



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago  
Loyola eCommons

---

Master's Theses

Theses and Dissertations

---

1953

## Motivation of the Natural Parents, the Placement Agents, And the Adoptive Parents in Independent Adoptions

Anne Marie Faletto  
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses)

 Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faletto, Anne Marie, "Motivation of the Natural Parents, the Placement Agents, And the Adoptive Parents in Independent Adoptions" (1953). *Master's Theses*. 994.

[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses/994](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/994)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1953 Anne Marie Faletto

MOTIVATION OF THE NATURAL PARENTS,  
THE PLACEMENT AGENTS, AND THE ADOPTIVE PARENTS  
IN INDEPENDENT ADOPTIONS

by

ANNE MARIE FALETTA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL  
OF SOCIAL WORK OF LOYOLA UNIVERSITY IN  
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE RE-  
QUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

FEBRUARY

1953

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                    |                            |      |
|--------------------|----------------------------|------|
| CHAPTER I.         | INTRODUCTION .....         | 1    |
| CHAPTER II.        | THE NATURAL PARENTS .....  | 9    |
| CHAPTER III.       | THE PLACEMENT AGENTS ..... | 30   |
| CHAPTER IV.        | THE PETITIONERS .....      | 52   |
| CHAPTER V.         | SUMMARY .....              | 67   |
| APPENDIX           |                            |      |
|                    | A .....                    | iv   |
|                    | B .....                    | v    |
|                    | C .....                    | vi   |
|                    | D .....                    | vii  |
|                    | E .....                    | viii |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... |                            | ix   |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

For many years agencies, courts, and the allied fields of medicine and law have been deeply concerned with the independent placement of children in homes for the purpose of adoption. Professional literature in the field of child placement has put much emphasis on the importance of a careful study, by a qualified person, of both the adoptive home and the child who is to be placed for adoption. However, statistics reveal that by far the greater number of children throughout the country are placed by persons having few or no qualifications in the field of child placement or in the field of adoption.<sup>1</sup>

#### PURPOSE

This thesis was planned with the threefold purpose of determining what factors are involved which lead to the participation in independent adoptive placements by the natural parents, the adopting parents, and the untrained placement agents.

---

1 Opal Jacobs, Institute on Adoptions, Chicago, February 1952

SCOPE

This thesis covers only those independent adoptions completed by the Division of Child Welfare of the Illinois Department of Public Welfare for the Madison County Court during the year 1950 in which the child and the adopting parents (petitioners) were unrelated by blood or marriage, and in which cases the adoptive planning had not received the services of a Child Placing Agency prior to the placement of the child in the adoptive home.

The year 1950 was chosen for the time span of this study and Madison County for the area of this study because in the year 1950 the Judge of the Madison County Court requested that the Division of Child Welfare of the Illinois Department of Public Welfare assist the court in the investigation of the independent adoptions petitioned for through his court. This investigation was that required by law as set up under Article 3, Section 3-1 on the adoption of children in the State of Illinois.

Upon the filing of the petition, and before the return day designated in the summons issued thereon, the court shall specifically designate either a licensed child welfare agency, probation officer of the court, or some other suitable agency or person, to investigate, accurately, fully and promptly, the allegations contained in the petition; ..... The information obtained as a result of such investigation shall be reduced to writing and presented to the court on or before the return day designated in the summons.....<sup>2</sup>

---

2 Smith-Hurd, Laws Relating to the Adoption of Children

The fact that the investigation of independent adoptions for the court during this period was completed by the Division of Child Welfare made the availability of more detailed information possible in the combined use of the summary report prepared by the Division for the court and the Division case record itself which was established concurrently with the Division's study of the independent adoption situation for the court.

In many cases the Division of Child Welfare had contact with the situation as a case under the Maternity Hospital Act concurrently with the request from the County Court for a study of the adoption petition.

The Maternity Hospital Act was an act approved June 24, 1915 allowing for the licensing, inspection and regulation of maternity hospitals, lying-in homes, or any other place, public or private, used for the confinement of women. This act was amended July 14, 1939 to prohibit such institutions or hospitals to place children for adoption or care in foster homes, or anywhere outside of the custody of their mothers, unless the hospital or institution was licensed as a child welfare agency as provided by law, except with the written permission of the State Department of Public Welfare.

The observance of this section of the Maternity Hospital Act was encouraged by the formation of the "Report of Maternity Hospital"<sup>3</sup> by the Division of Child Welfare which requested that the "Report" be completed by the hospital and forwarded to the Division of Child Welfare

for all children born to unmarried mothers and all other children who were to live away from their own parents, with the exception of the children who were dismissed to licensed child placing agencies. Upon the reception of this "Maternity Hospital Report", the Division contacted the mother who had given birth to the illegitimate child with an offer of whatever case work services were indicated.<sup>4</sup> This function of the Division was not synonymous with the services requested from the court.

However, as the same case worker for the Division of Child Welfare completed the adoptive investigation of the home in which the child had been placed for the Madison County Court and also the situation as it concerned the Maternity Hospital Act, a very detailed case record was available giving specific details concerning the mothers, the persons active in the independent placement of the child, as well as facts concerning the actual placement of the child, from its home or hospital to the home of the petitioners. It is the existence of these detailed case records which makes this particular thesis feasible in this area at this time.

The scope of this thesis is not to include material of the Maternity Hospital cases as such, or to point up the evils of independent placements. This thesis is to be geared specifically within the boundaries as set up in the purpose outlined above.

---

<sup>4</sup> A complete copy of the Maternity Hospital Law is included in appendix B.

METHOD

This investigation of the independent adoptions petitioned for in The Madison County Court was requested of the Division of Child Welfare in the form of a Request Letter which was received directly from the Court. A sample of the Request Letter is found in the appendix.<sup>5</sup> Following the investigation by the Division case worker a summary report was submitted to the court. The outline which was developed by the Division case worker for the preparation of this summary is also found in the appendix.<sup>6</sup>

The sample for this thesis was obtained by an examination of these Request Letters received from the Madison County Court by the Division of Child Welfare during the year 1950. Those cases were eliminated in which the child sought in adoption was a step-child of one of the petitioners; in which the child sought in the adoption was an illegitimate child of the adopting parents' daughter; or in which the child sought in adoption and the petitioners were in some manner related by blood or marriage.

This preliminary examination of the Request Letters revealed that seventy-five independent adoptions were investigated by the Division of Child Welfare during the year 1950. Of these seventy-five independent adoptions, fifty-four were step-children relationships or grandparents adopting illegitimate grandchildren; six were relatives adopting children of relatives; which left fifteen pure, independent adoptions. These fifteen cases are the sample for this thesis.

---

5 See Appendix C

6 See Appendix D



In the collection of data for this thesis the adoption summary report submitted to the Court by the Division of Child Welfare and the Division case record itself was used.

The material was collected on schedule sheets.<sup>7</sup> Two schedule sheets were prepared for each of the fifteen cases. One schedule related specifically to the mother and her child; the other to the petitioners. Each schedule contained material regarding the placing agent; the manner of contact between the placing agent and the mother and between the placing agent and the petitioners, or the manner of contact between the mother and the petitioners. Additional material was collected on fly sheets attached to the back of each set of schedules. Excerpts from the case records or adoption summaries for the court used to substantiate definite points of this thesis were noted on the fly sheets.

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of this thesis the following terms denote the meaning as given below.

Independent placement - This term indicates only those placements which were effected without the services of a Child Placing Agency and in which there was no relationship, through blood or marriage, between the child and the adoptive parents.

Adoptive parents - This term indicates those persons who have in their home a child whom they seek to adopt.

---

7 See Appendix E

Petitioners - This term identifies those persons who have petitioned the court for the adoption of a child. In this thesis the adoptive parents will be referred to as the petitioners. This identification will be used since the material used in the thesis initiated with the Madison County Court where the adoptive parents have the legal status of petitioners.

Placement agent or agents - This term identifies the unqualified person or persons arranging or actually effecting the placement of a child in the petitioners home.

Child Placing Agency - This term for purpose of this thesis, denotes an agency, authorized by the law of the state in which it operated, to plan for and place children in homes for the purpose of adoption.

Adoption through normal channels - In our present society, with its man protections for children, adoption through normal channels is adoption through a recognized child placing agency.

Adoption - Adoption is a legally and socially recognized means of bringing together a child in need of parents and a couple who wish to fulfill or complete their desire for a family. Webster defines adoption as the act of taking to or receiving as one's own what is not so naturally.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Third Edition of the Merriam Series, p. 15.

## THE PRESENTATION OF DATA

The material collected for this thesis was organized and classified for presentation in the narrative as well as the case history form.

The body of this thesis and the greater portion of the thesis is involved with the detailed presentation of each of the fifteen cases with specific excerpts from the case record to substantiate certain points, followed by a discussion of the various factors involved.

The material is analyzed and presented in three general sections: As the material related itself to the natural parents' motivation in the independent placement of their child, as it related itself to the motivation of the placement agents in such placements, and as it related itself to the motivation of the petitioners in the accepting or seeking for a child independent of an agency. One chapter was devoted to each of these three sections. The material thus presented was analyzed in relation to the threefold purpose of this thesis.

In the presentation of the data only that pertinent to the evolution of our purpose is recorded. Direct excerpts from the case record are used whenever possible.

The fifth chapter of this thesis is a summarization of the facts presented which seem to relate specifically to our threefold purpose and an analysis of the similarities and differences involved.

## CHAPTER II

### THE NATURAL PARENTS

This chapter will relate the factors which are involved in the independent placement of a child by his natural parent or parents. The specific areas examined are the identifying facts concerning the parents; age, religion, living arrangements, employment, and the original contact which aided the parent or parents in the placement of their child independently.

Each of the fifteen cases are presented as a separate unit, followed by an analysis of the facts which were most significant in the parents' decision to release their baby for adoption to independent, untrained persons.

In the study group, there are fifteen children; fourteen white children and one Negro child.

Of the fifteen cases there were only fourteen mothers. One mother was the mother of two children who were placed in separate adoptive homes at separate times. Those two children were half-sister and brother.

Of the study group of fourteen mothers, eight were young unmarried girls who gave birth to illegitimate children. Two were married women who were separated but not legally divorced from their husbands. In both cases the husband was the legal as well as the natural father of the child placed independently. Of the fourteen mothers, two were divorced women who had not remarried, and whose children were legally illegitimate. One mother was

still legally married to a husband who was serving in the military services overseas. The mother who is the parent of two children in this study group belongs to a special category. At the time of the placement of her first child she was legally married to the child's father who was serving in the military services overseas. At the time of the placement of her second child she was a legally divorced woman and the child born to her was illegitimate.

The case material is presented in the above groupings in order to lend some order and similarity in presentation.

#### The Eight Unmarried Mothers

The case of Agnes is representative of the first group which consists of the eight unmarried mothers. Agnes, who was a fifteen year old school girl of the Protestant Faith, resided with her mother, older brother, and younger sister, until the very night of her child's delivery, without knowledge to her family that she was pregnant.

