increase in people not receiving sufficient income to provide the necessities of life.
- This occurred during a simultaneous decrease of people reporting using social assistance.

There has been an increase in food bank use until 2011 when a steady decrease started to occur.

QUICK FACT:
On a yearly basis, the Lethbridge Soup Kitchen serves over 26,500 meals.
COMMUNITY SERVICES: HOUSING

EMERGENCY YOUTH SHELTER
- Based on data collected from April 2012 to March 2013:
  - 97 youth slept at the shelter
  - 52 (54%) youth referred due to conflict with family/caregiver
  - 172 Admissions and discharges
  - Average length of stay was 15 days
  - Total occupancy for the year was 51%

LETHBRIDGE EMERGENCY SHELTER
- An average of 75 people per night stayed at the Lethbridge Emergency Shelter, with a total of 25,373 occupants in 2012.
- An average of 78 people per night stayed at the Lethbridge Emergency Shelter with a total of 28,385 occupants in 2013.

YWCA HARBOUR HOUSE
- While 652 women and children were sheltered between April 2013 and March 2014, 425 women and children had to be turned away due to a lack of space.

TREATY 7 URBAN INDIAN HOUSING AUTHORITY
- Averages 20 to 30 vacancies per year from 2011 to 2013.
- Households on the waiting list:
  - 15 for 2 bedroom units
  - 18 for 3 bedroom units
  - 8 for 4 bedroom units
- Most common housing is 2 and 3 bedroom units
- There has been an increase in the waitlist, due to families moving into the city for education and/or employment and because of poor housing on-reserve or overcrowding.

LETHBRIDGE HOUSING AUTHORITY
- In December 2012, 526 individuals or families were waiting for housing assistance through Lethbridge Housing Authority:
  - 281 units in Community Housing, with 105 on the waiting list.
  - 403 units in Seniors Self-Contained Housing, with 19 on the waiting list.
  - 614 households receiving Rental Supplements through Lethbridge Housing Authority, with 402 on the waiting list.
- In December 2013, 498 individuals or families were waiting for housing assistance through Lethbridge Housing Authority:
  - 288 units in Community Housing.
  - 398 units in Seniors Self-Contained Housing.
  - The Lethbridge & Region Community Housing Corporation (L&RCHC) as 116 Affordable Housing units.
- Mar 2014 waiting list breakdown:
  - 126 units for Community Housing.
  - 33 units for Seniors Self-Contained Housing.
  - 377 to Rent Supplement.
  - 29 units for Affordable Housing.
- In April 2014, 702 households receiving Rental Supplements through Lethbridge Housing Authority.

ALBERTA BUDGET AND POVERTY
Future impacts on poverty in Lethbridge based on 2014-2015 Alberta Government budget:
- Operating expenses increased by 3.7 per cent in the 2014 budget. This is less than population plus inflation (five per cent), but higher than what it was in last year’s budget.
- Increase in the operational budget of the Ministry of Human Services by more than 5% from last year ($4.1 billion to be spent this year).
- The Social Innovation Endowment was established to bring more capacity to the social service and culture sector to innovate and collaborate when resolving challenging social issues.
- An increase of more than $1 billion in spending for health, education, post-secondary and support for vulnerable Albertans.
- Continued investment in homeless support programs to help house about 2,000 homeless Albertans this year, as well as fund over 3,200 spaces in emergency/transitional shelters.
- Alberta is also increasing the capacity of women’s emergency shelters by adding $3.8 million, bringing total investment to almost $33 million.
- Focus of investment to support low-income seniors through various benefits, an increase of more than 6% in Alberta Seniors Benefits from last year.
- $1.1 billion for the Assured Income for the Severely Handicapped (AISH) program, including $192 million for AISH health benefits.
- Investing $703 million in programs that help underemployed and unemployed people find and keep jobs, and help eligible Albertans cover their basic costs of living.
- Investing $288 million for child care programs, an increase of more than 6%.
- Investing $6.5 billion in our Kindergarten to Grade 12 education system.

Although the Alberta Government’s budget has returned to an operational surplus, Momentum (2014) says it is difficult to see any real progress on poverty reduction in the budget and is concerned by the lack of support for Alberta’s most vulnerable people.
Understanding the Impacts of and Finding Community Solutions to Poverty in Lethbridge

ADDRESSING THE IMPACT OF LOW-INCOME

How is the City of Lethbridge addressing the impact of persons living with a low-income?

ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT FOR AGENCIES THAT PROVIDE UNIVERSALLY ACCESSIBLE PREVENTION/EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMS:
- Family Centre
- Meals on Wheels
- Lethbridge Seniors Centre
- North-Bridge Seniors Centre
- Lethbridge Family Services
- Big Brothers & Sisters
- Boys & Girls Club

COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS:
- Youth HUB
- Vibrant Lethbridge
- Seniors Community Forum
- Bringing Lethbridge Home - SHIA
- Aboriginal Opportunities Initiative
- Community Substance Abuse Response Team
- Coalition of Municipalities Against Racism and Discrimination (CMARD)
- Prevention of Family Violence,
- Elder Abuse & Sexual Assault

COMMUNITY SUPPORT/SUBSIDIZED PROGRAMS FOR LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES:
- Go-Friendly
- Access-a-Ride

Counseling Services
- Home Supports for Seniors
- YWCA Neighborhood Play Programs
- Family Life Education
- Making Connections
- Meals on Wheels

FOOD SECURITY:
- Community Kitchens
- Lethbridge Soup Kitchen
- Lethbridge Food Bank
- Interfaith Food Bank

HOUSING SUPPORT:
- HomeBase
- Rent Supplement Program
- Intensive Case Management Services
- Affordable Housing and Homelessness Policy
- Lethbridge Housing Authority
- Habitat for Humanity

AFFORDABLE & EMERGENCY HOUSING:
- Emergency Shelter
- Community Outreach
- Habitat for Humanity
- Affordable Housing Policy
- Supportive Housing & Outreach
- Woods Homes Emergency Youth Shelter
- Transportation to Detox and Treatment
- Aboriginal Housing First Team
- Youth Housing First Team
- Mobile Urban Street Team
- YWCA Hestia Homes
- YWCA Residence

INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SERVICES:
- Community LINKS
- Recreation & Culture Guide
- “Getting Connected” Booklets
- Youth Directory

RESOURCES
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“Poverty is when you’ve got the weight of society pushing you down and you’re way down there, and it’s kind of hard to go back up because you’re trying to go up a waterfall, right? ...Once you are impoverished, it is very hard to get out. It’s like the mafia...you never get out, right?”

