



1965

## A Study of the Recidivism of Two Groups of Children Beset by Family Disunity Who Were Referred to the Intake Department of the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children by the Chicago Police

Wilfred Kozlowski  
*Loyola University Chicago*

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

 Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kozlowski, Wilfred, "A Study of the Recidivism of Two Groups of Children Beset by Family Disunity Who Were Referred to the Intake Department of the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children by the Chicago Police" (1965). *Master's Theses*. 1931.

[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses/1931](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/1931)

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).

Copyright © 1965 Wilfred Kozlowski

A STUDY OF THE RECIDIVISM OF TWO GROUPS OF CHILDREN BESET  
BY FAMILY DISUNITY WHO WERE REFERRED TO THE INTAKE  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARTHUR J. AUDY HOME FOR  
CHILDREN BY THE CHICAGO POLICE

by

WILFRED MICHAEL KOZLOWSKI

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of  
the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

June

1965

## LIFE

Wilfred Michael Kozlowski was born in Chicago, Illinois, on October 7, 1929.

He graduated from Carl Schurz High School in June, 1947. After returning from Korea where he was decorated for his efforts in training and integrating Koreans into the United Nations forces, he entered Loyola University in 1953. Upon receiving a Bachelor of Science degree in February, 1957, he began graduate studies in sociology at Loyola University in February, 1957.

The writer was employed for a year and a half in the Intake Department of the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children before accepting a position as a social science teacher at Mount Carmel High School while still remaining on the staff of the Intake Department on a part-time basis from 1958 until the present.

## PREFACE

Many thanks to the many authorities in the field of detention and child care who were contacted before and during the research who were extremely helpful in supplying the writer with information concerning the past history and research and the present trends in the field of detention of dependent children. These include Mr. Sherwood Norman of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency; the Children's Bureau of the Health, Education and Welfare Department; the Child Welfare League of America; the California Youth Authority; Mr. James Jordan, Superintendent of the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children.

Also, thanks to Mr. Jerome Burns, Director of the Intake Department; Father Sieber, deceased; my wife; and Dr. Francis Cizon -- all of whom, in their own special way, contributed greatly to the present research.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
<b>I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .</b>	<b>1</b>
Importance of the family -- Past studies relate family dis- unity to delinquency -- Application of the variables of race, age, religion and institution to a disunited family situ- ation -- Explanation of each variable -- Expected results of application of variables -- Statement of hypothesis to be tested.	
<b>II. DEFINING DEPENDENCY AND THE CONTEXT IN WHICH IT WILL BE                      APPLIED . . . . .</b>	<b>8</b>
Implications of involuntary and voluntary neglect -- Factors involved in voluntary neglect -- The court and its considera- tion of neglect from a historical viewpoint, past and present Legal definition of dependency -- Court social workers and their relationship in determining dependency -- Operational definition to be used in thesis -- History of the Audy Home as related to the Family Court -- Growth of Intake Department Procedural policies of Intake Department in handling cases.	
<b>III. SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE . . . . .</b>	<b>21</b>
What was desired in variables -- What was obtained in vari- ables -- What limitations exist in variables -- Deciding on a referring agency to the Intake Department in terms of what was desired, obtained, and the existing limitations -- Selection of Chicago Police as sole referring agency -- Examination of police referrals in terms of consistency, variability, similarity, sufficiency and accuracy -- Similar approach of police referrals as they are related to Intake and Audy Home -- Preliminary research -- Final sample to be used -- Method of obtaining data -- General data obtained.	
<b>IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .</b>	<b>48</b>
Recidivism for dependency and delinquency generally -- Number and per cent of recidivists for dependency for Caucasians and Negroes -- Number and per cent of recidivists for delinquency for Caucasians and Negroes (continuation of table headings) -- Summary of data.	

V. SUMMARY OF DATA . . . . .	89
------------------------------	----

General statements applicable to dependents and delinquents --  
 General statements concerning delinquency -- Specific state-  
 ments regarding dependents -- General statements regarding  
 delinquency -- Specific statements regarding delinquency --  
 Implications for further research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	99
------------------------	----

# LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. GENERAL RECIDIVISM FOR ALL ADMISSIONS . . . . .	39
II. GENERAL DISTRIBUTION OF ADMISSIONS ACCORDING TO RACE AND RELIGION . . . . .	41
III. MEAN AGE OF ADMISSIONS . . . . .	42
IV. MEAN AGE OF RECIDIVISM FOR DEPENDENCY FOR THE THREE MAJOR GROUPS STUDIED . . . . .	44
V. MEAN AGE OF RECIDIVISM FOR DELINQUENCY FOR THE THREE MAJOR GROUPS STUDIED . . . . .	46
VI. COMPARISON OF RECIDIVISM: GENERAL, DEPENDENCY AND DELINQUENCY	50
VII. NUMBER OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DEPENDENCY FOR CAUCASIANS AND NEGROES . . . . .	51
VIII. PER CENT OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DEPENDENCY FOR CAUCASIANS AND NEGROES . . . . .	52
IX. NUMBER OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR CAUCASIANS AND NEGROES . . . . .	54
X. PER CENT OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR CAUCASIANS AND NEGROES . . . . .	55
XI. NUMBER OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DEPENDENCY ON THE BASIS OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION . . . . .	58
XII. DISTRIBUTION OF NON-RECIDIVISTS AND RECIDIVISTS FOR DEPENDENCY FOR THE THREE MAJOR GROUPS ON THE BASIS OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION . . . . .	60
XIII. PER CENT OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DEPENDENCY FOR THE THREE MAJOR GROUPS STUDIED ON THE BASIS OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION . . . . .	61
XIV. NUMBER OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DELINQUENCY ON THE BASIS OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION . . . . .	63
XV. DISTRIBUTION OF NON-RECIDIVISTS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR THE THREE MAJOR GROUPS ON THE BASIS OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION . . . . .	65

Table	Page
XVI. PER CENT OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR THE THREE MAJOR GROUPS ON THE BASIS OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION . . . . .	66
XVII. FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR DELINQUENCY AFTER INITIAL REFERRAL FOR DEPENDENCY . . . . .	68
XVIII. FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR THE CAUCASIAN CATHOLICS AFTER INITIAL REFERRAL FOR DEPENDENCY . . . . .	70
XIX. FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR THE CAUCASIAN PROTESTANTS AFTER INITIAL REFERRAL FOR DEPENDENCY . . . . .	72
XX. FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR THE NEGRO PROTESTANTS AFTER THE INITIAL REFERRAL FOR DEPENDENCY . . . . .	73
XXI. COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR CAUCASIANS ON THE BASIS OF AGE . . . . .	79
XXII. COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR NEGROES ON THE BASIS OF AGE . . . . .	80
XXIII. COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR THE THIRTEEN- YEAR-OLD GROUP ON THE BASIS OF RACE AND RELIGION . . . . .	82
XXIV. COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR THE FOURTEEN- YEAR-OLD GROUP ON THE BASIS OF RACE AND RELIGION . . . . .	83
XXV. COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR THE FIFTEEN- YEAR-OLD GROUP ON THE BASIS OF RACE AND RELIGION . . . . .	85
XXVI. COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR THE SIXTEEN- YEAR-OLD GROUP ON THE BASIS OF RACE AND RELIGION . . . . .	86



At the White House Conferences of 1909 and 1933 concerning socially handicapped children, there was general consensus among the attending experts in the field of child welfare that the family is the most desirable means of transmitting the culture to a child. It was accepted that it should be the primary agent to shape the morals, aims, and social attitudes which affect the personality of a child. It was further agreed that where the family is disunited and incapable of performing this function, aspects of social disorganization, such as dependency and possible delinquency, are highly probable. In practice, this approach is supported by the fact that the principle of maintaining family unity is established public policy throughout the United States.<sup>1</sup> Research studies have also tended to verify the extreme importance of the family in maintaining social control.

Two of the more notable studies that emphasize the effects of family disunity relative to delinquency are Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay's Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas<sup>2</sup> and Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck's Delinquents in the Making.<sup>3</sup> Shaw and McKay seem to think that a broken home is not the cause of delinquency but rather that the degree of emotional disturbances suffered by the child in a broken home is the most important

<sup>1</sup>White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, Dependent and Neglected Children, (New York and London, 1933), p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay and others, Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas, (Chicago, 1942).

<sup>3</sup>Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Delinquents in the Making, (New York, 1952).

factor contributing to the delinquency of a child. The Gluecks, in taking another approach to delinquency as related to family disunity, studied the homes of delinquents and non-delinquents and found that more desertions, less affection and family unity, less-effective household management, more use of welfare facilities and more emotionally intensified situations characterized the delinquents' homes. The Gluecks think that very little progress can be made in crime prevention until family life is strengthened through a continuous, all-inconclusive program using the resources of all those engaged in mental hygiene, social work, education and religion.<sup>4</sup> Admittedly, these studies are not the most recent relating family disunity to delinquency but merely illustrate several different approaches that can be taken by a researcher. Irrespective of whether the studies were performed earlier or later than those mentioned, there exists the unmistakable fact of a high correlation between personality development and behavior patterns of a child relative to type of family. If there is a common denominator in delinquency studies, it is found in the troubled homes from which a disproportionate amount of delinquents come.<sup>5</sup>

Assuming the above findings to be valid, a high incidence of recidivism for dependency and delinquency or both should occur in the groups studied in this research, since being referred to the Intake Department of the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children as a dependent clearly reflects family disunity. This research will attempt, then, to discern and compare the recidivism

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 46-61, 197.