This case became active with the Division of Child Welfare as a Maternity Hospital Case almost simultaneously with the request from the Madison County Court for an adoption investigation. Consequently, the Division of Child Welfare case record is quite thorough. From the case record dated 3-1-50 we gather this paragraph.

Maternity Hospital report received from \_\_\_\_\_ Hospital indicating that \_\_\_\_\_ had given birth on 2-20-50 to an illegitimate baby boy. The report was signed by Nurse \_\_\_\_\_, Maternity Department and indicated that the baby was remaining in the hospital until legal proceedings would be completed for adoptive placement.....

3-2-50 visited Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ who was quite defensive but as we discussed the situation he advised that he had delivered the baby and one of the other physicians at the hospital had taken the case from him as he knew a family who wanted to adopt and the mother and grandmother of this child did not want to take the child home with them. As we talked, he advised that Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ could advise me of any of the details.

Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ advised that he did not know the girl, that she had come to the hospital towards the last minutes of labor and he had aided the birth as an emergency. He advised that after birth, the girl, her mother, and her brother, indicated that they did not know what they would do with the baby since no one seemed to know that Agnes was pregnant. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ advised that at this point one of the other physicians asked if he could not have the case as he had friends who would take the baby for adoption. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ advised that he washed his hands of the situation and refused to give further service to the baby since he did not want to be tied up in any illicit placing.

In the same case record, found in the summary prepared for the Madison County Court in the matter of the adoption investigation of Agnes' child we find this excerpt.

Agnes and her mother stated that after being approached by Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ with the offer of the good, superior home of his friends for the adoption of Agnes' child, they gave him permission to take full charge of the baby... Immediately after delivery, Agnes was taken home in an ambulance in order that the situation would be known to the community. Agnes' baby was admitted to the hospital nursery as an abandoned child.

In analyzing the above case material on Agnes we might correctly

reach the decision that the impetus in the decision made for this mother to give her baby away independent of an agency seems to be only in the simplicity and the urgency of the plan presented to her. An immediate solution to the problem was present and the members of this family took immediate advantage of it.

Another example of the group of eight unmarried mothers is the case of Betty, who was twenty years of age at the birth of her illegitimate child. Betty completed high school and later worked as a waitress for two years. She was of the Protestant Faith and lived with her family, in a small community, until the time of the birth of her child. In the Division record Betty's specific statement was recorded.

Betty stated that she placed her child with the petitioners because she had been approached by the family physician to whom she had gone in the eighth month of pregnancy. She had told the physician that she did not wish to keep the baby and he offered to take the child after birth and arrange an adoption. He also offered payment of all her expenses, medical and confinement.

This mother also seems to have accepted the first plan offered to her. The payment of her medical expenses might also have been a deciding factor in this type of planning for herself and her expected child.

The case of Carol presents a similar picture in the group of eight unmarried mothers. Carol, a twenty-two year old Catholic, unmarried mother, lived in a rooming house during her pregnancy. She apparently was employed as a nurse or nurse's aide in a large hospital in a large metropolitan area. The summary report prepared for the Court contained the following information.

Carol was never personally interviewed and the material recorded here is that received from Attorney            and the petitioners who receive the child.

These persons stated that during Carol's last months of pregnancy she confided in a nurse friend who was employed at the same hospital. This nurse friend, who was a close friend of the petitioners, although the petitioners lived approximately three hundred miles away, offered to arrange for the adoptive placement of Carol's expected child. Since Carol was without extra funds, the nurse friend also arranged that the petitioners would assume her confinement expenses.

The case material above seems to indicate that Carol also accepted the first plan that was offered to her in regard to her expected child. As a young girl, in a large city, with little financial security, an auxiliary factor in her decision to place her child independently might well have been the offer of financial assistance in regard to her confinement care.

The case of Delores is also representative of the eight unmarried mothers who placed their child independently. Delores, a fifteen year old Negro high school girl of the Protestant Faith, lived with her family during her entire pregnancy. We may gain some insight into Delores and her family's motivation in the statements contained in the summary prepared for the Court by the Division of Child Welfare.

Delores and her family related that during the young girl's latter months of pregnancy a friend of the family, who was an attorney, offered to take the child from them at birth in order to arrange an adoptive placement. Delores advised that



she did not want to keep her baby and felt that this was a good solution. Delores and her family advised that until their attorney's friend offered to take the baby they did not know what they would do since they did not feel Delores wanted or should keep her child because of her age.

It seems quite obvious that Delores and her family took advantage of the first means of solution to their problem.

The case of Evelyn differs considerably from the others in the group of eight unmarried mothers. Evelyn, a twenty-five year old Protestant girl, was an anesthetist by profession. She was living away from home at the time of her pregnancy and consulted an elderly aunt for advice regarding her expected child. The aunt offered to arrange placement of the child with friends.

The summary report submitted to the County Court by D.C.W. held this excerpt.

There are conflicting stories in this situation. However, Evelyn advised she never intended the child to be placed on an adoptive basis, but rather only on a temporary foster home basis. She definitely did help financially with the child's care during placement by sending money, clothing, toys, etc. However, after the petitioners had the child in their home for six months they petitioned the court, without the consent or knowledge of the mother, for the adoption of the child. The attorney filed the adoption petition on the grounds of desertion and abandonment by the mother.

Although this mother's placement did not culminate in adoption, it was one of the cases requested for study by the Madison County Court.

The mother learning of the adoption action petitioned the Circuit Court on a writ of habeas corpus. After two detailed hearings before the Circuit Court Judge, this mother's child was returned to her. This situation might well point out some of the heartaches that develop for both petitioners and mother in independent placement. We might also speculate that Evelyn's child underwent a great deal of emotional trauma through this period.

Frances, a twenty year old girl of the Protestant Faith, was also an unmarried mother. She was employed as a department store clerk and lived with her family during her pregnancy. In the court summary this statement helps us to see Frances' motivation in placing her child independently.

Frances advised that she placed her child with the petitioners as she had gone to her Minister in her last months of pregnancy for advice and he offered to take her child after birth to place with a family who lived in a neighboring state. She stated she had no qualms in this type of planning and felt that she was doing the right thing for the child.

Frances went to what she thought was the best source for advice in regard to her illegitimate pregnancy. This also was the first plan offered her in the solution of her problem.

Gloria, also an unmarried mother, received the service of a social worker, but not the protection of an agency in the placement of her child. Gloria was a nineteen year old girl of the Protestant Faith who was employed as a waitress. She was separated from her family, living in a small community away from home.

In the case record of the Division of Child Welfare was recorded this statement.

Gloria stated that she had been referred by friends to Miss \_\_\_\_\_ (a case worker with a Public, non-placing agency). Gloria related that Miss \_\_\_\_\_ worked out plans for her care in a maternity hospital including full payment of all expenses and offered to take her child immediately after birth for adoptive placement.

Gloria possibly felt that she had gone to the right source in planning for her expected child. Although she was aware that the baby was being placed with friends of the social worker, no doubt she was not clear as to whether this really was other than a proper placement plan. Gloria did have her maternity hospital fees paid by the social worker and it was later learned that the fees were paid by the social worker's brother who received Gloria's baby. Although the situation here is a little unusual in speaking of independent placements of children, the facts indicate that this mother accepted the first plan offered to her. Payment of her confinement expenses was also included in the plan for the placement of her child.

Hazel is also representative of the group of eight unmarried mothers who placed their children independently. Hazel, an eighteen year old girl of the Protestant Faith, was employed as a waitress prior to and during her pregnancy.

Hazel stated that she grew desperate during her pregnancy and traveled many miles to escape the ridicule of family and friends. Finding

herself in a strange city she did not know where to turn for help. She did not want to keep her baby and felt "things had come her way" when Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, the delivering physician, offered to take her baby for adoption.....

No plans had been made prior to her entry into the hospital. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, the physician delivering her child, told her of the numerous families whom he knew who could give the child a good home and also offered payment of her hospital expenses. Hazel advised that she had no feelings other than she was doing the right thing.

The presentation of the immediate solution to Hazel's problem apparently was the main factor in this mother's decision to place her baby in this particular manner. The payment of her medical and hospital expenses may have been an auxiliary factor.

### Summary

In an analysis of the facts concerning the choice of the eight unmarried mothers to place their child for adoption through independent sources, we see as the first and prominent factor, the simplicity and urgency of a plan presented to each mother which represented an immediate solution to her problem. In each case the mother took immediate advantage of it.

Of our eight unmarried mothers, four sought help for the planning of their child. The other four were approached regarding plans for their expected child. Agnes, Betty, and Hazel were openly approached by physicians who offered to place their expected children for adoption. Delores was offered a plan by their family friend who was an attorney. Carol, who sought advice from her nurse friend; Evelyn who consulted her aunt; Frances,

who confided in her Minister; and Gloria, who was referred to a social worker, were also offered a simple, immediate plan as a solution to their problem.

The distinguishing note might be mentioned that none of these eight mothers "shopped around" for a plan regarding their child. Akin to the facts mentioned above we have eight unmarried mothers who sought advice and help from professional persons with the exception of Evelyn, who confided in her Aunt. Despite this, no one made a referral to a Child Placing Agency, nor did the mother personally seek the advice of a Child Placing Agency. Gloria, who was referred to a social worker, may have felt that she was receiving services of an agency in planning for her child.

The living arrangements of our eight unmarried mothers does not seem to be a factor in their decisions to place their children independently rather than through a child placing agency. Five of the mothers were living in the home of their parents during their pregnancy; three were living away from home. Of the three girls living away from home there seems to be no similarity of factors. Hazel accepted a plan from the physician delivering her baby. Carol accepted a plan from her nurse friend in whom she had confided. Gloria accepted a plan from the social worker to whom she had been referred. Of the three girls living away from home, Carol and Gloria made efforts to seek help with their problem; Hazel did not seek a plan, but was approached with a plan at the time of the child's birth.

All of the eight unmarried mothers, with the exception of the two young fifteen year old girls, were employed. This factor might be significant in the mothers' decision to relinquish their babies for adoption,

but would seem to have no bearing in their decision to relinquish their children to independent, untrained sources.

Age does not seem to be a factor in the mothers' decision to place their child independently. Of the group of eight unmarried mothers, two were fifteen years of age, four were under twenty-one years of age, one was twenty-two years of age, and one was twenty-five years of age. The families of the two fifteen year old school girls felt age was one of the factors involved in the adoption placement. However, this does not seem to be a factor in the independent placement.

Although on the whole the marital status of the eight unmarried mothers was definitely significant in their decision to relinquish their children for adoption, this marital status could also be indirectly a factor in their decision to relinquish their children to independent sources because of the desperate urgency of a plan for a baby born to them in the unmarried state.

#### The Two Mothers Separated, But Not Divorced

The case of Mrs. E. is one of the two cases representative of the group of two mothers who were separated from their husbands, but not legally divorced.

Mr. and Mrs. E. were a couple twenty years of age who separated shortly after the birth of their first child. The child was given to the maternal grandparents, who after several months of rearing the child alone with no interest by either parent, gave the child to friends who had grown to love the child.