- Focus Group Participant
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MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

The mandate of Vibrant Lethbridge, an initiative of the City of Lethbridge Community and Social Development Committee, is to elevate the profile of poverty in Lethbridge, engage multi-sectoral partners and identify community assets and systemic/programmatic interventions that could strengthen the community’s response to poverty-related issues.

Vibrant Lethbridge actively engages with people in our community who has lived experience and may be affected by the strategies we recommend. This serves to ensure we are building support within the community based on the needs and assets. Vibrant Lethbridge has ready access to an advisory group that can facilitate and support future proposed strategies and provide opportunities for collaborative approaches to reducing the effects of poverty in Lethbridge.

Vibrant Lethbridge engages a broad and diverse group of organizations; business sector and community leaders promoting a collaborative planning process to help integrate community efforts to address poverty in Lethbridge.

The development of this research “You’re Trying To Go Up A Waterfall...” was one of Vibrant Lethbridge’s strategic goals for 2013. The purpose of this research was to glean an understanding of community and individual experiences of poverty in Lethbridge from people who have lived experience with the effects of poverty. This community-based research took over six months and a considerable number of volunteer hours to coordinate and execute and we are grateful for their dedication and perseverance to complete. We are most grateful to the people who participated in the focus groups; for their trust, openness, courage and willingness to tell their stories. This research along with input from community agencies, will inform the development of bold new steps to reduce the impact of poverty experienced by more than thirteen percent of Lethbridge citizens.

When people live in persistent financial distress, the whole community pays in increased costs to the health care, education, social services and criminal justice systems as well as impacting our local economy in lower spending on goods and services. Sustained poverty reduction will improve the quality of life for all members of our community and provide for a healthy and sustainable future.

I look forward to the next phases of this important work together.

Sincerely,
Renae Barlow
Chair, Vibrant Lethbridge Sub-committee
Chair, Community and Social Development Committee

For more information about our committee, please visit our website at www.vibrantlethbridge.com

"YOU’RE TRYING TO GO UP A WATERFALL": A REPORT

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to glean an understanding of community and individual experiences of poverty in Lethbridge, Alberta, from people who have lived experience with the effects of poverty, rather than from organizations that serve these individuals. This information was acquired using focus group methodology, as well as individual interviews. The research team sought input from a variety of groups considered to be particularly at-risk to struggle with poverty, including: single parents, First Nations people, people with disabilities, young adults (18+ years old), senior citizens, immigrants, and women. Ultimately, this research will add to collective knowledge about poverty in Lethbridge in order to appropriately focus poverty-alleviation efforts by the City of Lethbridge and local non-governmental organizations.

INTRODUCTION

Vibrant Lethbridge is a volunteer-based sub-committee of the Community and Social Development Group of the City of Lethbridge. It is a local manifestation of the Vibrant Communities movement founded by the Tamarack Institute for Community Engagement, which seeks to reduce poverty throughout Canada by helping communities identify and implement locally appropriate measures, often through existing governmental and non-governmental organizations (Tamarack Institute, n.d.).

The goal of Vibrant Lethbridge is to understand the impacts of poverty on different groups in Lethbridge, to raise the community’s awareness of the effects of poverty on the lives of all community members, and to determine effective actions that can be taken to reduce the impact of poverty in Lethbridge. One of the means of achieving this goal has been to conduct focus group research with various populations in Lethbridge deemed by local service organizations to be particularly vulnerable to experiencing poverty either episodically or chronically. This focus group research is meant to help Vibrant Lethbridge members and the wider community more fully appreciate and understand the lived experiences of people in poverty. In October 2012, Vibrant Lethbridge formed a sub-committee comprised of volunteers from the larger committee to organize and carry out this research.

The mandate from the Vibrant Lethbridge committee to the niche focus group sub-committee follows:

“The strategic plan moving forward is to hold niche-focus groups for groups such as seniors, youth, First Nations, parents, immigrants and others to ask about their experience of poverty and learn first-hand what issues/solutions may be presented. Individuals within these groups could also be identified to participate on the VL committee. The leads on this goal will be gathering information about the various groups in Lethbridge that will help us gain access to these niche groups.”
Vibrant Lethbridge sees the results of this research as fundamental to the creation of viable solutions for alleviating poverty in the community. Poverty not only adversely impacts the mental and physical well-being of the people who live in it. It also is an impediment to people’s ability to fully participate in daily and community life, thus stunting the ability of individuals, families, and communities to fully realize their potential. Poverty is both episodic and constant: people might move in and out of it due to temporary circumstances, or they may find themselves trapped in it for years or generations. Poverty also is systemic and a condition to which we all are vulnerable, regardless of the socioeconomic status we occupy or the social categories that comprise our identities.

The cost in purely economic terms of allowing poverty to continue to flourish in Alberta have been measured and elaborated by Briggs and Lee (2012). Lethbridge itself has the third highest poverty rate in Alberta (at 13 percent), after Calgary and Edmonton. Twenty percent of those in poverty in Lethbridge are children under the age of 15; 40 percent are single parent families, and 42 percent are Aboriginal people (Nash, 2012). The economic consequences of this systemic issue still need to be quantified. However, the impacts of poverty on individuals and communities can be measured in much more than economic terms. It is the experiential knowledge - the lived experience - of poverty that this report seeks to make plain.

The VIBRANT Lethbridge committee, understanding the value of combining these two types of information, decided to undertake a focus group methodology to collect this information on lived experience. Focus groups are group interview/conversation scenarios centered around a particular topic of common interest to or experience of participants (Kidd and Parshall, 2000). Focus groups have been cited as a way to allow cultures to speak for themselves, allowing them to give voice to their lived experiences in their own words and on their own terms, and as a way for people to discover that others share similar life histories and circumstances, thereby allowing new interpretations of those experiences to arise (Society for Research in Child Development, 2012).

As with all research methods, focus groups have both strengths and limitations; the latter can be addressed using mixed methods, as discussed above. Focus group responses are not independent of one another, but rather build upon each other as participants share their insights and uncover the similarities and differences in their experiences (Society for Research in Child Development, 2012).

Focus group participants cannot be considered as representative of their group; instead, as was the case for this research, they often are selected based on whether they have the time, inclination, and expertise to participate (Palsy, 2008). None of these facts makes the result of focus group research any less valid. As is the case with other qualitative methods, the knowledge derived from this process allows an exploration of lived experiences and their deeper meanings within and across cultures, rather than a statistical exploration of responses (Society for Research in Child Development, 2012).