<sup>5</sup>William C. Kvaraceus, The Community and the Delinquent, (New York, 1954), p. 236.

for dependency or delinquency or both of two groups of boys from seriously disturbed families. Of those cases referred, the more serious cases should have a higher recidivist rate, the seriousness of a case being determined in this research by transfer from the Intake Department to the more permanent part of the Audy Home. Less serious cases are those released from Intake to other sources. To further refine the research, an attempt will be made to apply the variables of race, age and religion to those cases that are referred elsewhere by the Intake Department and those cases that are referred to the Audy Home proper. It is expected that in each age, race or religious group a greater rate of recidivism will exist among those cases transferred to the Audy Home proper. However, it is expected that each group of elsewhere referred and Audy Home cases would be different from each other. A brief explanation, then, of the variables of race, age and religion should generally represent the expected differences.

Along with the institutional variable relative to recidivism will be applied the variables of race, age and religion, all of which will now be briefly discussed. In emphasizing the racial variable, the White House Conference of 1933 made specific mention of the Negro movement to the North, which led to problems of housing, health, crime, education, politics, social contacts, and dependency. The Negro, in making the cultural transition from rural to urban life, had not only the problems that characterize this cultural transition but had to encounter unfriendly attitudes and prejudices because of his race. These facts made adjustment toward sound family living even more difficult than for the Caucasians.<sup>6</sup> It could then be

---

<sup>6</sup>White House Conference, pp. 280-282.

expected that the Negro groups should return for dependency and delinquency or both and in all probability for more serious offenses than the Caucasian groups. It is hoped that other relationships can be determined by the research, specifically, in relation to the types of offenses, age of offenses, and distribution of offenses for specific age groups.

In respect to the second variable of age and its relationship to family disunity and possible delinquency, considerable importance is attached by criminologists and penologists. At least three generally accepted principles concerning age and crime are recognized: (1) most criminals exhibit anti-social behavior patterns early in childhood; (2) the later the problem is attacked, the less the chances for rehabilitation; and (3) young children should not be detained in police stations and correctional institutions designed primarily for adults.<sup>7</sup>

It is not certain what patterns, if any, will exist in the age groups studied; but it does appear that against the background of these principles, many cases should return at an early age for delinquency, i.e., under the age of twelve. Also, it appears that those cases referred later for dependency would have been exposed to more disrupting personality influences and would hence engage in delinquent behavior earlier than cases referred earlier whereby the court would then be influencing the welfare of the child. Also expected would be an increase in recidivism and readmissions as the boy's age increases. Whether this is so or whether different patterns of dependency and delinquency exist for each age, racial and religious group

---

<sup>7</sup>Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, eds., Preventing Crime, (New York, 1936), p. 6.

should be determined by this research.

The third variable to be considered in the thesis is religion, since the development of institutions for dependents historically has been closely allied to religious social systems. There has not been a similar development of institutions for dependents for all creeds, and there should appear in the thesis definite distinctions among the groups studied because private institutions have been closely allied to the Arthur J. Audy Home in regard to placing children. For example, the most difficult child to place in a private institution has always been the Negro Protestant child; therefore, it could be expected that different rates of transfer should exist between that group and the Caucasian Catholic or Protestant group. Also, the research hopes to determine the distribution of referrals for each group relative to transfers to the Audy Home proper. Another aspect of religion other than the availability of institutions for dependent placements made possible by religious groups is the impact that religious beliefs have on the conduct of people but will not be considered in this research.

The fourth variable, the institution, is important to the thesis because the variables of race, age and religion are applied in an institutional setting. The variable of institution is related to family disunity because the referral to an institution for dependent children reflects a disunited family. Referral of a dependent child to the Arthur J. Audy Home is even more reflective of family disunity because the institution is primarily a delinquent institution and the only emergency shelter care home in Cook County. Associated, then, with a referral to the Audy Home is a stigma as well as deleterious social contacts for a dependent child. These

factors tend to support a generally accepted position by social workers that a child should not be removed from a home because of squalid conditions even where parents appear inadequate because of ignorance, limited opportunities and a lack of experience if any of the characteristics of forethought, loyalty, responsibility, imagination and reverence for God are exhibited.<sup>8</sup> The thesis, then, will concern only serious cases of family disunity and will attempt to discern between these serious cases. The criterion of seriousness will be determined by the fact that a child is released from the Intake Department of the Arthur J. Audy Home or is transferred to the Audy Home proper where the child will remain on the average of approximately 21 days.