The following material had been recorded in the summary report prepared for the Court by the Division of Child Welfare caseworker.

The situation is somewhat mixed. According to the petitioners the child's parents did not wish to make any type of home for her at birth and accordingly the child's grandmother cared for her immediately after birth. Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_ advised that she was a widow at that time and was living with the child's grandmother as a boarder. While in the home she assumed much of the financial as well as the day-by-day care of the child. She was married to Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ in December, and she and her new husband, by agreement with the child's grandmother and parents, took the baby to their new home. Mary remained with them from December to March, from the time she was nine months until she was thirteen months, at which point the child's grandmother took her back. According to the petitioners, the parents of the child have never been concerned about her care and in the same month, March 1949, the grandmother voluntarily brought the child back to their home where she has remained until the present time.

In the Division Case record this comment was found.

At the adoption hearing Mr. and Mrs. E., who are still separated but not divorced, advised the Judge that they had at no point been able to offer Mary a home. They had no objection to Mary's adoption by the petitioners.

Although Mrs. E.'s mother was really the person responsible for the independent adoptive placement of the E.'s child, Mr. and Mrs. E. indirectly participated by their rejection and complete lack of interest in the child. Indirectly at least, Mr. and Mrs. E. as well as the grandmother accepted the first acceptable plans offered to them for the permanent care of this child.

Mr. and Mrs. B., a couple in their early thirties are also representative of the group who were separated, but not divorced. Mr. and Mrs. B. also had a three year old child. At the time of the birth of their second child Mr. and Mrs. B. separated; the older child was placed with the paternal grandparents and the new born child was placed with the maternal grandparents.

Four years later, the middle-aged couple who had lived in the maternal grandparent's home and had given care to Mr. and Mrs. B.'s child while there, planned to move to a neighboring city and asked the grandmother if the child could go with them. Mr. and Mrs. B. were contacted, showed no objection, and allowed their child, who was now four years of age, to go with them.

The court summary report prepared by the Division reads.

The petitioners advised that Jane's parents were never interested in her. They separated at the time of her birth and allowed the maternal grandparents to assume her full care.....

The petitioners stated they had helped in Jane's care since they lived in the same house with the grandparents.....

They received Jane into their home, with the parents' consent, directly from the grandmother, the early part of June 1950.

#### Summary

In examining the two cases outlined above many similarities are present. Both sets of parents were separated at the point of birth, both



used resources of relatives for the care of their new-born child. Neither set of parents could give definite reasons why they had failed to make plans for their children. In regard to the grandmothers who actually were the persons responsible for the adoptive placements, the personal element of friendship seemed to be present, since in both placements there was a very close relationship between the grandmother and the person who took the children for adoption purposes. Relieving themselves of the responsibility forced upon them is also an evident factor with these grandmothers' pushing for an easy solution for the permanent care of their grandchildren.

In each case the marital status is indirectly related to the child's adoption, but not necessarily related to the independent adoption of the child.

In each of these situations a plan for the children evolved itself from a previous plan for the children, and no urgent, conscientious planning on an emergency basis was present. The first acceptable plan offered was utilized.

#### One Married Mother With Husband In Military Services Overseas

Of our fourteen mothers, the husband of one was serving in the military services overseas. The child born to this mother, although legally that of her husband, was actually an illegitimate child.

Mrs. Andrew, a twenty-six year old mother living in a semi-rural community, became illegitimately pregnant while her husband was overseas. She received no pre-natal care and while in labor a physician from a neighboring town was called to the home. At the moment of birth, an elderly

neighbor woman, acting as mid-wife, heard the mother's statement to the doctor that she did not want her child as her husband was not the father. This mid-wife, a few minutes later, asked the mother if she could have the baby to give to her son who had wanted a baby for many years. The mother gave her new-born son, with the doctor's knowledge, to the neighbor who in turn took the child to her home, a few doors away, in order to "save" him for her son and daughter-in-law who lived in another state.

The Division case record states...

When Mrs. A. was interviewed relative to her decision about her baby she was quite complacent stating she did not want her baby, was desperate at the time of birth as to what she would do with him and felt it a "piece of luck" that the neighbor knew what to do with "it".

Mrs. A. made the statement that she had made no efforts to contact an agency, although she knew they existed in the neighboring community, because she thought it would be too costly to plan for the adoptive placement of the baby in this manner. She also commented that she feared contact with her husband who did not know of her pregnancy.... The petitioners paid her medical bill.

### Summary

In analyzing the above material we might correctly reach the decision that the impetus of this mother's choice to give her baby away seemed to be only in the simplicity and urgency of the plan presented to her. An immediate solution to her problem was presented to her and she took immediate advantage of it.

The Two Divorced Mothers

Of the study group of fourteen mothers, two were divorced women who had not remarried and whose children were legally illegitimate.

Mrs. Doddy, a thirty year old mother of two children, ages four and six years, gave birth to an illegitimate baby girl two years after legal divorce from her husband. She sought prenatal care from the physician who was giving pediatric care to her other children. The Division record contains the following comment.

Mrs. D. advised that she had given little thought to releasing the baby for adoption until her physician proposed the idea since she was divorced. He offered her expected baby the security of the home of a good, well-established couple in the community. Mrs. D. stated that the offer of payment of her medical expenses also helped in her decision since her only means of support for herself and the children was the support money from her ex-husband who was not the father of this child. She had not made her pregnancy known to the natural father.

Mrs. D. was not looking specifically for a plan for her expected child when she sought medical care from her physician. A plan was offered her which she felt offered security to her baby and further security to herself and her other two children.

Although this mother stated that the payment of her medical expenses was an added factor in her choice to place her baby independently, her statement might be questioned. Prior to the proposal of placement by her physician she had wondered how she would manage financially. However, she had planned definitely to keep her baby.

Mrs. P., another mother who was divorced at the time of the birth of her child, was a twenty-six year old night club performer, of the Protestant Faith. She had been divorced from her husband for many years when she became illegitimately pregnant.

The friends Mrs. P. approached regarding possible plans for her expected baby, agreed to take her child at birth. She advised she definitely did not want her expected child and after receiving the promise of her friends to take her child she engaged the services of an attorney to work out legal matters concerning adoption of the baby by these friends.

The summary prepared for the Madison County Court in the matter of the adoption of the child of Mrs. P. contained only one brief comment concerning this mother's motivation in releasing her child to independent sources.

When Mrs. P. was interviewed she stated that she had no plan to offer her son and was happy that the petitioners had taken her child and were willing to adopt him.

This mother sought help in the solution of her problem, and apparently took the first plan offered her. Mrs. P.'s type of employment could well have been a factor in her choice to place her child immediately.

#### The Mother of Two Children

In the study group of fourteen mothers, one mother gave birth to two children who underwent independent adoptive placements at separate times.

Mrs. F. gave birth to the first child she placed independently while her husband was serving in the military services overseas. Mrs. F. was eighteen years of age at the time and had already given birth to two other

children whom she had placed independently in boarding homes. Although Mrs. F.'s husband was legal father and had arranged for an allotment for this third child, there was some question of paternity.

After this child's birth Mrs. F. arranged for a foster home placement for him with friends. Although she agreed to pay for his care from the allotments received from her husband, she failed to do so. After some time the friends selected by the mother were unable to care for the child without funds and in turn gave the child to a childless couple who knew the child well. This was with the consent and knowledge of the mother and again she was to assume his care financially but failed to do so. The second family kept Mrs. F.'s child for two years, and only at the point that they learned that she had released for adoption her other two children plus a fourth child who had been born to her illegitimately, did they demand that she sign consent forms for the adoption of this child to them.

The case record of the Division of Child Welfare gives some insight into this mother's motivation.

Mrs. F. could give no definite reason why she had originally placed this child as well as her other children. She did state that she had never wanted her third child, but had not actually thought of placing him for adoption because she was receiving allotment checks for his care and her husband was legal father. She advised that she signed relinquishing papers at the request of the petitioners who had her child, to avoid court action on the grounds of abandonment and non-support. In this area she expressed real fear since she had received allotment checks from her husband for this child as well as her older children, but had failed to support them while in their foster homes.

Mrs. F.'s fourth child and the second child she placed independently was born illegitimately to her after she was legally divorced from her husband. She was twenty-two years of age at this time. During her pregnancy she sought the services of the attorney who had participated in her other children's independent adoptions. This attorney offered to take her child at birth and arrange an adoption with his friends. Mr. P. included in the terms of this arrangement, full payment of her medical expenses, confinement expenses, as well as maintenance expenses during her last four months of pregnancy. This mother signed, before the attorney and the family who was to receive her child, an agreement to the effect that she would receive monthly one hundred dollars for her care and at the point of birth of her child the petitioners would have full claim to him.

An excerpt from the Division record gives this information.

Mrs. F. showed no warmth or interest in her baby. She was quite hostile, wondering why her activities were questioned. She produced the agreement signed before Attorney          and the petitioners which is attached to this record.....

It is difficult to analyze the factors which were most prominent in this mother's decision to release her children for adoption, least of all adoption through independent sources. One might question her real concern and interest in her children and wonder whether the interplay of money payments and financial gain for herself were not the most significant in placement plans for all of her children. However, in the placement of both children she accepted the first plans offered to her.

Summary

In a brief analysis of the fifteen cases in relation to the facts which seem significant in the Mothers' choice to place their babies through independent sources, the first and prominent factor is that all of the mothers in the fifteen cases accepted the first plan offered to them. In each of the fifteen cases this plan represented an immediate solution to their problem.

In three of the fifteen cases, the Mothers also accepted a second plan offered at the time of the failure of the first plan.

In eleven of the fifteen cases the Mothers accepted plans which not only represented a fast and immediate plan for their baby, but which also included payment of their medical or hospital expenses.

In one case the Mother included in her plan the payment of her medical and hospital expenses plus maintenance funds to sustain her in her last months of pregnancy.

Although all of the mothers in the fifteen cases accepted the first acceptable plan offered to them, the manner in which the plan was offered varied. In six of the cases the mothers sought advice with their specific problem. The persons contacted offered placement of their child. Of these, one mother had specifically in mind the finding of a home for her child by the person contacted. One mother asked friends to take her child.

In five of the cases the mothers did not seek specific help with their problem, but were offered a plan while securing medical attention. In three of these five cases the mothers were first offered a plan for their baby at the very moment of the birth of their child.

In one case the mother and her family were offered a plan by a friend who knew of the girl's pregnancy.

In three of the total fifteen cases, plans were offered by relatives or friends with later adoptive replacements. The parents in all three of these cases were separated at the time of the placement of their children.

In this regard the facts presented in this chapter seem to support the fact that the most important reason mothers placed their children independently rather than with the protection of an agency is because in their desperation they utilized the first acceptable plan offered to them. Help with medical expenses is usually an auxiliary reason.



## CHAPTER III

### THE PLACEMENT AGENTS

This chapter will record the facts which were significant in determining the answer to the second part of our problem--Why do placement agents participate in the independent placement of children.