The niche focus group sub-committee, consisting of volunteers from the Vibrant Lethbridge committee, recognized early on that the groups identified as vulnerable to the impacts of poverty also are considered particularly at-risk of manipulation and abuse by people in positions of power, such as researchers and government officials. Therefore, the sub-committee took extra precautions to guard violations of these groups’ and individuals’ rights and freedoms. In particular, the sub-committee abided not only by guidelines for ethical human subjects research set forth by the University of Lethbridge, but also by those ethical practices particular to communities that were the focus of the project, such as local First Nations populations. All members of each focus group research team, the transcriptionist, all individual interviewees, and all members of the focus groups signed confidentiality statements; all focus group members and individual interviewees signed letters of consent.

METHODS

While a fair amount of statistical data on poverty, derived from census and other quantitative data collection methods, exists in Canada, Alberta, and even Lethbridge, very little information exists regarding the first-hand lived experiences of people who deal episodically or chronically with poverty. This qualitative data, these personal stories, are valuable additions to knowledge gained using quantitative methods, such as the economic-cost information presented in “Poverty Costs” (Briggs and Lee, 2012). Both together allow researchers to test hypotheses, to bridge macro and micro theories, and to access and “give voice” to populations that otherwise are invisible and silent in society (Leckenby and Hesse-Biber 2007). Mixing qualitative and quantitative information also allows for triangulation, which can be seen either as a way to confirm results gained through different methods or as a way to inquire more deeply into inconsistencies in knowledge produced by one method alone (Nightingale 2003). Hodgkin (2008) argues that using both qualitative and quantitative methods allows researchers to highlight “issues of need,” which can be discovered using qualitative methods, along with people’s experiences of those needs via qualitative methods (29).

The cost in purely economic terms of allowing poverty to continue to flourish in Alberta have been measured and elaborated by Briggs and Lee (2012). Lethbridge itself has the third highest poverty rate in Alberta (at 13 percent), after Calgary and Edmonton. Twenty percent of those in poverty in Lethbridge are children under the age of 15; 40 percent are single parent families, and 42 percent are Aboriginal people (Nash, 2012).

The VIBRANT Lethbridge committee, understanding the value of combining these two types of information, decided to undertake a focus group methodology to collect this information on lived experience. Focus groups are group interview/conversation scenarios centered around a particular topic of common interest to or experience of participants (Kidd and Parshall, 2000). Focus groups have been cited as a way to allow cultures to speak for themselves, allowing them to give voice to their lived experiences in their own words and on their own terms, and as a way for people to discover that others share similar life histories and circumstances, thereby allowing new interpretations of those experiences to arise (Society for Research in Child Development, 2012).

Focus groups are considered especially vulnerable to falling into and remaining in poverty, including single parents, First Nations people, people with disabilities, young adults (18+ years old), senior citizens, immigrants, and women. These populations were identified as vulnerable to poverty by the various members of the Vibrant Lethbridge committee who provide services to these communities. Focus group members were recruited through non-governmental community organizations that serve the populations in question. Interview participants were recruited through acquaintance with research team members.

Research teams conducted eight focus groups and two interviews. Focus groups and interviews were held in locations that facilitated maintaining the confidentiality of participants but that also were comfortable and easily accessible to them. All participants were compensated for their time with a healthy meal, a gift card to a local grocery store, free childcare, if they required it, and a round-trip bus ticket for them and each of the children they had to bring with them to the meeting.

The niche focus group sub-committee, consisting of volunteers from the Vibrant Lethbridge committee, recognized early on that the groups identified as vulnerable to the impacts of poverty also are considered particularly at-risk of manipulation and abuse by people in positions of power, such as researchers and government officials. Therefore, the sub-committee took extra precautions to guard violations of these groups’ and individuals’ rights and freedoms. In particular, the sub-committee abided not only by guidelines for ethical human subjects research set forth by the University of Lethbridge, but also by those ethical practices particular to communities that were the focus of the project, such as local First Nations populations. All members of each focus group research team, the transcriptionist, all individual interviewees, and all members of the focus groups signed confidentiality statements; all focus group members and individual interviewees signed letters of consent.

The VIBRANT Lethbridge committee, understanding the value of combining these two types of information, decided to undertake a focus group methodology to collect this information on lived experience. Focus groups are group interview/conversation scenarios centered around a particular topic of common interest to or experience of participants (Kidd and Parshall, 2000). Focus groups have been cited as a way to allow cultures to speak for themselves, allowing them to give voice to their lived experiences in their own words and on their own terms, and as a way for people to discover that others share similar life histories and circumstances, thereby allowing new interpretations of those experiences to arise (Society for Research in Child Development, 2012).

Focus groups are considered especially vulnerable to falling into and remaining in poverty, including single parents, First Nations people, people with disabilities, young adults (18+ years old), senior citizens, immigrants, and women. These populations were identified as vulnerable to poverty by the various members of the Vibrant Lethbridge committee who provide services to these communities. Focus group members were recruited through non-governmental community organizations that serve the populations in question. Interview participants were recruited through acquaintance with research team members.

Focus groups consisted of between five and nine participants plus a research team, consisting of a facilitator, a note taker, and a resource person from the Vibrant Lethbridge committee. The niche focus group sub-committee felt it was important that each research team have sub-committee member on it; the other members were volunteers from the Vibrant Lethbridge committee. The facilitator led the meeting, including asking questions and gently guiding the discussion without inserting any of her or his own opinions on what was being said. The note-taker was a silent participant who served as a back-up to the digital recorder, making extensive notes all verbal interactions. The resource person, another silent participant (unless required to be), was present to offer emotional support to the participants. Another silent participant (unless required to be), was present to offer emotional support to the participants. Another silent participant (unless required to be), was present to offer emotional support to the participants. The facilitator led the meeting, including asking questions and gently guiding the discussion without inserting any of her or his own opinions on what was being said. The note-taker was a silent participant who served as a back-up to the digital recorder, making extensive notes all verbal interactions. The resource person, another silent participant (unless required to be), was present to offer emotional support to the participants. Another silent participant (unless required to be), was present to offer emotional support to the participants. The facilitator led the meeting, including asking questions and gently guiding the discussion without inserting any of her or his own opinions on what was being said. The note-taker was a silent participant who served as a back-up to the digital recorder, making extensive notes all verbal interactions. The resource person, another silent participant (unless required to be), was present to offer emotional support to the participants. Another silent participant (unless required to be), was present to offer emotional support to the participants. The facilitator led the meeting, including asking questions and gently guiding the discussion without inserting any of her or his own opinions on what was being said. The note-taker was a silent participant who served as a back-up to the digital recorder, making extensive notes all verbal interactions. The resource person, another silent participant (unless required to be), was present to offer emotional support to the participants. Another silent participant (unless required to be), was present to offer emotional support to the participants. The facilitator led the meeting, including asking questions and gently guiding the discussion without inserting any of her or his own opinions on what was being said. The note-taker was a silent participant who served as a back-up to the digital recorder, making extensive notes all verbal interactions. The resource person, another silent participant (unless required to be), was present to offer emotional support to the participants. Another silent participant (unless required to be), was present to offer emotional support to the participants.
All research participants – both focus group members and individual interviewees – were asked these four questions. As mentioned previously, each focus group and interview was digitally and manually recorded; questions. As mentioned previously, each focus group and interview was digitally and manually recorded; questions. As mentioned previously, each focus group and interview was digitally and manually recorded; questions. As mentioned previously, each focus group and interview was digitally and manually recorded; questions.