It would then appear that if the variables of race, age and religion are applied to a disunited family situation in an institutional setting, there should appear not only a high degree of recidivism for dependency and delinquency, or both; but there also should be variances between the racial, age and religious groups. Further, if some of the groups of cases that are referred are considered to represent more family disunity, that group should have a higher rate of recidivism for dependency and delinquency. The hypothesis to be tested, then, is "since those children who are referred initially for dependency to the Intake Department of the Arthur J. Audy Home and who are transferred to the Audy Home proper generally represent more serious family problems and subsequently placement problems, then the rate of

---

<sup>8</sup>White House Conference, pp. 100-101.

recidivism for dependency and delinquency or both will be greater for them than for those children initially referred for dependency who are referred elsewhere from the Intake Department after the first admission. Further, differences will exist between the racial, age and religious groups referred elsewhere from the Intake Department and those referred to the Audy Home proper." The introduction of each of the variables of age, race and religion to the Intake and Audy Home cases should alter the major hypothesis significantly; but whatever the specific variable or combination of variables used, the Audy Home cases are expected to have a higher rate of recidivism. In the next chapter, a definition of dependency will be given as well as a further explanation of the context in which the definition will be applied.

## CHAPTER II

### DEFINING DEPENDENCY AND THE CONTEXT IN WHICH IT WILL BE APPLIED

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First, the concept of a dependent child in relationship to the law will be explained and clarified insofar as the concept is related to the thesis. Secondly, the public institution, the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children, which is where the research was conducted, will be analyzed. The first segment of the chapter will concern the implications of involuntary and voluntary neglect which results in a state of dependency for a child; the factors involved in voluntary neglect; the court and its consideration of neglect from a historical view, past and present; the legal definition for dependency; the court social workers and their relationship in determining dependency and finally an operational definition of dependency to be used in the thesis. The second segment of the chapter will discuss the history of the Audy Home as related to the development of the Family Court; the growth of the Intake Department; and, lastly, the procedural policies of the Intake Department in handling dependent cases.

The first aspect to be considered is the implication of involuntary and voluntary neglect on the part of the parents or guardian that results in a state of dependency and possibly entrance into a public institution for a child. Involuntary neglect on the part of the parents or guardian that result in referrals to the Audy Home can best be illustrated by referrals for such things as death of a parent, fire, illness or possibly by a mistake being made where the parents leave a child in the care of an

apparently reliable party whose unreliability results in the child being referred as a dependent. Generally, any type of referral where the parent is not directly responsible for the dependency can be classified as involuntary neglect. However, voluntary neglect exists when the parents are directly responsible for the child being involved in a state of dependency. Some clear examples of voluntary neglect would be desertion, abandonment, incarceration for some criminal offense or other obvious parental neglect. The concept of neglect has not only physical but also medical, emotional, moral and educational overtones; and what appears often to the caseworker as an infraction of parental duties is not always adjudged so by the court. Understanding, then, the history of the courts, relative to the concept of neglect, is most essential to understanding the thesis.

Until the concept of a juvenile court became a reality in 1899, children had little legal protection from an indifferent, cruel or irresponsible parent. The first case of improper treatment of a child in New York City had to be heard under a law forbidding the cruelty to animals because for centuries the absolute right of a parent over a child was upheld in the courts, even to the extent of allowing abuse to a child. Social workers, however, have tended to change this position of the court through the establishment of juvenile courts.<sup>1</sup> Judge Thomas D. Gill, of the Hartford Connecticut Juvenile Court, writing in the National Probation and Parole Association

---

<sup>1</sup>Thomas D. Gill, "The Legal Nature of Neglect," National Probation and Parole Association, VI (January, 1960), 2.



Journal of January, 1960, states that dependents were in the unfortunate position of not being able to obtain help from the law and quotes in this article some statements made by Justine Polier, New York Juvenile Court Judge, who said, in effect, that for two hundred years countless dependent children were mistreated as much by the public's indifference as well as the public's manifestation of its concern. Further, the assistance given to unfortunates since the early colonial days was characterized by anonymity and inexpensiveness and thus left the lack of legal protection or legal status for dependents to carry with them.<sup>2</sup> Judge McGill further stated that the boundaries of legal neglect will never be clearly delineated, although precedents have been and will be set that will define neglect more clearly.<sup>3</sup> The legal system through which neglect will be more clearly defined is the juvenile court system; and, therefore, pertinent to the thesis being understood is the legal definition of dependency that provides the framework in which the court social workers operate. The legal definition for dependency in Illinois is given in the Illinois Statutes under the title of the Juvenile Court Act and is as follows:

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly: (1) that all persons under the age of twenty-one (21) years shall, for the purpose of this Act only, be considered wards of this State and their persons shall be subject to the care, guardianship and control of the court as herein after provided. For the purpose of this Act, the words "Dependent Child" and "Neglected Child" shall mean any male child who while under the age of seventeen years or any female child who while under the age of eighteen years, for any reason, is destitute, homeless or

---

<sup>2</sup>Justine Wise Polier, Everyone's Children, Nobody's Child: A Judge Looks at Underprivileged Children in the United States (New York, 1941), p. 23.