In the study group of fifteen children; four placements were arranged and completed by members of the medical profession. Two placements were arranged and completed by members of the legal profession. Three placements were originally arranged by the mothers, but received the active support and cooperation of attorneys whose services the mothers had requested. Of the remaining six placements; one was arranged and completed by the minister to whom the mother had gone for help and advice regarding her illegitimate pregnancy. Another placement was arranged and completed by a social worker, independent of an agency, to whom the mother had been referred. Still another placement was completed by an Aunt to whom the mother had gone for advice regarding her pregnancy. Three placements were completed by the parents with the help of relatives and friends.

In order to lend some similarity in presentation, five groupings are used. The four placements which were arranged and completed by physicians constitute the first group. The second group is composed of the two placements arranged and completed by attorneys. The third group consists of the three placements arranged by the mothers, but completed with the

active support and cooperation of attorneys. Group four is inclusive of the placement completed by the minister; the one completed by the social worker; and the one completed by the Aunt. These three placements are considered as a unit since in all three the placement agent was originally consulted by the mother for specific help and advice regarding their problem of illegitimate pregnancy. These situations differ slightly from the situations which ended in placement by physicians or attorneys as in each the mother sought medical or legal help, and not specific help with her problem. The case of the placement of Carol's baby is a slight exception since Carol did go to her nurse friend for specific advice regarding her pregnancy. However, this placement had the active support of an attorney and thus is included in group three.

The fifth group includes those placements which were arranged and completed by the mothers with the help or support of non-professional persons such as relatives or friends.

#### Group I

The cases of Agnes and Mrs. D. are examples of independent placements by physicians. Both mothers' babies were placed by the same physician, a prominent pediatrician in a large urban area. This physician was a board member of the two child placing agencies located in the community in which he practiced and lived. He was known to have arranged and actually placed many babies in the community.

We quote from Agnes' case record from the section concerning an interview with this physician.

Dr. D. advised he had many personal and professional friends who would pay well to have a nice baby for adoption..... Dr. D. complained of "red tape" connected with agency placements when asked about referral to agencies and his particular office as board member.... He advised that arranging and making placements himself was the only way he could guarantee that his friends would get the baby he wanted them to get.

In regard to the placement of the baby of Mrs. D. by the same physician this excerpt was found in Mrs. D.'s record.

Dr. D. stated "his families" would be glad to pay all medical expenses for any mother who could give them a good child and would be happy to pay for the extra efforts any person would have to put forth to get them such a child.

The cases of Betty and Hazel are also representative of placements by physicians. Quoting from Betty's record - -

Betty stated that she placed her child independently because she had been approached by the family physician to whom she had gone in the eighth month of pregnancy..... He also offered payment of all her medical and confinement expenses.

In the Division case record on Betty the following excerpt had been recorded.

I interviewed Dr. W. in his office relative to his activities concerning Betty's baby's placement directly from Hospital to the petitioners, Mr. and Mrs. Baker..... He had no qualms that the baby was only two days old at the time of the placement, stating he knew both Betty and the father all their lives.

..... He asked whether agencies know as much about babies whom they place..... Dr. W. advised that Mr. and Mrs. Baker had been on his list for a long time.

In another section of the record this comment was located.

Mr. and Mrs. Baker commented that adopting a baby through Dr. W. had been very costly, but they were tired of "fooling around" with agencies..... The petitioners acknowledged they had paid both their physician and their attorney for their extra services as well as full medical expenses for the mother of their child.

The case record on Hazel is very similar. Hazel at the very time of the delivery of her child was offered a plan by the attending physician who also arranged to have her medical expenses paid. The case record runs as follows - - -

Dr. B. was interviewed on the hospital floor. He advised that he had not known Hazel before delivering her child but felt he could help her by suggesting the placement of her child with his friends who had wanted a child for a long time. He felt that he had done the right thing. Hazel did not want her baby and also needed help with her medical care..... When asked about referral to an agency Dr. B. stated that he had worked cooperatively in the past with \_\_\_\_\_ and other agencies, but the process was too slow..... "We never knew when or whether they were going to do anything".

In another section of the record concerning the interview with the family who received Hazel's child the following statement is quoted which may indicate further motivation on the part of Dr. B. in the independent placement of this child.



The petitioners stated it had been expensive to adopt their baby because they paid Dr. E. for his services as well as full medical expenses for the mother.

### Summary

In evaluating the facts concerning the motivation of the four physicians who were the placement agents in the four cases discussed above, two prominent factors underline all four of the cases; the financial gain for the placement agent and the personal element of friendship between the petitioners and the placement agent.

It would not be fair to say that the more prominent factor in the participation of the four physicians in independent placements was geared principally to the financial gain for themselves in such activity. However, with the involvement of the extra efforts and risks for the physician in such activities, plus the fact that extra funds were received above the fees for their ordinary duties, this fact does stand out as being very significant in the four placements arranged by physicians.

The personal element is indicative of some motivation of independent placements by the four physicians. All four of the physicians placed "their babies" with personal or professional friends. In the cases of Betty and Agnes' babies, the petitioners specifically requested the placement agents to locate babies for them. However, in both of these cases the petitioners were also friends of the physicians. The other two cases involving independent placements by physicians, the cases of Hazel and Mrs. D., included the "offer" of the baby to the petitioners whom the

physicians personally knew wanted a child for adoption.

Akin to the personal element mentioned above may be the element of service - - - giving service to a family who greatly wanted something the physician had in his power to give. This type of thinking may denote the specific motivation in the case of Hazel and Mrs. D.'s babies. In both cases the physicians approached the mothers for their babies for the purpose of adoption and inturn placed them with friends who had wanted a child, but not specifically approached the physicians to find them one.

The physicians may have been motivated by the desire to help the mothers who had come to them specifically for medical help, but who also had a much graver problem which the physician felt he was equipped to solve for them. This would not be geared to personal element since in the case of Hazel and Agnes the mothers were complete strangers. Betty and Mrs. D., although they were also approached by the physicians for plans for their babies, were well known to the physicians.

In reviewing the above comment it must be remembered that the physician could not have offered the mothers a solution to their problem by offering to place for adoption their illegitimate children unless in turn they had in mind persons who would take the child from them.

In the case of Hazel's baby, which was delivered by Dr. B., we might recall the record in which Dr. B. stated he offered placement of Hazel's baby because Hazel did not wish to keep it and he had friends who would take the baby for adoption.

In Dr. B.'s statement alone we see a physician giving service to a desperate mother as well as a childless couple which might well indicate

the dual service-personal motivation of physicians in participating in the independent placement of a child for adoption. However, he too received extra funds for his placement service.

Another element which seems to have some significance in the four independent placements completed by physicians involves the policies and procedures of child placing agencies. Both Dr. W. and Dr. B. spoke of agencies slowness, "red tape", and indecisiveness in regard to plans for unmarried mothers and placement of children. Although there are no particulars available to either substantiate or refute these physicians' comments, these are the often misunderstood feelings which are prevalent among both professional and lay groups concerning adoption through agencies.

## Group II

Of the study group of fifteen children the placement of two children was arranged and completed by an attorney.

In the case of Delores, the fifteen year old Negro school girl whose family was offered an independent adoptive plan by their attorney friend, we quote from the summary prepared for the Madison County Court by the Division of Child Welfare worker.

..... Delores' mother advised that their attorney friend knew a family who would take Delores' baby to adopt.... She would not give his identity, but advised he asked very little for his services.

The case of the second child of Mrs. F. also involves the arrangement and placement of the child by an attorney. Mrs. F. went to the attorney who had aided her in the independent adoption of three of her

other children. In the detailed Division case record the following facts were present.

When interviewed, Mrs. F. stated that her attorney, Mr. B. had a list of families interested in adopting a baby. Mr. B. offered full payment of her medical expenses as well as maintenance expenses during her last four months of pregnancy..... Mrs. F. advised that she signed, before the attorney and the family who received her child, an agreement to the effect that she would receive monthly one hundred dollars for her care and at the point of the birth of her child the petitioners would have full claim to him.

In another section of the Division case record on Mrs. F.

When interviewed by the worker regarding his activities in independent placements, Mr. B. advised that he was well equipped as an attorney to arrange adoptions which were essentially a legal matter..... He further stated that his clients are able to pay well for his services and that in all probability he knows his clients better as persons than an agency would.

### Summary

In an analysis of the two cases which involve independent placements arranged and completed by attorneys, the personal element seems significant in both cases.

The attorney friend of Delores' family would not have been able to offer a plan for Delores' baby except for his personal relationship with this family. He also gave personal service to the family which took Delores' baby. Although the attorney received a small payment from



Delores' family for his services to them, we would hesitate before including this fact as the most important one in this attorney's motivation to place Delores' child independently.

The fact that Delores' family as well as the attorney were members of the Negro race may be significant in the independent placement of Delores' child for adoption. Since the attorney was never interviewed personally no facts are available as to whether he knew how to secure the services of a professional agency in planning for the girl's baby.

In exploring the independent placement of Mrs. F.'s child by the attorney, the personal element of relationships between the attorney and the petitioners who received the child as well as considerable financial gain for the attorney are present. The attorney also mentioned the fact that adoptions were essentially a legal matter.

With a comparison of the comments made by this mother as well as those made by the placing agent the facts seem to indicate that this particular placing agent was not a novice in the independent placement of children. Immediately this fact brings up the reason for his active participation which again might indicate considerable financial gain for himself.

### Group III

Of the study group of fifteen children, three were placed by their mother with the full aid and participation of an attorney whose services the mothers had requested.

The case of Mrs. P.'s baby is indicative of this group. Mrs. P. was the twenty-six year old divorced night club performer who became

illegitimately pregnant. Friends whom she approached requesting plans for her expected baby, agreed to take the baby at birth. Mrs. P. secured the services of Mr. H. to work out legal matters concerning the adoption of the baby by these friends.

Mrs. P. was interviewed on 8-8-50 at which time she stated Mr. H. was most helpful in completing legal matters for the adoption of Stephen.... She stated that both she and the petitioners paid him for his services.....

When Mr. H. was interviewed by D.C.W. worker he was quite haughty, indicating he was justified in his activities by having given a fatherless child a home..... Before the interview became too specific he spoke of the many other adoptions he had arranged for "just a small fee".....

He talked of his enjoyment when the adoptive parents would bring their baby to his home many months later so he might see him..... He mentioned how in his forty years of law many mothers have come to him desperate for help with their plans... Many times these mothers wanted only legal help in getting support from the father of their child, but he usually talked them into adoption and could help them out with payment of their medical payments besides. In some cases "my adoptive families" were able to repay "my mothers" for their troubles..... Mr. H. stated that the adopting couples on "my list" are always able to pay him well for his trouble.

The case of Carol's baby is also one which fits into the category of placement by a mother with the active help and cooperation of an attorney. The petitioners, who had been approached by Carol's nurse friend to accept for adoption Carol's expected child, secured the services of an

attorney to work out legal matters.

The summary prepared by the Division of Child Welfare for the Madison County Court in the matter of the adoption of Carol's child gives the following information.