1. What does poverty mean to you?
2. What are some obstacles or barriers that hold a person back from coming out of poverty? (Prompt/clarifying comment: What do you think causes poverty?)
3. How do you think living in poverty affects a person’s life?
4. What things could help a person come out of poverty? What could this community do to help more people have a better life? Better opportunities? Participate in society more fully? (Prompt/clarifying comment: Maybe there are things the community is already doing to help people have a better life that you think are useful/important... Those ideas are good to share too.)

All focus groups discussed the ways in which poverty is perpetuated within and across generations. Many commented that when poverty is all a person knows, then it is difficult to imagine that life might be different. [What causes poverty?] “Background. If you come from poor, like my family’s poor, then you’ll be poor.”

“Once you’re in that box and you don’t understand why you’re so dysfunctional you stay in that box, but if you step out of the box, you start learning.”

In addition to generational issues, there are seemingly innumerable ways to fall off the path out of poverty, and there are not enough comprehensive ways to support people who are trying very hard to remain on that path. In some ways, poverty seems inescapable, especially because it is tied to other personal difficulties and social stigmas.

**General Impressions of the Data**

During data analysis, a number of themes common among all focus groups emerged, as did themes unique to specific populations. These themes suggest that while poverty has ubiquitous community consequences, it also touches the lives of individuals in unique ways. Therefore, addressing poverty in ways that offer long-term solutions to help people emerge from and remain out of poverty requires community-wide as well as individually tailored responses.

**The Cyclical & Intergenerational Nature of Poverty**

Most focus groups discussed the ways in which poverty is perpetuated within and across generations. Many commented that when poverty is all a person knows, then it is difficult to imagine that life might be different. [What causes poverty?] “Background. If you come from poor, like my family’s poor, then you’ll be poor.”

“You grow up that way feeling very, you know, like you don’t deserve certain things. You grow up poor you tend to grow up thinking that you’re going to be poor for the rest of your life.”

Importantly, though, some viewed this generational burden as not quite impossible to escape, perhaps indicating that with the right supports, it is possible to imagine and attain a different life:

“Once you’re in that box and you don’t understand why you’re so dysfunctional you stay in that box, but if you step out of the box, you start learning.”

In addition to generational issues, there are seemingly innumerable ways to fall off the path out of poverty, and there are not enough comprehensive ways to support people who are trying very hard to remain on that path. In some ways, poverty seems inescapable, especially because it is tied to other personal difficulties and social stigmas.

“...poverty is you’ve got the weight of society pushing you down, and you’re way down there, and it’s kind of hard to go back up because you’re trying to go up a waterfall, right? So it’s very difficult, and once you are impoverished, it is very hard to get out. It’s like the mafia...you never get out, right?”

“[When in poverty] you feel trapped, insignificant, like... your opinion isn’t worth anything”

“I got so used to living on next to nothing that I feel like I am next to nothing.”

Furthermore, people may be vulnerable to poverty to a greater or lesser degree depending upon which social categories they occupy. Table A offers an array of sociocultural and socioeconomic identities that put people at more or less risk of falling into poverty, even briefly. In the center column is the aspect of a category that is least vulnerable. In the left and right columns are the marginal identities from which people are susceptible to falling into poverty. Some of these identities are inevitable: almost all of us will eventually become elderly, and many will become infirm. Some of these identities are fixed: for the most part, men will remain men and women will remain women. All of these identities overlap and often are simultaneous, making it difficult to pin-point which part of a person’s identity is the key to their susceptibility to poverty. For example, is Person X poor because she is a woman, mentally disabled, an addict, poorly educated, or some combination of these traits?

“[To me it’s not so much what you can’t buy it’s the necessities that you can’t get. I mean all the other stuff aside, I mean if you can’t get your medication, if you can’t get this to help yourself get up the ladder... that’s where... people give up, you know, they’re anti social because I mean, who’s going to want someone like that hanging around them, and you know, all the stigma and such that goes along with that in society.”
TABLE A: Sociocultural and socioeconomic causes and consequences of poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINAL</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
<th>MARGINAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Middle-aged</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMI</td>
<td>Not FNMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without children</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addicted</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited education</td>
<td>Educated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited skills</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible minority</td>
<td>No generational experience with poverty</td>
<td>Generational experience with poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless/shelter living</td>
<td>Housed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not resilient (job, health, legal issues)</td>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of status, stigmatized</td>
<td>Respected</td>
<td>Socially isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored</td>
<td>Positive future outlook</td>
<td>&quot;Climbing the waterfall&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor nutritional choices</td>
<td>Eats properly (healthy food and enough to eat)</td>
<td>Intact Natural disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible minority</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SELF-ESTEEM AND CONNECTION TO PEOPLE, COMMUNITY

Yet another common theme was the link between poverty and feeling useless to society, a sense that lends itself to low self-esteem, depression, and other factors discussed above.

“Self-esteem is the number one - if you don’t think highly of yourself, how could you get up in the morning and get ready and try and go look for work? How could you even begin...?”

Many of the participants in this study mentioned their desire to be useful members of society, to be visible and valuable, to contribute in some meaningful way, even if they are not able to hold down a steady job and contribute economically. Although many respondents were at a loss for how they might begin to contribute, others offered solutions to their dilemma, including volunteering with community organizations, participating in public art projects, and offering their knowledge to people in greater need than themselves.

“Volunteerism. That is something that can be used as a job. Now if you take people that were once homeless that were helped by volunteers and volunteered to help someone else then they’re not only gaining skills at an aspect but they’re helping someone else. … It doesn’t necessarily have to be money right off the bat but it could end up that way.”