<sup>3</sup>Gill, p. 2.

abandoned, or dependent upon the public for support, or has not proper parental care of guardianship, or habitually begs or receives alms, or is found living in any house of ill fame or with any vicious or disreputable person, or has a home which by reason of neglect, cruelty or depravity on the part of its parents, guardian or any other person in whose care it may be, is an unfit place for such a child: and any child who while under the age of ten (10) years is found begging, peddling, or selling any articles or singing or playing any musical instrument for gain upon the street or giving any public entertainments or accompanies or is used in aid of any person so doing.<sup>4</sup>

Any legal definition, however, has to be applied and interpreted for a given social milieu which for all practical purposes means that each county juvenile court has to depend largely on social workers to carry out its interpretation of the law. Here in Cook County the Family Court allows the caseworker to make many decisions regarding whether a petition is filed that alleges that a state of dependency exists for a child or, if possible, a delinquent petition is filed. Generally, the Family Court has used twelve years of age as the minimum age for filing a delinquent petition. However, if a child by his actions exhibits a sophistication in his delinquent behavior and is under twelve years of age, a delinquent petition may be filed. Many boys commit objectively delinquent acts before the court on a dependency petition because the court philosophy was rehabilitative in its inception and remains so today. The next step to understanding the thesis is to emerge with an operational definition in relation to what has been said concerning dependency.

For the purpose of the thesis, a dependent child will be any child who was referred on his first admission for temporary shelter to the Intake

---

<sup>4</sup>Illinois Revised Statutes, 1961, Section 2001-2006 (August, 1961).

Department of the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children by the Chicago Police and who was classified by the Intake Social Worker as a legal dependent on the records irrespective of whether the state of dependency is temporary or permanent. Excluded from consideration are boys referred for an objectively delinquent act who the court will undoubtedly classify as a dependent. For example, if a seven-year-old boy is referred on his first occasion as a runaway or for theft or any other offense, he is not considered in the research. All children, then, are clear cases of being objectively classified as legal dependents, however temporary this state of dependency may be for a child, on the occasion of the first admission. Since the operational definition will be applied in the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children, it becomes necessary to understand the history of the Audy Home as related to the development of the Family Court, the growth of the Intake Department of the Audy Home and the Procedural policies of the Intake Department in handling dependent cases, specifically those cases that constitute the universe. The second segment of this chapter will concern the above-mentioned concepts.

The establishment of a juvenile home was a necessary supplement to the Juvenile Court Act of 1899, and both must be observed in relationship to each other. For years before the Juvenile Court became a reality, the care of dependent and delinquent children presented a challenge to existing courts and private agencies. Vast population changes in urban areas compounded the problem of maintaining family unity and increased the problem for existing courts and social agencies. Genuine agitation for a juvenile court law began in Illinois several years before the establishment of the

first American juvenile court law in Illinois in 1899. A subsequent statute, the Charities Act of 1907, provided for the care of dependent and delinquent children and was the result of a growing awareness that a suitable place was needed for the temporary detention of juveniles awaiting court action and for the shelter and custodial care of alleged dependents. After considerable controversy concerning the type of facility that would best meet the needs of delinquent and dependent children outside of jails and police stations, a detention home was agreed upon. The detention home was supposed to be "so arranged, furnished and conducted that as near as practicable for their safe custody the inmates shall be cared for as in a family home and public school."<sup>5</sup> The detention facilities used after this act was passed soon became inadequate, and new facilities had to be found; and so in 1923 the present detention home was built according to standards set down by the Children's Bureau. One of the more important standards that has a relationship to the thesis was that dependent children be separated from delinquent children.

However, by 1924, one year after the detention home was built, it became apparent that the detention home was becoming overcrowded, partially because groups making referrals were using the facilities of the detention home indiscriminately and not utilizing community resources effectively. Obviously, the separation of dependent and delinquent children became more theoretical than was actually practical. That some agency was needed to

---

<sup>5</sup>Savilla Millis, Juvenile Detention Home in Relation to Juvenile Court Policy (Chicago, 1935), p. 20.

screen referrals, especially to divert dependent cases away from the Audy Home, became more obvious to those associated with the detention home; but since change in public institutions is only the culmination of the concentrated efforts of people close to the problem, delays were inevitable. Eventually, in 1935, a study was made of the overcrowded detention facilities by a group of social workers selected by the Cook County Board of Commissioners. One of the reasons the detention home was overcrowded was that many dependents were being referred and that placement of these children was slow. This fact was noted in the fiscal report of 1935 by the County Commissioners who reported that "Many cases have been held on call for months waiting for the Children's and Minor's Service to determine whether they will accept the children. These delays impose a heavy burden on the court, unnecessary hardships on the children and add a vast amount of additional work to Court and Staff."<sup>6</sup> Also mentioned were the increased Negro referrals and the difficulty in placing them in homes other than their own, as no institutions other than boarding homes were available to Negroes. As a result of the findings by the selected group of social workers, the Intake Department of the detention home was established in 1937 primarily to screen each child's needs and to provide alternatives to detention whenever necessary. This function has been modified through the years as a result of the increasing demands made upon the other divisions of the court, and in 1955 the Intake Department was given authority by the court to dispose

---

<sup>6</sup>Annual Message of Cook County Board President, (Cook County, Illinois), 1935), p. 57.

of dependent cases. Actually, for two years prior to being officially designated to dispose of dependent cases, the Intake Department performed this function. Understanding the procedural policies of the Intake Department relative to disposing of dependent cases is necessary to understanding the limitations and scope of the thesis.