The petitioners, Mr. and Mrs. Campbell, are not too specific as to the complete arrangements concerning the placement of this child in their home..... They advised that they learned of the child's mother's pregnancy through a close friend and arrangements for placement were aided with the services of their attorney \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_... Mr. and Mrs. Campbell advised that at the point their attorney had talked with Carol and drawn "consents for adoption" they drove to \_\_\_\_\_ with their attorney where the mother signed in their presence and before \_\_\_\_\_ Clerk of the County Court of \_\_\_\_\_.

After these arrangements were completed the mother, with the petitioners, and their attorney drove to the infant home where the mother arranged for the discharge of the child from the home and gave her to the petitioners who were waiting in the car outside.

The petitioners advised they paid their attorney well over the usual fee for adoption in order to cover his expenses and time involved in obtaining the mother's consent. They also paid Carol's full medical expenses.

The placement of Mrs. A.'s baby was also greatly aided by the services of an attorney. Mrs. A.'s child was born to her illegitimately while her husband was serving in the military services overseas. This mother did not wish to keep her child and the elderly woman who aided in the birth took the child from the mother's home to her home, a few doors

away, where she immediately arranged legal procedures to have the baby placed with her son and daughter-in-law in a neighboring state. Legal matters were completed by this attorney who filed a petition in the County Court while the baby was still in the future adoptive grandmother's home, and the future adoptive parents were still in another state. In the Division case record this comment is found.

Attorney D. advised that Judge \_\_\_\_\_ had given him permission to complete this adoption with the condition that he secure an investigation of the home in which the child was to be placed.

He advised he had questions about placing a child across state lines, so he talked with Judge \_\_\_\_\_ and States Attorney \_\_\_\_\_ who had advised him the petitioners could petition this court with the provision that a report of the petitioners' home be available to the court before the day of the adoption hearing.

### Summary

An analysis of the facts in the three independent placements arranged by the mothers with the full aid and participation of an attorney whose services were requested, shows the presence of the elements of personal service and financial gain.

As the material relates to the mothers as the original placement agent the personal element of friendship is present in the nurse-friend-mother placement of Carol's baby as well as in the placement of Mrs. P.'s baby. The friendship element is less pronounced in the case of the placement of Mrs. A.'s child, except when we consider that the mother and the

mid-wife were joint placement agents originally in which case the personal element is most prominent as the child was placed with the mid-wife's son and daughter-in-law.

In mentioning the motivation of the participating agents in each of the three cases there seem to be no significant factors other than the giving of legal service requested and corresponding personal financial gain for the attorneys. Each of the three attorneys were compensated well above the fees which they would have received for regular service to adoptive couples. This fact is significant when we consider the personal and professional person. Attorney D. who aided in the placement of Mrs. A.'s child had the sanction of the Judge and States Attorney of the local court.

#### Group IV

Group four according to the division of the fifteen placements by placement agents, includes the placement completed by the minister to whom Frances had gone for advice concerning her illegitimate pregnancy. Frances was offered an immediate plan by her pastor who was to place her child after birth with his friends who lived in a neighboring state. This minister was never personally interviewed so we can only speculate as to his motives in arranging this independent placement. The facts available might indicate the personal element of supplying a child for his friends along with his pastoral duties of solving a grave problem for one of his young parishoners.

The placement of Gloria's child by the social worker to whom she had been referred is another example of this group of placement agents.

The social worker, independent of her agency, which was not a child placing agent, offered plans to Gloria and full payment of her medical expenses. From the case record it was learned that although Gloria may have felt she was arranging placement through an agency, her baby, immediately upon discharge from the maternity hospital at the age of eight days, was placed in the home of the social worker's brother and his wife who had no children of their own. The following paragraph was taken from the Division of Child Welfare record.

Miss B. was interviewed on 6-10-50 relative to the plans which were made by her for Gloria's baby. She was quite apologetic stating she had planned to refer the matter to the local court for relinquishment of this baby for adoptive placement. However, the child was born sooner than expected which necessitated an immediate placement since the child could not remain in the maternity home. She advised she had placed the child with her brother as a temporary plan while she worked out a proper referral to the local court. Her brother and his wife became attached to the child and wished to keep her on an adoptive basis. Miss B. stated that she allowed the baby to remain in the home without the benefit of any legal proceedings. After six months had elapsed she instructed her brother and his wife to petition the local court for adoption on the grounds of abandonment and non-support.

The case of the independent placement of Evelyn's child is also indicative of Group IV. Evelyn had gone to her elderly Aunt for advice concerning her illegitimate pregnancy. This aunt arranged an adoptive placement, although according to the mother's statements she felt the placement was of a temporary boarding nature rather than permanent. From

the Division of Child Welfare record these comments are quoted.

Mrs. T., Evelyn's Aunt, stated that Evelyn did not want her child and she arranged placement of the child with a childless couple who were close friends of hers and whom she knew could give the child a good home.....

Some of Mrs. T.'s comments lead one to believe that she was taking the matter into her own hands so that the presence of Evelyn's baby within the family group would not cause scandal and idle gossip.

#### Summary

In a breakdown of the three placements in group four, prevalent throughout each of them is the element of service to the mother plus the personal relationship with the petitioners with whom the three placement agents placed "their babies".

The minister, the aunt, and the social worker felt they had given the unmarried mother, who had come to them with their problem the only solution in the accepting of their child for adoptive placement. However, when we evaluate the fact that all three placement agents would have had the knowledge and opportunity for a referral to an agency, the personal element of giving their friends a child for adoption comes more prominent of the two motivations in the placement of these children.

#### Group V

The fifth group includes those placements which were arranged and completed by the mothers with the help or support of non-professional persons such as relatives or friends.

The case of the baby of Mr. and Mrs. E. was indicative of this group. We need not go into detail again as to the motivation of either the parents or the child's grandmother since the material was presented in Chapter II at which time we dwelt with the parents' motivation in the independent placement of their child.

The placements of the babies of Mr. and Mrs. B. and Mrs. F. were also indicative of group five in the division of the fifteen cases according to placement agents. Both cases were presented in detail in Chapter II where we attempted to determine motivation in the independent placement of children by their mothers or natural parents. Mr. and Mrs. B. separated at the birth of their second child, placing the older child with the paternal grandparents and the new born with the maternal grandparents. Four years later the middle aged couple who had lived in the maternal grandparent's home and had given care to Mr. and Mrs. B.'s child while there, moved to a neighboring city at which time they requested of the grandmother and the parents, permission to take the child with them. Excerpts from this case record might give a glimpse of the grandmother's feeling in this situation.

Mrs. Phillips, the child's maternal grandmother, advised that the Smiths had loved and cared for Jane for five years and had given her more than either she or her parents could ever give. Although they were a middle aged couple who had already reared their own four sons, the grandmother felt they had a right to give Jane a home if they wished to do so.



In the case of the placement of Mrs. F.'s baby, the family who eventually adopted him gave this information regarding the intermediary placement agent who was a friend of Mrs. F. and with whom Mrs. F. had originally placed her new born son. The material is to be found in the Division case record on the child.

When Mrs. Jones was interviewed she commented several times that she and her husband had never specifically thought of adoption nor inquired into it. Mrs. Jones indicated that while her husband was in the military service overseas she had a one room apartment in an inexpensive apartment building in a mediocre section of \_\_\_\_\_ in order that she could save as much as possible for the building of a new home when her husband returned from service. She worked shift work in one of the defense plants in the community and occasionally in emergencies she was called upon to give baby sitting care to this child whom Mrs. F. had placed with a friend. Mrs. Jones stated that after the return of her husband from service they built a home and frequently visited this friend who was still caring for Mrs. F.'s child. At the point that the friend was not able to continue with the child's care she and her husband took him upon the insistence of both their friend and the child's mother. Mrs. Jones commented that there was no particular reason for their taking the child into their home since they were not particularly interested in a child, but she did know him and felt, like her friend, that this was the least she could do since she was now unemployed and had a beautiful large home with spacious yard space. James was about fifteen months of age at this time and the mother was to pay board to the Jones' from the allowance she was receiving from James' father.

Mrs. Jones' comments lead this worker to believe that the friend with whom Mrs. F. had first placed James was actually trying to arrange a secure plan for the child in forcefully requesting her friends, the Joneses, to take James whom she no longer could care for adequately.

### Summary

In an analysis of the three placements included in group five which involved placements completed essentially by the mothers with the aid of relatives and friends, the personal element of relationships between the petitioners who received the child and the mother or other active placement agent is consistently present. Akin to this fact is the motivation, on the part of the participating placing agent, to help in securing a secure, stable home for the child. In all three of the cases the participating placement agent had originally cared for the child himself which may indicate the element of "pushing onto someone else" the responsibility enforced originally on them.

### Summary

In an evaluation of the fifteen cases as they relate to the motivation of the placement agents in independent adoption, the following facts were significantly apparent.

In nine cases the placement agents received financial funds above their ordinary fees. Six of these received their funds from the petitioners, one from both the petitioners and the mother of the child, and one from the family of the child's mother.

The placement agents in all of these nine cases were members of either the medical or legal profession. Four were physicians and five were attorneys.

The essence of these findings may be clarified by a simple table.

TABLE I

Tabulation of Placement Agents By Payments Received or Not Received For Their Service Of Arranging An Independent Adoptive Placement

| Placement Agents              | Payment Received | No Payment Received |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Four Physicians               | 4                | 0                   |
| Five Attorneys                | 5                | 0                   |
| One Minister                  | 0                | 1                   |
| One Social Worker             | 0                | 1                   |
| One Aunt                      | 0                | 1                   |
| Three Friends<br>or relatives | 0                | 3                   |
| 15      Total                 | 9                | 6                   |

An interesting note may be made that the group of non-professional placement agents received no extra funds for their placement services.

As secondary factors in the nine cases which involved payment of extra funds for the service of independent placement given either by the petitioners or the child's mother, two cases indicated a close friendship

between the placement agent and the petitioners. In two cases the placement agents indicated lack of confidence in agencies. In one case the placement agents felt equipped to handle and arrange adoptions as they were essentially a legal matter. One placement agent indicated the idea of his enjoyment in giving a fatherless child a home and seeing the happiness of the new adoptive couple in receiving such children.

In two cases of the total fifteen the placement agents received no extra funds for their services in arranging the independent placement, although in both cases they arranged for the petitioners to pay the mothers medical bills. The combined idea of service to the unmarried mothers and the personal giving of a child to childless friends.

In three cases of the total fifteen the placement did not involve payment of extra funds or the payment of medical expenses. In all three cases the mother of the child and the participating placement agent had personal contact with the child and the participating placement agent had personal contact with the child and the petitioners before the placement of the child in the petitioner's home. The petitioners also had contact with the child before placement. Prominent elements seem to indicate the combined motivation of the finding of a good home for the child plus relieving themselves of the responsibility placed upon them. In each of these cases the placement agent helping the parents with the adoptive placement were caring for the child themselves at the time of replacement.

In one case there was no exchange of extra payments, no medical payments assumed, nor personal contact with the child before placement. Although the material available is dubious, the Aunt making the placement

seemed to be interested in removing the child from the family group.