Also related to the desire to contribute is the need to be connected to people other than themselves, to see and talk and interact with others. Loneliness, the scarcity of human contact, is in fact another form of poverty, one that plays upon emotional and mental health and contributes to the cycle of poverty.

“I’ve only lived here maybe a year and in August and I maybe can say in a year that I’ve lived here I’m meeting, oh, maybe 40 people. The rest are just kind of locked up in their rooms and that’s a scary thing. Shuffleboard disappeared…”

INTERCONNECTIONS OF FEAR, STRESS, DEPRESSION, HEALTH (MENTAL AND PHYSICAL) AND ADDICTIONS

Another theme common across focus groups was the constant stress and fear they experience regarding their financial situation. There is fear of not being able to meet all their basic expenses, such as food, shelter, medical requirements, child care, transportation, and utilities. There is the fear of being kicked out of their living spaces or of having to settle on living in dangerous, violent, or otherwise inadequate housing situations. There is fear of not being able to help the people who rely on you, whether family or friends, and also of alienating the people you must rely on to meet basic needs.

“Sometimes you’ve got to decide between going, alright, do I pay my full electric bill or do I make sure I have enough food for the month for my family?”

“Cause you’ve got six kids you’re going to need a big house, you’re going to need a big rent. You’ve really got nothing leftover.”

“Volunteerism. That is something that can be used as a job. Now if you take people that were once homeless that were helped by volunteers and volunteered to help someone else then they’re not only gaining skills at an aspect but they’re helping someone else. … It doesn’t necessarily have to be money right off the bat but it could end up that way.”

Also related to the desire to contribute is the need to be connected to people other than themselves, to see and talk and interact with others. Loneliness, the scarcity of human contact, is in fact another form of poverty, one that plays upon emotional and mental health and contributes to the cycle of poverty.

“I’ve only lived here maybe a year and in August and I maybe can say in a year that I’ve lived here I’m meeting, oh, maybe 40 people. The rest are just kind of locked up in their rooms and that’s a scary thing. Shuffleboard disappeared…”

“Sometimes you’ve got to decide between going, alright, do I pay my full electric bill or do I make sure I have enough food for the month for my family?”

“Cause you’ve got six kids you’re going to need a big house, you’re going to need a big rent. You’ve really got nothing leftover.”

“Volunteerism. That is something that can be used as a job. Now if you take people that were once homeless that were helped by volunteers and volunteered to help someone else then they’re not only gaining skills at an aspect but they’re helping someone else. … It doesn’t necessarily have to be money right off the bat but it could end up that way.”

Also related to the desire to contribute is the need to be connected to people other than themselves, to see and talk and interact with others. Loneliness, the scarcity of human contact, is in fact another form of poverty, one that plays upon emotional and mental health and contributes to the cycle of poverty.

“I’ve only lived here maybe a year and in August and I maybe can say in a year that I’ve lived here I’m meeting, oh, maybe 40 people. The rest are just kind of locked up in their rooms and that’s a scary thing. Shuffleboard disappeared…”

“Sometimes you’ve got to decide between going, alright, do I pay my full electric bill or do I make sure I have enough food for the month for my family?”

“Cause you’ve got six kids you’re going to need a big house, you’re going to need a big rent. You’ve really got nothing leftover.”

“Volunteerism. That is something that can be used as a job. Now if you take people that were once homeless that were helped by volunteers and volunteered to help someone else then they’re not only gaining skills at an aspect but they’re helping someone else. … It doesn’t necessarily have to be money right off the bat but it could end up that way.”

Also related to the desire to contribute is the need to be connected to people other than themselves, to see and talk and interact with others. Loneliness, the scarcity of human contact, is in fact another form of poverty, one that plays upon emotional and mental health and contributes to the cycle of poverty.
This type of preoccupation makes it difficult to navigate already complicated systems and to find ways to address immediate and long-term needs. Recent research published in Science (Mani et al., 2013) suggests that poverty—considered to be a form of scarcity—diminishes people’s cognitive abilities, including their ability to make critical decisions about daily life. Someone dealing with scarcity subconsciously is devoting much of their mental capacity to thinking about that scarcity, leaving less mental “bandwidth” available to consider other parts of life. This diminished capacity to address multiple problems manifests in people’s lives as, among other characteristics, diminished impulse control and the inability to plan and problem-solve.

Thus, the need to deal with scarcity makes it harder for people to engage in daily decision-making and planning. For example, the requirement to understand and navigate the complicated bureaucratic systems that exist to manage individual and community poverty. This diminished cognitive bandwidth also has a direct impact on whether people are able to make decisions that might extricate them from poverty.

“I remember staying up at night before I left my ex, you know, and we were behind in rent and bills were unpaid; they were shutting off my electricity every week, and I would go back in and beg them to turn it on ‘cause I had a brand new baby at the house, and I would just lay in bed at night and just, what am I going to do? Like, what am I supposed to do? There’s nothing I can do. My parents won’t help me, friends won’t help me anymore, Social Services won’t help me. Like, I had nothing. I had absolutely nothing...to live like that for so long...it was terrifying.”

The fear experienced by people in poverty is compounded by the stress of working daily to meet basic needs in a system that is sometimes irrational and often biased against the people it is meant to serve. Stress and fear combine and lead to depression, which can lead to both physical and mental health problems.

“It would be—that’s a lot of anxiety for immigrants and the anxiety leads to depression and depression is probably the entry to mental ill health. And the system would be bearing the cost.”

These problems often require medication that becomes an extra expense that cannot be paid—e.g., $50 for diabetes medication can push a tight budget over the tipping point—or can even lead to addictions that exacerbate the other symptoms of this complicated puzzle. Trying to break free from addiction often becomes an inadvertent path back into poverty, as systems are set up to help those with addictions, not those who have emerged from them:

“[You could be a crack head and because you’re on crack you’ll get paid to pay for your addiction. You can’t work, you can’t do anything; you’ll get paid to have your place in all this but all your money’s going to crack. I’m not going to start doing crack to get help from the government because I can’t afford to have my own place. I don’t understand why they can’t help. That’s what they’re supposed to be there for is to help the citizens when they need the help.”

In the entry to mental ill health. And the system would be bearing the cost.*

EMOTIONAL POVERTY

While it is a ubiquitous symptom of poverty, emotional poverty seems particularly impactful on two groups, primarily due to compounding factors of the inability to speak English (immigrants) and societal prejudice (First Nations people). Many immigrant respondents discussed how the process of becoming a refugee and moving to a new land with new customs meant a loss of their traditional measures of status, independence, and importance in their society. Because they no longer own land and grow crops to feed their families, elder immigrants are the least important members of their households, often having to rely on their grandchildren to be wage earners. These people then lose their personal autonomy and their sense that they are contributing to their families, thereby straining essential social and emotional relationships.