Dependent children generally are referred to the Intake Department from two major sources, the court divisions and the police. Each of the Family Court divisions has a relative function in regard to dependent children. When a caseworker from one of the court divisions refers a dependent child, then that child in all likelihood will go through the Intake Department and then be transferred to the Audy Home. These types of cases are not included in the thesis, however. The other major referring sources of alleged dependent children is the police; and for this thesis, only the Chicago Police referrals are considered. A further explanation, then, of the involvement of the Chicago Police relative to the Intake procedural policies is essential to the thesis to understand the types of cases that are represented in the Universe.

When a state of emergency arises, the police are usually called in; and when no temporary plan can be effected, the police have no alternative but to refer the dependent child or children to the Intake Department. Emergencies arise at all times of the day or night and on the weekends, and the Intake Department is open twenty-four hours a day every day of the year. It is the only County institution available to take care of such emergency situations. Needless to say, many of the cases referred by the police are already active with outside agencies or the Family Court. Upon

being called in on such a case, the police are supposed to make an investigation to establish if any alternative plan can be adopted other than to refer the case to the Intake Department. The extent to which these investigations are made probably differs with the police personnel working on the case. In all cases, at least a sufficient attempt to contact relatives or locate the parents has to be made to the satisfaction of the Intake worker screening the case. However, the time and circumstances of a case have to be considered. For instance, if the police are called in on a case in the dead of night and the children are hungry, tired, cold and insufficiently clothed, it would seem that an extensive investigation would impose more hardships on the children; therefore, the Intake worker would be inclined to accept the children and remain in contact with the police, who can then proceed to make a more thorough investigation of the case. The characteristic feature of cases referred by the police is the need for emergency housing and care. There are then several possible decisions that are made in dependent cases by the Intake Department.

When an alleged dependent child is accepted for care by the Intake Department, the first task is to ascertain if the child is active with the court. Has the child previously been involved in such a situation that the court has intervened and is still actively working on the case? If the case is known to the court, the proper worker in the respective division of the court which has jurisdiction is notified; and the case is turned over to that person. The worker active on the case is obviously in a much better position to make a decision on the case. If the case is not active with the court, the Intake worker must then ascertain the child's status as regards

to outside agencies.

After determining the status of the alleged dependent and the jurisdiction over the case, the Intake Department acts accordingly. If, however, jurisdiction lies with the Intake Department, then one of the three things is done. First, the worker must determine if the case is serious enough to be brought into court. If the case appears not to be serious, it may be adjusted and the child returned to those with whom he or she has been residing.

Secondly, if the worker has some misgivings about the case for one reason or another, yet does not have conclusive evidence to file a petition alleging dependency, then a complaint can be taken on the case. This basically means that a court worker will conduct a further investigation. The Intake Department can release the child to the guardian or request a custody order from a court referee, then supplies a caseworker with available information regarding relatives, accusations by different parties, statements by those associated with the case and the like for purposes of further investigation.

If the Intake worker feels that sufficient evidence is available, he will file a dependent petition. If possible, the Intake worker attempts to work out a solution without filing a petition because paramount in the mind of the worker and imbedded in case after case in court is the generally accepted primacy of the parent relative to his or her child. Although the position of the court has changed since the middle nineteenth century, there still remains the situation where evidence supporting a dependency petition must be presented. The caseworker is then left in the position of



scrutinizing what appears to be reliable evidence to be presented in court.

The Intake worker, therefore, must be aware of the rights of parents relative to their children. In many instances, allegations are made against parents or guardians by relatives and friends as to the unfitness of the parents or guardians. However, what constitutes evidence of these allegations is a different matter. The Illinois Supreme Court has handed down several decisions upholding the rights of parents as well as their obligations which means that parents cannot simply escape from their obligations nor can children be taken too easily from parents. Many terms, such as cruelty, unfitness, drunkenness, abandonment, desertion and neglect are prone to subjective analysis; and the court has to have some basis in reliable facts and consistency of activity by the parents to prove the matter in court.<sup>7</sup>

Thus, many referrals from the police are terminated by the Intake Department without filing a petition alleging a state of dependency exists for a given child.