The importance of the personal element of friendship between the placement agent and the mother as a part of motivation in independent placement of children might best be shown by a simple table.

TABLE II

Tabulation of the Existence of Personal Relationships  
Between the Placement Agents and the Mothers  
in Independent Adoptive Placements

| Placement Agents              | Placement Agent<br>Knew Mother<br>Before Placement | Placement Agent<br>Did Not Know<br>Mother Before<br>Placement |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Four Physicians               | 2  | 2   |
| Five Attorneys                | 2  | 3   |
| One Minister                  | 1  | 0   |
| One Social Worker             | 1  | 0   |
| One Aunt                      | 1  | 0   |
| Three Friends<br>or relatives | 3  | 0   |
| 15 Total                      | 10   | 5   |

The reader's attention is brought to the fact, as indicated in Table II, that the placements made by the non-professional persons were decisively determined by the personal contact with the mothers before placement of the child.

In this chapter, the facts presented show the existence of three causes for independent adoptive placements. These three causes are:

1. The agent's realization of personal financial gain;
2. The agent's personal contact with the mother;
3. The agent's contact with the child before placement.

The first and second factors were almost equal in frequency. The third factor involved the combined motivation of the agent's finding for the child a good adoptive home, plus the agent's relieving himself of the responsibility that had first been placed upon him.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE PETITIONERS

This chapter will record the facts which are significant in determining the solution to the third section of our problem - - - What factors are involved which precipitate adoptive parents securing a child independently rather than with the protection of an agency.

The material is presented in concise form and only those facts pertinent to the evolution of our problem are recorded. Excerpts from the case record or the adoption summary report are quoted wherever possible to substantiate definite points.

In presenting the fifteen cases in relation to the motivation of the petitioners' participation in independent adoptions, a basis for comparison is immediately obtained if a division of the petitioners is made into two groups; those who placed an application with a child placing agency for the adoption of a child and those who had not placed an application with an agency for the adoption of a child. In using this division for the grouping of the petitioners; eight couples had placed an application with some agency for the adoption of a child and seven couples had not placed such an application.

#### The Eight Petitioners who Placed Applications With Agencies

In an analysis of the eight petitioners who had placed appli-

cations with an agency for the adoption of a child, the progress and status of their application with the agency appears to indicate immediately the motivation prompting these couples to accept or even seek a child for adoption from an independent source.

Of the eight petitioners who had placed an application with an agency, information was available indicating that four of these eight couples were rejected by the agency with which they had applied for the adoption of a child.

The Division case record on Agnes' baby contained the following information on the petitioners who accepted Agnes' baby from Dr. D. for the purpose of adoption.

On 4-24-50 Mr. and Mrs. John Adams were in DCW office for appointment. They were a very pleasant, attractive, intelligent couple and seemed quite convinced that they wanted the \_\_\_\_\_ baby for adoption..... They advised they had been married for sixteen years, but because Mr. Adams was of the Protestant Faith and Mrs. Adams of the Catholic Faith, agencies to whom they had applied for a child hesitated accepting them.....

Mrs. Adams advised she went to school with Dr. D's wife and because of this close friendship they asked Dr. D. to "find a nice baby boy" for them.

Mr. and Mrs. Hawley, the petitioners who received Hazel's baby for adoption directly from Dr. E., also were rejected by the agency with which they had applied for the adoption of a child. The Division case record on the baby held this information.

Mr. and Mrs. Hawley advised they have been married for twenty years. Mr. Hawley is fifty and his wife forty-seven..... Mrs. Hawley



stated that approximately three years ago she and her husband had placed an application with \_\_\_\_\_ for the adoption of a baby, but withdrew their application some months later because the agency would not consider them for a baby because of their age. The agency had talked with them about a child between the ages of eight and ten, but the Hawleys stated they were not interested in a child this age....

The petitioners advised that Dr. B. offered them the baby because her mother did not want to keep her and he knew they had wanted a baby for a long time.

Frances' baby was also placed with petitioners who had been rejected by an agency. The Division case record, in the section concerning an interview with the petitioners during the time their home was being studied for the court for the adoption of Frances' baby, contained this excerpt.

Mr. and Mrs. Foster are a young, attractive couple in their late thirties. They stated they have been married for eight years and have wanted to adopt a baby for many years. They advised Mr. F. was sterile and accordingly approximately three years after marriage they had placed their first application to adopt a baby. Since that time they have attempted to adopt a baby on numerous occasions, but because of Mr. Foster's employment as a traveling CPA which changes their residence about every six months they were always rejected.....

The Fosters advised that their home minister Reverend Zieller told them of Frances' child and they were immediately agreeable to taking her because they had tried so hard to get a baby.

Mrs. F.'s second baby was received for adoption from the attorney by the petitioners, Mr. and Mrs. Farmer, who had also been rejected by an agency. The Division case record concerning an interview with the worker of the non-sectarian agency in the community regarding the Farmer's

application had recorded the following information.

On 6-10-50 I talked with Miss Z \_\_\_\_\_, who after reviewing the Farmer record advised that their family physician had indicated considerable nervous tension on the part of Mrs. Farmer with a history of two hospitalizations for emotional difficulties. Their application was rejected.

Another section of the Division record held this excerpt:

The petitioners advised that they had requested their attorney to secure a child for them.

In the four cases cited above the one fact that the petitioners had been rejected by the agency to whom they had applied for the adoption of a child seems to be the most important. The conjecture may be made that this fact is the main cause in the searching for and accepting of a child for adoption from an untrained, independent placement agent.

Of the eight couples who had placed an application with an agency for the adoption of a child, four had had their applications delayed for various reasons. This delay seemed to lead to the family's discouragement and lack of confidence in the agency that they would ever receive a child and seemed to lead gradually to their reception of a child for adoption from independent sources.

Mr. and Mrs. Baker had been married for fourteen years when they adopted Betty's baby whom they received from Dr. W. Mrs. Baker had never had a pregnancy although there was no physical basis for this. From the Division case record this excerpt was obtained.

Miss \_\_\_\_\_ advised that Mr. and Mrs. Baker had applied with their agency for the adoption of a child approximately four years ago. Although the petitioners' marriage was a mixed

religion marriage, their application was originally questioned on the basis of Mr. B.'s neglected religious practices as a Catholic rather than Mrs. B.'s identification with the Presbyterian Church. Following Mr. B.'s renewal of his religious duties, the home was studied and approved by the agency, their application was placed on the agency's approved list, awaiting placement of a child.

Another section of the record contained this comment.

..... Mr. and Mrs. Baker commented that adopting a baby through Dr. W. had been very costly, but they were tired of "fooling around" with agencies.

Mr. and Mrs. Campbell, who had received Carol's baby with the help of their attorney, had been married for six years. Mrs. Campbell had never had a pregnancy and organically was incapable of pregnancy. They had applied early in their marriage for the adoption of a child through an agency. According to the agency, approval of the home was delayed at first because of Mr. Campbell's changeable employment. Their home was later approved for a child of limited mental ability. Three years had elapsed between the time of their application with the agency and placement of Carol's baby with them.

Mr. and Mrs. Campbell advised that they had never thought of or been approached to accept a child previously, but when they learned of Carol's baby they had no doubts that they should take her even though she was underdeveloped and little was known about her, because they had waited so long for a baby.

Mr. and Mrs. Allison, who received Mrs. Anderson's baby from Mr. Allison's mother who had acted as mid-wife, had applied to a non-sectarian agency for a child three years prior to receiving this baby. The social history received from that agency of the study of the Allison home

contained this comment.

When Mr. and Mrs. Allison originally applied for the adoption of a child we discouraged them since they were a very young couple and there was no physical basis for Mrs. Allison's lack of pregnancy. With their hesitant cooperation their application was omitted from our waiting list for two years.

Mr. and Mrs. Doyle's, who received Mrs. Duddy's baby from Dr. D., application to adopt a child through an agency was also delayed for several years. The Division case record contained this comment, obtained from the worker of one of the child placing agencies in the community.

On 8-15-50 Miss \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ was interviewed. She stated that Mr. and Mrs. Doyle had placed an application with their agency about four years ago. However, because of their age an infant could not be considered for placement with them. After many interviews the Doyles were agreeable to the possibility of the placement of an older child.....

Another section of the Division record read.

Mrs. Doyle advised that they had waited so long for a child they did not feel they should "pass up" Dr. D.'s offer, even though it was quite costly.

An examination of the facts in the four cases reveal that the delay in the approval of the agency application, which was caused by the tangible deficiencies in the petitioners' adequacy as potential parents, had a great bearing on the petitioners' seeking or accepting a child from independent sources.

#### SUMMARY

Through an evaluation of the facts in the eight cases as they

relate to the motivation of the petitioners in the acceptance of a child on an independent basis the following factors were significantly apparent.

The eight petitioners had placed applications with child placing agencies for the adoption of a child. Their applications were either rejected or delayed. This fact seemed to be important in their seeking or accepting a child from an independent source. Of these eight petitioners, four asked their placement agents to secure babies for them. Four were approached by the placement agents who knew they wanted a baby.

Three of the four petitioners who were approached by placement agents regarding the acceptance of a child on an independent basis, were petitioners whose applications with child placing agencies had been delayed, one had been rejected.

Three of the four petitioners who had requested their placement agents to secure children for them, independent of an agency, were petitioners whose applications to adopt through an agency had been rejected, one had been delayed.

In the total picture of the eight petitioners whose applications were rejected or delayed by the agency with which they had applied, it is further significant that three out of the four who had specifically requested their placement agent to secure babies were applicants who had been rejected by the agency.

Seven of the eight petitioners whose application to adopt a child through an agency were either rejected or delayed, paid their placement agent extra funds for the special service rendered them. The petitioners who received the child placed with them by their minister were the only exception.

All the eight petitioners whose applications to adopt through an agency were either rejected or delayed paid the medical expenses for the mother whose child they received. It is further significant that the petitioners whose application was rejected by the agency to which they applied because of the adoptive mother's emotional instability were the petitioners who paid maintenance for the mother of the child they received.

The eight placements analyzed above were arranged or supported by members of professions. One placement was arranged by a minister, four placements were arranged by physicians, one was arranged by an attorney, and two received the active support and cooperation of attorneys although the actual placements were made by the mothers.

In six of the eight placements the petitioner's home was actually found by the placement agent.

#### The Seven Petitioners Who Had Not Applied to Adopt Through An Agency

Of the seven families who had never placed an application with a child placing agency for the adoption of a child, four were young couples who had been directly approached by the placement agent to accept for adoption the child in question. In an exploration of their motivation in the acceptance of such a child, the immediate availability of a particular child plus the approach by a friend to take the child seem to be significant factors.

Delores's baby, who was placed by the friend attorney with the Dallys, was accepted in this manner.

On 9-11-50 Mr. and Mrs. Dally were interviewed in their home relative to the adoption

of \_\_\_\_\_. The Dallys advised that they were asked about the adoption of Delores's baby by their attorney \_\_\_\_\_. They received the baby directly from him..... They advised that they had never been approached previously to accept a child, but they had talked with their attorney friend about their interest in adoption, although they had not asked him specifically to find a child for them.....