“Poverty is like he was independent from the age of 13, like, but when he comes to Canada from the day he arrived he is not able to get any kind of to get into the work or make himself independent so he has to depend on the government support from the day he arrived here in Canada.”

The multiple adverse impacts on First Nations people of racism and poverty have been studied and documented (Currie et al., 2011). Stories of daily dealings with disdain and prejudice and the knowledge that whatever one does, one cannot escape one’s indigeneity and the implications for it on one’s circumstances, underscore the necessity of addressing societal ill-will toward the First Nations population in Lethbridge—and everywhere.

“The non-Native person in front of you will be greeted, will be treated so well but when you’re up on the next line you’re totally ignored or you encounter a lot of people that are right out ignorant. Uh, I was able to overcome that by...when I go out into the city and have to encounter I don’t look at them directly anymore as I used to. I look above their heads so that I don’t have to see how their reaction is to me.”

Poverty is: “Being treated—because of how you’re being treated, the poorness that comes along with it. Unable
to work yourself out of being Native. I can never change [into] a White person and be successful.”

“I have to live [in a really unsafe place] ‘cause I have no money….My relative was murdered, and I tried to leave Lethbridge and another relative was killed….in a car accident. A lot of dysfunction. But that caused me poverty because of all those poverty stricken dysfunctional things that happened to me. My mental state and – that’s poverty when you’re not able to work yourself or be able to choose a safe place to live and live like, you know, those White people down the street and - that’s poverty.”

Unfortunately, there is also a burgeoning mistrust between these two vulnerable populations in Lethbridge, a mistrust it would behoove both communities, as well as the wider public, to address.

**STRUCTURAL SUPPORT AND SYSTEMIC FAILURES**

A final theme, and one which might be fairly readily addressed by the City of Lethbridge, is the need for more comprehensive, multi-faceted support systems that are set up to help people succeed at critical moment in their progress out of poverty. At the moment, there are gaps and loopholes in existing systems that contribute to the sense of uncertainty and fear that already plague vulnerable populations. Several people across focus groups mentioned that it is easier to get support when one is addicted to drugs or alcohol than when one is sober.

“I want to find out why there’s more support for people with addictions than for somebody who’s trying and really stuck in a tight spot. There’s no exceptions to the rule. There’s no - there’s just no help. I’ve been dealing with social workers for the past three years and I haven’t been able to get anything for myself. And I’m the one that’s suffering because when I suffer my kids suffer and I see that in all my girls…. It’s really hard for me. I don’t understand why I can’t get this help.”

Several other respondents mentioned that there are more supports for people who are in dire need or abject poverty than there are for people who are slowing making their way out.

“Some families are still lower income but they don’t qualify for the food bank”

“I’m still living like this and I still can’t find a job. I still can’t find anyone to help me with my daughter, and I don’t have a home. And everybody’s okay with it. That’s what it feels like to me…. I don’t know what I have to do because I’m really stuck. I have no family support right now because everyone is as bad off as me, if not worse, and they want me to turn to my family and ask my friends for help. Everybody is just as bad off as me. How are we supposed to help each other? I don’t understand how any of this is supposed to work.”

Many respondents had suggestions for making the system work better, from offering better and more connected transportation services to getting organizations to work more closely together to having individual support workers with the knowledge to connect people to services they might not be aware of.

“There is a lot that this community can do, like again, to begin first they have - I think what they have to do is really work, like I said, with all the different organizations here. Have an in depth look at exactly what they’re doing. Are they being effective?”

“I have a relative who was murdered, and I tried to leave Lethbridge and another relative was killed…in a car accident. A lot of dysfunction. But that caused me poverty because of all those poverty stricken dysfunctional things that happened to me. My mental state and - that’s poverty when you’re not able to work yourself or be able to choose a safe place to live and live like, you know, those White people down the street and - that’s poverty.”

Many discussed the difficulties of working with an inflexible and apparently arbitrary system whose rules they do not understand, for example, this respondent referring to an interaction with a social services employee:

“Well, you have to follow our policies. Well, you don’t meet the requirement so we’re not going to - you can’t come into our program.”

Not all is dire in the social system, however. There were many references to the kindness and compassion of service providers, and many local NGOs were discussed with great appreciation. It is this kindness, this acknowledgment of shared humanity, that can make a difference in the daily mental health and stressful lives of vulnerable people.

“I remember going to the food bank and I just cried the first time I went there. I cried and cried. And the lady that was behind the desk, she came around and she said, don’t you ever cry when you come here. This is for you; don’t you feel bad about taking - and that really meant a lot to me. And I still go the food bank once in a while. And I think that if it wasn’t for the food bank, I don’t know, some of these people would be starving to death.”
RESPONDENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP

From the results elaborated above, a number of systemic problems can be identified and responses to them considered. Unfortunately, poverty reduction strategies often are cast not in terms of potential systemic change, communities of care, or citizen empowerment but rather in terms of the personal failures of the people living in poverty, which can lead to the stigmatization of those who struggle with poverty. Addressing the stigma associated with poverty is crucial to removing barriers to accessing services and encouraging alliance-building across the multiple communities that could benefit from collaborative anti-poverty efforts (Kingfisher, 2002 and 2007).

Fortunately, the respondents in this research had the opportunity to express their opinions on changes that can be made to improve their access to services and to help lift them out of poverty. The recommendations and suggestions that follow derive both from the knowledge produced by respondents during focus groups and individual interviews and from the discussions among the research and data analysis teams about the results.

For example, as one First Nations respondent pointed out, “For a lot of our people, our Blackfoot language is a more soothing language. Non-Native [the English] language is right to the point and sometimes it could come in a really blunt, like rude [way].” Providing native speakers of local First Nations languages at social service points would be one way to ease communication with First Nations clients. This also is undoubtedly true for the many immigrant populations in the city. A dearth of translation services means that many people are not fully aware of the services that are available to them. One of the most common suggestions for making the lives of people in poverty better is the provision of more educational and vocational training opportunities. Many people felt that their inability to be properly trained for decent wage-earning positions left them stuck in the cycle of poverty. Skilled immigrants were particularly incensed that they were not able to contribute their existing abilities to their new country:

“Canada is losing a lot of income by allowing professionals, trained people, to waste in the country.”

“…we were new in Canada, we have not contributed to the Canadian government. Like, we have never worked in Canada, we didn’t pay any tax to this government and how can we expect [the government to take care of us]?”