Basically, filing a petition means that in the mind of the worker sufficient evidence is available and subject alleges that a child should be taken from the parent or guardian and placed by the court in a suitable home or institution. The social worker's frame of reference may come to grips at times with that person interpreting the law, but generally much cooperation exists among court officials and court caseworkers. Restraints upon social workers come more likely from the subtle atmosphere of the court in general

---

<sup>7</sup>Ralph Biley, A Working Manual for Juvenile Court Officers, (Chicago, 1932), p. 39.

and its underlying philosophy.

When it is felt that a petition should be filed on a case, the Intake worker attempts to find a suitable place for the child if the parents appear to be unable to properly care for the child. Often relatives are sought as a means of placement or some friends with whom the parents would like the child placed. Sometimes arrangements can be made with existing private agencies to temporarily care for a child. If none of these possibilities exists, the Temporary Care Department of the court is contacted and a request for a home then made. If there is still no home available, the child is then transferred to the Audy Home Proper until a home of some kind is available with a custody order being obtained from a referee. This last aspect of handling of a dependant case is important to understanding in part the limitations of the intended research. The reason for this is that in some cases understudy transference to the Audy Home Proper is dependant on the availability of a temporary care home. This means that a child coming in one day with a given set of circumstances may be placed in a temporary care home but that on another day would have to be transferred to the Audy Home Proper.

To summarize briefly, it might be said that this chapter concerned itself first with an attempt to define the term dependency and develop the framework for a working definition. In doing so, it was pointed out that dependency is a somewhat nebulous term in that there are so many aspects to be considered when reference of the term is made to children. Secondly, a brief history of dependency and its relationship to the Audy Home and Intake Department was given, since it is necessary to understand the general context

to which the term dependency is applied.

## CHAPTER III

### SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

In the first chapter, family disunity was discussed relative to dependency and delinquency. In the second chapter, the term dependency was clarified insofar as it related to the Family Court but with specific emphasis on the Intake Department of the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children. The present chapter will explain how the sample selection was made in terms of what was desired, what was obtained, and what limitations thereby exist. After explaining how the sample was chosen, the general characteristics of the sample will be presented.

Our problem is concerned with dependent children who were referred to the Intake Department and subsequently referred elsewhere or to the Arthur J. Audy Home Proper relative to their recidivism for dependency or delinquency or both. The variables of age, race, and religion were specifically to be considered in reference to such recidivism in each Intake and Audy Home group of dependent children. Adequate comparison between each age, racial, and religious group made necessary a clarification of the operational meaning of these variables and a sampling that would be adequate for the measurement of them.

Dependent cases between three and six years of age referred in given years and who would have reached their seventeenth birthday at the time of the research would have been the most desirable age group for such study. The unavailability of these records forced the abandonment of this plan, and another approach had to be chosen. As the next best approach, dependent cases

born between 1945 and 1948 and referred to the Intake Department before January 1, 1961, were chosen. By using this termination date for referrals, each child would have had at least one year from the initial referral for dependency to engage in possible delinquent behavior. (The material was collected after January 1, 1962.) In addition, a sixteen-year-old boy born in 1945 would not have completed his sixteenth year until January 1, 1962, or later. This is important because, if he were older, it would place him beyond the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, if he had had no previous contact with it.

These age qualifications gave to the data the age consistency necessary to make comparisons between the various age groups. Each year of referral in this case would then represent one age group. The children born in 1945 would represent the sixteen-year-old group, and the fifteen, fourteen and thirteen-year-old groups would be represented by the other years of birth. Two limitations in the choice of the above-mentioned age groups exist.

The first limitation in choosing the age group in this way is that a boy, whether born in January or December of 1945, is considered to be a sixteen-year-old boy. This holds true for all the fifteen, fourteen and thirteen-year-old groups. Since the birth pattern can be assumed to be steady throughout the year, it was assumed that the earlier and later births of the various years would balance each other out. In addition, since the comparisons between variables were to be made between Intake Department cases and Audy Home cases, the same limitations would exist for both groups.

Secondly, this choice of age grouping does not control the number of years between the first referral and January, 1961. For example, four

fifteen-year-olds, born in 1947, could vary to the extent that one might be referred for dependency at the age of three, another at seven, another at nine and another at fourteen. This means that in each age bracket some of the children will have had more opportunity to have engaged in delinquent behavior after their first referral to Intake. This factor tends to be minimized, however, since in the sample most of the children were referred for dependency at about eight years of age. Against, since the comparison is between groups referred from Intake, the same limitation will affect each. This limitation will be given consideration in the evaluation of the data.

The race variable posed little problem for operational definition since only Caucasian and Negro cases were used and the decision of the worker filing the record was accepted. However, there does appear to be a limitation imposed on the research regarding racial subtypes, such as Puerto Rican and Mexican. Since the records from which the research data was obtained were recorded by the Intake Department which uses only the three main racial classifications, these children were classified as Caucasians; and this factor must be given consideration in the light of this limitation.