The Dallys advised that they paid Delores' medical expenses through their attorney friend.

The Gordons who received Gloria's child, admitted their interest in adoption, but because of their youth and new marriage felt that they should wait although they were definite Mrs. Gordon could not conceive a child. The only comment in the record which seems to specify any motivation on their part to accept independently the child Mr. Gordon's social worker sister offered to them is quoted below.

When Miss \_\_\_\_\_ asked us to take Sharon we could hardly resist. We had always wanted a baby.

Although the Pahles were a young childless couple they had not thought of adoption even when taking their friend's, Mrs. P.'s, child. The Division case record reads.

Mr. and Mrs. Pahle advised they were married before a Justice of the Peace five years ago. They had never thought of taking a child into their home and took Stephan only as a special favor to his mother who was their friend.

This case is very complicated. The petitioners were not seeking to adopt the child at the time they received him into their home although his mother had requested legal help after placement. However, after the child had been in the petitioner's home for approximately a month,

neighbors of the new petitioners placed complaints against them because of Mr. Pahle's alcoholism and because the baby was left alone for long periods of time. By the time the adoption petition reached the county court, the Mother, the petitioners, and the attorney were all bent on keeping this child in the petitioner's home. It was in this area that the attorney was paid extra fees for his services by both the petitioners, and the Mother of the child.

The Everetts who took Evelyn's child from her Aunt were never interviewed as the mother petitioned the Circuit Court on a Writ of Habeas Corpus when she learned of the adoption action on her child. This action superseeded the adoption petition; accordingly the investigation requested by the County Court was not completed as the child was returned to her mother. The information obtained from the mother and the Aunt indicated that these petitioners were a middle aged couple who had never had a child and agreed to take Evelyn's child when approached in this regard by Evelyn's Aunt.

The remaining three petitioners were couples who had contact with the children they adopted prior to receiving the children in their homes on an adoptive basis. In each of the three cases this seems to be a prominent factor in their accepting the child for adoption. In both the cases of Mr. and Mrs. Evans, who took the child of Mr. and Mrs. E., and the Smiths who took Mr. and Mrs. B.'s child, the petitioners were middle aged couples who had already reared their own families and had become attached to the child while living in the same home with the child. Their comments are almost identical.



Mr. and Mrs. Smith advised that they had become very fond of Jane during the four years they lived in her grandmother's home and since the grandmother was elderly and the parents seem to have no concern for her they asked permission to keep her permanently.

Mrs. Evans stated that she had always thought of Mary as being her own child since she had cared for her from birth when she had been placed with her grandmother by her parents.

In the case of Mrs. F.'s baby, who was received by Mr. and Mrs. Jones, Chapter III already contains specific material which indicates their reasons for taking James. For clarification purposes a requote of some of this material may be indicated.

..... At the point that the friend was not able to continue with the child's care she and her husband (Mr. and Mrs. Jones) took him (James) upon the insistence of both the friend and the child's mother. Mrs. Jones commented that there was no particular reason for their taking the child into their home since they were not particularly interested in the child, but they did know him and felt like her friend that this was the least she could do since she was now unemployed and had a beautiful large home with spacious yard space.

### Summary

Of the total fifteen cases, seven indicated that the petitioners in question had not placed an application for the adoption of a child with any child placing agency.

Of these seven petitioners, three were couples who had contact with the children they adopted prior to receiving the children in their homes on an adoptive basis. This fact alone seems to be the most significant in their accepting of a child on an independent basis. In two of these cases the petitioners were middle aged couples who had already

reared their families but who had become attached to the child they took independently for adoption while living in the same home with him. The other petitioners had cared for the child, supposedly on a boarding basis, for almost two years before securing adoptive consents.

Four of the seven petitioners, who had not placed an application with agencies for the adoption of a child, had been directly approached to accept the child by a friend. In an analysis of their motivation in the acceptance of such a child their passive interest in the possibility of having a child, plus the immediate availability of a particular child combined with the approach by a friend to take the child, seemed to be most important in three of the four cases. The fourth case in which the petitioners took Stephen as a favor to his mother does not closely follow the above pattern.

An interesting observation is that of the seven petitioners who had not applied with an agency for the adoption of a child, none paid the placement agents extra fees for the service of receiving a child for adoption. The case of the Pahles, who took Stephen as a special favor to his mother, might be a slight exception. However, the payment they made to the attorney, whose services Stephen's mother had secured, was given in an effort to secure help in keeping Stephen after complaints had been raised against them by neighbors.

In two of the seven cases, the mothers of the child gave payments to the placement agents for the services rendered them.

In three cases the petitioners paid medical expenses for the mothers.

The data as presented seems to indicate that these seven sets of petitioners more or less played the passive role in the independent placement of the child they received for adoption. Their lack of initiative in placing an application with an agency seems to be comparable to their lack of initiative in actively seeking a child through independent sources.

There seems to be further significance in the fact that only one of these seven placements was made by a professional person. This was the case of the Dallys who received Delores' baby. The fact that the families involved are of the Negro race may be important in itself. The case of the Pahles, who received Mrs. P.'s child, had the active support of the attorney but the original placement was made by the mother.

Five of the placements were made by the mothers of the children with the help of relatives and friends. All of these placements involve the personal element of friendship between the petitioners and the placement agent or contact with the child.

One placement was made by a social worker independent of her agency which was not a child placing agency. The petitioners who received the baby were the brother and sister-in-law of the social worker. Though the facts are hazy the child supposedly entered their home on a temporary basis rather than on an adoptive basis, pending the formation of permanent placement plans by the petitioner's sister.

### Summary

From an analysis of the facts presented in this chapter the conjecture may be made that more petitioners were lead to seek or accept a child

independently because their applications to adopt a child through an agency had been either rejected or delayed. The facts recorded seem to support the fact that this was true of eight out of the fifteen sets of petitioners.

The secondary factors of personal contact with the child or offer of the child to friends by friends may best be shown in table form.

TABLE III

Correlation of Petitioners and Mothers in Regard to  
Agency Applications

| Petitioners  | Petitioners Knew Mothers Or<br>Child Prior To Placement | Petitioners Did Not<br>Know Mother Or Child<br>Prior to Placement |
|--|---|---|
| Seven Petitioners<br>who had not<br>placed an ap-<br>plication with<br>an agency | 5   | 2   |
| Eight Petitioners<br>who had placed<br>an application<br>with an agency          | 0   | 8   |
| 15      Total  | 5   | 10  |

From the facts available there appeared to be a definite correlation between those petitioners who had placed applications to adopt through an agency and those petitioners who paid their placement agents for services rendered to them in the independent placement of a child with them. The findings can be clearly shown in table form.

TABLE IV

Correlation of Petitioners, Money Payments and Agency Applications

| Petitioners                                      | Paid Placement Agent | Did Not Pay Placement Agent | Paid Medical Bills | Did Not Pay Medical Bills |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Seven Petitioners who did not place applications | 0                    | 7                           | 3                  | 4                         |
| Eight Petitioners who did place applications     | 7                    | 1                           | 8                  | 0                         |
| 15 Total   | 7                    | 8                           | 11                 | 4                         |

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY

This study has analyzed fifteen cases of independent adoptions studied for the Madison County Court by the Division of Child Welfare during the year 1950 in relation to the motivation of the natural parent, the placement agents, and the adopting parents in participating in the independent adoption of a child.

The following points were supported by the facts available in the fifteen cases used in this study.

In an examination of the facts which seem most significant in motivating the natural parents to release their child for adoption to untrained placement agents the offer of an easy quick solution to their problem and financial help were consistently present. The statement is supported by the fact that all of the mothers in the fifteen cases accepted the first plan offered to them. Eleven mothers also received financial help with their problem.

The motivation of the placement agents is a little more difficult to define. The facts show that the professional placement agents were motivated principally by a realization of financial gain. The facts also indicate that the agents felt a responsibility of serving the unmarried mothers and the childless petitioners. The non-professional placement agents seem to be prompted by personal motives, related either to the

mother or to the child.

The petitioners seemed to divide themselves into two groups, those who had placed applications with agencies for the adoption of a child and those who had not. The fact that the agencies had rejected or delayed the placement of a child in the home of the petitioners because of the tangible deficiencies in the petitioner's adequacy as potential parents had a great bearing on the seeking or accepting of a child from independent sources.

The petitioners who had not placed applications with agencies for the adoption of a child seemed to have been motivated in the acceptance of a child on an independent basis by the offer of a particular child to them by close friends. The personal element was most prevalent with this group of petitioners. In several cases there was direct contact with the child prior to adoptive placement in the home of the petitioners.

**APPENDIX A**



STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE  
DIVISION OF CHILD WELFARE

**REPORT OF MATERNITY HOSPITAL**

(To be filled out and forwarded to the Regional Office of the Department of Public Welfare for all children born to unmarried mothers and all other children who are to live away from their own parents, except those children dismissed to licensed child placing agencies. This report should be submitted immediately following the birth of the child.)

NAME OF HOSPITAL \_\_\_\_\_

Address of Hospital \_\_\_\_\_

Name and Address of Attending Physician \_\_\_\_\_

CHILD

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Birthdate \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Male

\_\_\_\_\_  
Illegitimate

Race: \_\_\_\_\_  
White

\_\_\_\_\_  
Female

\_\_\_\_\_  
Legitimate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Negro

\_\_\_\_\_  
Other

Congenital Abnormalities \_\_\_\_\_

MOTHER

Name in Full \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Admission \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Discharge \_\_\_\_\_

Birthdate \_\_\_\_\_ Birthplace \_\_\_\_\_ Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

Marital Status: \_\_\_\_\_ Religion: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Living together

\_\_\_\_\_  
Protestant

Number of other children

\_\_\_\_\_  
Not married

\_\_\_\_\_  
Catholic

now living born to this

\_\_\_\_\_  
Separated

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hebrew

mother: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Divorced

\_\_\_\_\_  
Other

\_\_\_\_\_  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**DISPOSITION OF CHILD**

Will mother keep child? \_\_\_\_\_ Does mother wish to surrender child? \_\_\_\_\_

If child is to be referred to child-caring agency give name and date \_\_\_\_\_

Will relatives take the child? \_\_\_\_\_ Relationship \_\_\_\_\_

Give names and addresses of near relatives, including other children: \_\_\_\_\_

Give further information of value in above case: \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

To be signed by Superintendent of  
Hospital, or Supervisor of  
Maternity Department.

## APPENDIX B

## MATERNITY HOSPITAL LAW

AN ACT for the licensing, inspection and regulation of maternity hospitals, lying-in homes, or other places, public or private, for the confinement of women and to provide a penalty for violation thereof. Approved June 24, in force July 1, 1915.