One respondent offered a solution to this problem, one that the City of Lethbridge, in conjunction with Lethbridge College and the University of Lethbridge, might consider—assisting immigrants who are already skilled in their own countries attain licensure here. The respondent offered this solution as a comparison to how people are trained to drive in Canada:

“In the place of the driving school, you could have [retraining] for jobs. [The government says] that there is a lack of labor in Canada, so it goes all out to say, ‘Skilled laborers from other continents, from other places, please come.’ How do they get here? They don’t fly here just like that… Just like that. You get your credentials in Nova Scotia, you get [them] assessed. [They] say, ‘Oh…this person is good, this person is okay.’ [The government] gives them the permission to get the process going. They get it done, they’re successful, they land in the country, [the government says] they are not skilled. Yeah, that’s the meaning because you don’t give them the job that they are qualified for; [skilled people] are all over the place in Canada, they come every year, but [there are] no jobs for them. Now, if there are standards and things that you want to achieve in your country, beautiful, it’s perfect, it’s a good thing. Just like the case that I gave as an example of the driver’s license let there be institutions that could train and adapt [their] skill and a kind of internship because Canada is losing a lot of income by allowing professionals, trained people, to waste in the country. There are a lot of them. They are wasting. They don’t have access to the job. They have knowledge; they need adaptation. Maximum maybe six months, a year, whatever, and you make them to work to pay tax. Then the country is more prosperous.”

Many respondents across focus groups felt a keen need for learning and practicing life skills that might help them exit poverty, such as cooking, smoking cessation, shopping, making healthy food and life choices, saving money, budgeting, and money management. A number of people in each group already possessed these skills as well as the knowledge of what it’s like to be in poverty and make use of these skills in that context. Perhaps making use of these people by employing them as experts in their field would be a way to empower, to value, and to engage these skilled people with the broader community.

A better, more flexible, and more affordable transit system that can accommodate irregular work schedules was mentioned by several respondents. An improved, accessible, lower-cost bus system also would allow disconnected people to access activities that might help them to be both physically healthy and better integrated with the community at large.

One of the strengths of Lethbridge is its value of and encouragement offers a way to emerge from depression and the feelings of inconsequence and invisibility that potentially be operationalized in the context of already existing services in Lethbridge. They suggest strongly that having an outlet for communication, access to a person or a group willing to listen and offer kindness and encouragement offers a way to emerge from depression and the feelings of inconsequence and invisibility that people in poverty often experience.

“If people were allowed to speak… to have a someone you can go and talk over your situation… (You feel like you’re not going anywhere; you’re staying dormant, you know? And to be able to go out and say I can do this, I don’t have that stigma anymore, I can do this. But when you get stuck you’re stuck, you know, so to be able to go out and talk to somebody that’ll really give you that push you need.”

“Always having to be behind on either your bills or food or being to get anywhere. Childcare, having to pay 140 dollars a month for preschool. That just boggles my mind.”

“You have to have child care to go to work.”

“…poverty does cause educational barriers as the choice to go back to school is almost selfish as it costs a child precious time with their parent or parents. How can this be seen in the best interests of the child?”

“My daughter’s suffering a lot. I didn’t think it was fair. I went to work, before she got out of school, after lunchtime, and I was there until after she got out of school, and I talked with this woman, and she called [a support organization] for me, and they spoke on my behalf, and that’s how I was able to get there. But I was ready to give my daughter up so she wouldn’t have to live like that. I want her to have good experiences. It’s very heartbreaking, and I have been through a lot of experiences in the past year and a half, and it doesn’t seem to be over yet. I’m just wondering how long I’ll be able to hold onto my daughter before she does get taken ‘cause they expressed to me that they felt she was in danger because she didn’t have a home, nothing secure.”

As mentioned previously, one of the consequences of this loneliness is the feeling of being silenced, of being unable to communicate with anyone who will commiserate and of becoming stuck in solitude and depression as a result: another vicious circle. However, some respondents offered solutions to this issue that can potentially be operationalized in the context of already existing services in Lethbridge. They suggest strongly that having an outlet for communication, access to a person or a group willing to listen and offer kindness and encouragement offers a way to emerge from depression and the feelings of inconsequence and invisibility that people in poverty often experience.
“It’s very important to be [together] once in a week…so we can explain our feelings to [each other]. It is a great help to share [our] experiences and it might give some relief to us.”

“I think the one barrier that we all encounter is still the prejudice, but again, as an individual I see if we get help from our reserve, utilize more people from the positive background like Elders to come in and help young people [who are] going through self-esteem [issues] and helping them out. I think we can overcome that. … I was able to overcome that but I went back to the reserve too and I started attending, like our [ceremonies] and that brought me my strength to understand how to live in a society where we encounter prejudice everyday. But it’s hard. It really takes a lot of work to be able to overcome that.”

Finding ways to assure people have access to compassionate community can be a solution to at least some of the difficulties experienced by people in poverty.

A final suggestion stems from many respondents’ satisfaction with the assistance provided to vulnerable populations by many non-governmental organizations in Lethbridge. A variety of participants in all focus groups very strongly that these organizations give them invaluable support that makes their lives easier. However, they also felt that many people who could make use of these services are not aware that they exist.

One recommendation consistently derived from this observation was that there should be an effort to find people in their circumstances – in full collaboration with a wider community of care and mutual responsibility. The systems in place that are greatly beneficial to them as they maneuver through their complicated lives. Many local NGOs provide the time, compassionate connection, information, and resources that vulnerable individuals and groups need in order to navigate the bureaucratic hurdles and everyday indignities of a life in poverty. If the resources within Lethbridge can be interconnected more fluidly, if systems of support can be simplified, if loopholes can be closed and tenuous safety nets can be secured, people vulnerable to poverty may well find themselves in a better position to emerge from their circumstances – in full collaboration with a wider community of care and mutual responsibility.

Much more analysis of the data collected during this project must be done, and further avenues for solutions derived from local strengths and resources must be explored. Furthermore, other vulnerable populations should be included in further research, for their experiences will enlighten and enhance any future decision making around poverty alleviation. For example, Lethbridge is home to two institutions of higher education. Recent research has shown that students at these institutions are particularly vulnerable to issues deriving from poverty, such as food insecurity (Nugent, 2011). Students, therefore, should be included in further research and outreach endeavors by the city.