Section I. \*\*\*No hospital or institution licensed under this Act, or persons connected with such hospitals or institutions, shall place children for adoption or care in foster family homes, or anywhere outside of the custody of their mothers, unless the hospital or institution shall be licensed as a child welfare agency as provided by law, except with the written consent of the State Department of Public Welfare. But nothing in this act shall prevent the placing of any child by a licensed child welfare agency in a private family or home for legal adoption, or the legal adoption of any child from a licensed child welfare agency.

\*\*\*\*\*

Section 3. No child from such maternity or lying-in hospital shall be placed in a family home or be legally adopted until such home shall have been investigated and approved by the State Department of Public Welfare.

\*\*\*\*\*

Section 5. Any manager, superintendent, or person in charge of such maternity or lying-in hospital who fails or refuses to procure a license as provided in Section I thereof, or anyone who violates any of the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not less than \$50 nor more than \$500, or by imprisonment in the county jail for not to exceed one year, or both fine and imprisonment in the discretion of the court. Approved as amended July 14, 1939.

APPENDIX C

OFFICE  
of  
COUNTY CLERK  
MADISON COUNTY  
EDWARDSVILLE, ILLINOIS

July 17, 1950

Miss \_\_\_\_\_  
Child Welfare Worker  
Probation Office  
Court House  
Edwardsville, Illinois

In Re: John Adams and Jane Adams  
Vs. Earl Smith and Betty  
Smith and Larry Smith,  
a minor.  
Adoption Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

Dear Miss \_\_\_\_\_:

County Judge \_\_\_\_\_ would like to have an investigation made in  
the above captioned case.

Mr. and Mrs. Adams reside at 163 Second Street, Edwardsville, Illinois.

Report must be filed in this office on or before August 7, 1950.  
\_\_\_\_\_ is attorney for Mr. and Mrs. Adams.

Sincerely,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of County Court

**APPENDIX D**

## INVESTIGATION

in the matter of

the

ADOPTION

of

NAME OF CHILD

The following is the investigation in the matter of the adoption of NAME OF THE CHILD by the petitioners FIRST, MAIDEN, AND LAST NAME OF THE ADOPTING PARENTS who reside at COMPLETE ADDRESS AT THE TIME OF ADOPTION.

### RELATIONSHIP

The child's name, birth date and place, and natural parents. Relationship of the child to the petitioners. How and when the child was received into the home of the petitioners. Mention any court or legal action pertinent to this child's placement in the home. Has the child's natural parents supported or shown any interest in the child during the period he was in the petitioner's home. Have the natural parents signed legal consents for adoption.

### THE CHILD

Repeat above, name of child, birthdate and place and natural parents. Give a brief description of the child, physical appearance, personality, and type of care and training received at the hands of the petitioners. Attachment to the child by the petitioners and their future plans for him. Any general observations relative to the fitness of this particular child for this home.

### HEALTH

A general picture of the child's health at present with medical statements from the family physician. Where the child is the natural child of one of the petitioners, a medical statement is not always too important.

### MARRIAGE

State the date and place of marriage, verified if indicated. Note all previous marriages of either party with verified dates of divorced. Custody wardship in divorces should be noted where a step-parent is adopting a

natural child of their spouse. The length and stability of the present marriage is significant.

### RELIGION

The practiced religion of the petitioners and religion of the child's parents should be indicated. Notation should be made of the regular church adherence at the time of the adoption.

### THE HOME

A brief description of the home including the size, appearance and general management should be given. It should be indicated whether the petitioners own, are buying, or are renting their home with financial figures as indicated mentioned.

The neighborhood should be very briefly described and if the child is or will attend school in that area some thought should be given this in the report.

### EMPLOYMENT

The petitioner's place of employment, length of service here, and average income should be clearly indicated. Any part-time or additional income must be noted. Here a brief employment history may be given although this usually is more valuable given under the ADOPTING PARENTS as such.

### INCOME, SAVINGS, INSURANCE AND DEBTS

A very brief but concise report should be given showing the above status of the petitioners.

### ADOPTING MOTHER

We may give date and place of birth, a brief personal history to date, with more emphasis on her later years. Some information could be given on previous marriages, as to cause of failure, etc. If employed, a brief history in this regard can be given. Specific details should be given relative to this mother in relationship to the child sought in adoption.

#### Health

A brief description of the mother's health should be given with medical statements. Again, medical statements might not always be too significant if the mother is a natural mother of the child sought in adoption.

### ADOPTING FATHER

Emphasis as stated above, principally specific information relative to types and lengths of employment to the present time.

#### Health



As above.

COMMENTS OR RECOMMENDATIONS

Respectfully submitted,

Child Welfare Worker  
Division of Child Welfare

**APPENDIX E**

SCHEDULE

PETITIONERS

Father \_\_\_\_\_  
Birthdate \_\_\_\_\_ Religion \_\_\_\_\_  
Nationality \_\_\_\_\_ Race \_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Present Marriage \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Previous Marriages \_\_\_\_\_  
Previous Wife Deceased \_\_\_\_\_ Divorced \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Children \_\_\_\_\_  
Previous Marriages \_\_\_\_\_  
Present Marriage \_\_\_\_\_

Mother \_\_\_\_\_  
Birthdate \_\_\_\_\_ Religion \_\_\_\_\_  
Nationality \_\_\_\_\_ Race \_\_\_\_\_  
Years Married at Time of Placement \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Previous Marriages \_\_\_\_\_  
Previous Husband Deceased \_\_\_\_\_ Divorced \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Children \_\_\_\_\_  
Previous Marriages \_\_\_\_\_  
Present Marriage \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Pregnancies \_\_\_\_\_  
Previous Marriages \_\_\_\_\_  
Present Marriage \_\_\_\_\_

EDUCATION

Grade School 12345678  
High School 1234  
College 123456  
Technical 6mo. 1yr. 2yr.  
Business 6mo. 1yr. 2yr.

EDUCATION

Grade School 12345678  
High School 1234  
College 123456  
Technical 6mo. 1yr. 2yr.  
Business 6mo. 1yr. 2yr.

EMPLOYMENT

Type \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Years \_\_\_\_\_

EMPLOYMENT

Type \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Years \_\_\_\_\_  
Employed at Present \_\_\_\_\_

FINANCIAL SITUATION

Income \_\_\_\_\_  
Savings \_\_\_\_\_

HOUSING

Own Home \_\_\_\_\_ Size \_\_\_\_\_  
Rent \_\_\_\_\_ Condition: Good \_\_\_\_\_  
House \_\_\_\_\_ Fair \_\_\_\_\_  
Apartment \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_

EFFORTS OF PETITIONERS TO OBTAIN A CHILD

Number of Agencies to Which Petitioners Applied \_\_\_\_\_  
Petitioners Interviewed by Child Placing Agency \_\_\_\_\_  
Accepted \_\_\_\_\_ Rejected \_\_\_\_\_ Discouraged \_\_\_\_\_ Referred \_\_\_\_\_  
Petitioners attempted Previous Independent Placements \_\_\_\_\_ No. of Times \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Years Spent Seeking a Child For Adoption \_\_\_\_\_  
Age of Petitioners at Time of Child's Placement: Mother \_\_\_\_\_  
Father \_\_\_\_\_

SCHEDULE

THE CHILD AND MOTHER

THE CHILD

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Birthdate \_\_\_\_\_ Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Legitimate \_\_\_\_\_  
Nationality \_\_\_\_\_ Race \_\_\_\_\_ Religion \_\_\_\_\_  
Birth: Normal \_\_\_\_\_ Health: Pre-Natal Care Received \_\_\_\_\_  
Full Term \_\_\_\_\_ Initiated during \_\_\_\_\_ month of pregnancy  
8th Month \_\_\_\_\_ Pre-placement Physical \_\_\_\_\_  
7th Month \_\_\_\_\_ Psychological Test Administered \_\_\_\_\_  
Age at time of Placement \_\_\_\_\_ Age at time Petitioned Filed \_\_\_\_\_ Age at time of Adoption \_\_\_\_\_

THE MOTHER

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Birthdate \_\_\_\_\_ Nationality \_\_\_\_\_  
Religion \_\_\_\_\_ Race \_\_\_\_\_  
Marital Status: Married \_\_\_\_\_ Number of other Pregnancies \_\_\_\_\_  
Single \_\_\_\_\_ Other Children \_\_\_\_\_  
Divorced \_\_\_\_\_ Legitimate \_\_\_\_\_  
Separated \_\_\_\_\_ With Mother \_\_\_\_\_  
With Others \_\_\_\_\_  
Education: Grade School 12345678 Illegitimate \_\_\_\_\_  
High School 1234 With Mother \_\_\_\_\_  
College 123456 With Others \_\_\_\_\_  
Business 6mo. 1yr. 2yr. Adopted Out \_\_\_\_\_  
Employment: Type \_\_\_\_\_ Number of Years \_\_\_\_\_  
Living Arrangements: \_\_\_\_\_  
Own Home \_\_\_\_\_ With Relatives \_\_\_\_\_  
Rooming House \_\_\_\_\_ With Friends \_\_\_\_\_

ALLEGED FATHER

Background Known to Mother \_\_\_\_\_ To Placement Agent \_\_\_\_\_ To Petitioners \_\_\_\_\_  
Alleged Father Participated in Placement Plans \_\_\_\_\_

PLACEMENT

Placement Arranged: \_\_\_\_\_ Actual Placement Made: \_\_\_\_\_  
Directly with Child's Mother \_\_\_\_\_ By Child's Mother \_\_\_\_\_  
Through Physician \_\_\_\_\_ By Physician \_\_\_\_\_  
Through Attorney \_\_\_\_\_ By Attorney \_\_\_\_\_  
Through Minister or Priest \_\_\_\_\_ By Minister or Priest \_\_\_\_\_  
Through Friends \_\_\_\_\_ By Friends \_\_\_\_\_  
Through Others \_\_\_\_\_ By Others \_\_\_\_\_

Maternity Expenses Paid by Petitioners: All \_\_\_\_\_ Part \_\_\_\_\_ None \_\_\_\_\_  
Extra Payments made by Petitioners: Mother \_\_\_\_\_ Attorney \_\_\_\_\_  
Physician \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baldwin, Frances, "Independent Adoptions" Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Social Work, Washington University, 1949
- Child Welfare League of America, Adoption Practice
- Crull, Virginia, "Adoptive Practices in the State of Kansas" Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Social Work, Washington University 1949
- Huffman, Helen C., "A First Protection for the Child Born Out of Wedlock", The Child, August, 1946.
- Leavy, Martin L., The Law of Adoption in Forty-Eight States.
- New York State Journal of Medicine, The Doctors Responsibility in Child Adoption.
- Nimb, Eleanor, The Illinois Adoption Law and Its Administration
- Regulations Governing Maternity Hospitals, State of Illinois, Department of Public Health, 1948.
- Ricks, James, Legal Aspects of Adoption.
- State of Illinois, Children's Laws
- State of Illinois, Laws Relating to the Adoption of Children.
- State of Ohio, Department of Public Welfare, Suggested Policies and Procedures in the Placement of Children for Adoption
- Survey, June, 1941, Why Babies are Bootlegged.
- Townsend, Walter, Placement and Protective Services in Adoption, Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1948.