Ultimately, we recommend that further steps be taken to understand the scope and depth of impact of poverty on the lives of people in Lethbridge. While the people we spoke with feel that there are many positive aspects of their lives and many tools available to them to meet their immediate needs, the long-term needs they have in order to permanently leave poverty still need to be addressed and the systems that assist with this goal need to be strengthened and made more dynamic and responsive. The Vibrant Lethbridge Committee is actively pursuing immediate and long-term next steps toward its ultimate goal of poverty alleviation and is committed both to keeping research participants informed about existing progressive actions and involved in the planning and strategizing of new initiatives.
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CONCLUSIONS

As is demonstrated in the knowledge shared above, day-to-day living is quite difficult for people living in poverty. They must negotiate the daily requirements of participating in community life, including going to work and caring for their children and extended families, but they must do so in the context of limited physical, economic, mental, and emotional resources and while enduring the community skepticism and stigma that adhere unerringly to people in poverty.
MAY 20TH, 2014

On January 16th, 2014 over eighty participants from over twenty organizations met at the Lethbridge Lodge to hear about and discuss the results of focus groups conducted by Vibrant Lethbridge in the spring of 2013 with people living in poverty in Lethbridge. After Dr. Trina Filan presented the report, You’re Trying to Go Up a Waterfall, which summarized the experiences and concerns shared by participants in the focus groups, each table group was asked to respond to three questions:

what do you and your organization do?
what gaps do you see in services provided?
what could be done to address them?

The following summarizes the responses given by the participants.

GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY COOPERATION

Not surprisingly given that the participants in the round table were largely from government and non-profit agencies working with the poor the issue that generated the most discussion and ideas was the issue of inter-agency cooperation and communication. There was a general consensus that silos needed to be dismantled with a variety of suggestions made about how this might be accomplished.

- a unified intake process so that people aren’t required to duplicate applications
- chart out process for clients looking at ways to streamline the process
- a centralized phone number with multiple first languages provided
- a 211 call system to help connect people with the right office
- a centralized location (not only to facilitate access but to allow greater community building between clients)
- shared departmental funding to facilitate cooperation between departments
- adopting an “every door is the right door” attitude
- better advertising of services including better communication across offices/agencies
- bulletin boards with material from other offices and agencies posted
- materials in more than one language
- an agency based community guide like Community Links but with more detail
- better hours for working people
- more outreach workers and less in the office
- more connections with businesses and faith groups
- using a team approach involving more people including the police to assist clients
- creating opportunities for agencies to become familiar with each other’s services through things like breakfasts, “speed dating” event, or regular meet and greet gatherings perhaps linked to the
client service fair
- addressing the needs of people for whom English is not their first language and the needs of those who do not have basic literacy
- using AB Child Health benefits card as ID for supplements
- working more closely with faith communities and ensuring that they are kept informed about programmes and events

TRANSPORTATION

The third issue which received a significant number of dots was transportation. There was a general agreement that transit was inadequate for the working poor. Several suggestions were made:

EMPLOYMENT ISSUES

There was agreement that the minimum wage does not represent a living wage and that coupled with a lack of benefits ensured that many working people were living in poverty. Suggestions for improved employment included:

STIGMA

Many people identified stigma as a significant issue in working with people living in poverty. Education was one suggestion to address the problem. Another was the breaking down of barriers between people of different income groups by creating more mixed neighbourhoods and by providing gathering places for community building. These would include green spaces but also community halls that were affordable and accessible. Other suggestions included:

CHILD CARE

The greatest need identified was for child care subsidies and for child care that was accessible outside of daytime hours to accommodate shift work.

EDUCATION

A variety of issues were raised around the theme of education. It was suggested that employers needed to find ways to encourage training and skill building among their employees. Many people identified the need for life skills training like budgeting and cooking. It was suggested that more needed to be done with children in the schools to break cycles of poverty. Expanded school lunch and snack programs as well as more Head Start programs were suggested. Employment skills and self-employment skills were identified as needs. Further suggestions included:

FOOD

There were a variety of suggestions of ways in which people living in poverty could get better access to affordable, healthy food besides food banks. These included:

RECREATION

There is general agreement that there needs to be greater access for low-income families to recreational facilities in the city. It was suggested that Jump Start/ Kid Sport subsidies be expanded.
It was suggested that supports for immigrants are not in place long enough. Transition programmes and employment supplements were suggested and it was thought that more could be done with the university and college to facilitate their integration.

**CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS**

Comparing the responses of participants in the roundtable event with the participants in the focus groups reveals, not surprisingly, common themes and concerns. Both groups identified specific issues around services such as transit, health care, and day care. Both also reveal concerns to break down barriers between groups in the city. The government employees used the language of silos to speak of the need for more inter-agency cooperation but one could extend the metaphor of silos to say that there is a general concern to overcome the isolation of the poor in their own silos of poverty.

In 1987 William Julius Wilson wrote a seminal book, The Truly Disadvantaged, in which he argues that when people live in poverty in concentrated neighbourhoods it intensifies the social and economic impact of that poverty making it much more difficult for people to change their circumstances (Wilson, 1987). Further, when that poverty is experienced over generations it becomes even more entrenched (Sharkey, 2013, for an extensive discussion of Wilson and Sharkey’s work see Rothstein, 2014). There are a number of theories about what this is so including arguments that when the poor live in isolation they lack the kind of mentoring or ‘role models’ that help people make changes in their lives or that they lack the social networks that enable them to access resources in the community (Chaskin and Joseph, 2011).

The stigmatization of the poor which may feed into this isolation is also exacerbated by that isolation, an isolation which often leads to depression and other forms of mental illness. In both the focus groups and the roundtables we heard repeatedly that the more people live in silos of poverty the more likely they are to suffer physically, mentally, socially and economically.

Many of the suggestions that were made by both people living in poverty and people working in agencies reflect a desire to create broader networks between people living in the city. Suggestions like creating opportunities for people in poverty to volunteer have the potential not only of enabling people to develop skills but also affords them the opportunity to form connections with other people in the city. In his study of how people find jobs Mark Granovetter found that most people find work through informal networks of what he calls “weak ties” (Granovetter, 1973). We are most likely to share the same information and resources with those with whom we share strong ties, close friends and family, but acquaintances or casual friends are more likely to provide access to a broader network of information and connections (Beck, 2014). Granovetter suggests that communities with large networks of weak ties are actually better able to mobilize resources to address communities problems as well. The benefits of these kinds of programmes, therefore, accrue to the entire city and not just to people living in poverty.

Specific suggestions that we move away from neighbourhoods of concentrated poverty by creating more mixed neighbourhoods and that we create more affordable, accessible “third spaces” where communities may gather, reflect a concern that poverty often translates into isolation both physical and social.
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