The religious groups comprised the third variable. In the original design, the religious categories were to be combined with race: e.g., Caucasian Catholic and Protestant and Negro Catholic and Protestant. Later, a modification in the comparisons between the religious groups had to be made, since the Negro Catholic represented so few cases that this group had to be excluded except where comparisons between Caucasians and Negro groups were made in areas other than religion. Of the 606 cases used, only 22 were

specifically designated as Negro Catholic.

A further difficulty arose from the fact that some cases were not designated according to religion. It appears that these cases were not designated on the Intake admission sheet because the children were very young when referred and were placed or referred elsewhere soon after their referral to Intake. The Intake Department apparently never ascertained the religion of the children from the adult to whom the child was later released.

The data reveals that thirty-five Caucasian cases not given a specific religious designation were classified as Intake cases. Two were recidivists for dependency and nonrecidivists for delinquency. Twenty-four Caucasian cases were classified as Audy Home cases, and none of these were recidivists for dependency or delinquency. The Negro cases not designated according to religion show a marked similarity to the Caucasian cases relative to recidivism. Twenty Negro cases from the Intake Department were referred to places other than the Audy Home and thereby became Intake cases. Three were recidivists for dependency, and none were recidivists for delinquency; sixteen cases were transferred to the Audy Home, and only two were returned for dependency, while only one was returned for delinquency. No bias, therefore, exists in the data because of the lack of information on religion in these cases.

It is important, however, to examine why these cases were not designated and if other cases were incorrectly classified. It appears that the cases were not designated according to religion because the children, being very young at the time of referral, did not know their religious affiliation. When comparing the average age of admission of the non-religiously classified

children with the religiously classified children, it was found that the mean age of the non-classified group was slightly over five years of age, and for the latter group the mean age was eight years. Other cases used in the research not designated according to religion after the first admission may have had this data recorded on the Intake admission sheet upon their return.

A distortion in the research is possible when comparisons are made between the Protestant and Catholic cases inasmuch as most of the Negro cases would fall into the Negro Protestant group and the Caucasian cases divided between the two religious groups. The problem is how to determine which cases are going to be considered for each group, since the number of recidivists is relatively small. For all practical purposes, the total of the non-religiously classified cases would not appreciably alter any of the comparisons between the variables because of this small recidivist rate; and since these cases are considered when general comparisons are made between the different racial and age groups, the difficulty does not appear to be serious.

Another limitation in regard to the religious variable is concerned with the migratory movements of different people. There has been a great increase in the number of Puerto Ricans, Southern Negroes, and Southern Caucasians in the Chicago area. Each of these groups tends to represent a particular religious affiliation. The Puerto Ricans are predominantly Catholic, and the other two groups are predominantly Protestant. Whether these groups represent a significantly disproportionate number of referrals because they are more transitory than the more established residents is not known or studied in the research.



The fourth major consideration in the selection of the sample was the problem of the referrals insofar as the police and the Intake Department and Audy Home were concerned. One of the first problems concerning the referrals was the selection of a referring agency that would provide the research with desired controls. Since there are numerous agencies with varying policies and relationships to the Audy Home that refer children to the Intake Department for dependency, it was decided to use only those referrals made by a single agency, the Chicago Police Department.

Specific reasons are noted for eliminating referrals from all other agencies. The suburban police departments would provide too much variability to the cases since each department is relatively autonomous in its structure and in the handling of dependent cases. Outside agencies were discounted as a source of referral, because when a referral is made by one of these agencies, it is generally assumed that the child will be transferred to the Audy Home Proper. The major group of referrals eliminated from consideration were the court referrals. When a court worker makes a referral to the Intake Department, a custody order has generally been obtained by the worker which, in effect, means automatic transfer to the Audy Home Proper and leaves no decision to the Intake worker.

However, with cases referred by the police, this automatic transfer to the Audy Home Proper does not occur. When the police make a dependent referral, the case could conceivably be active with one of the outside dependent agencies or with one of the court divisions and subsequently be assigned to that particular agency having jurisdiction. Nevertheless, a decision still has to be made by that agency concerning the placement of that

child.

Upon closer examination of the referrals from the Chicago Police Department, it was decided to eliminate any case that was referred by the police for any other reason than dependency, even though the child might ultimately be regarded as a dependent. There are numerous cases referred to the Intake Department in which a child is charged with a delinquent act. This same child, as a result of his age and the circumstances surrounding the case, would probably be regarded as a dependent by the court. It has been the general policy of the court in past years not to file delinquent petitions on boys under twelve years of age. To include these cases would enlarge the scope of the research beyond a single thesis. It was, therefore, decided to use only those cases referred to the Intake Department that were objectively dependent cases, even if some cases would never go to court on dependent petitions. This refinement yielded a more reasonable and testable sample.

The referrals of the police department were examined in terms of consistency, variability, similarity, sufficiency and accuracy. The executive directives regarding the referral procedure to be followed by the police would provide the desired consistency to the research. These directives are generally followed by the police districts. Different police districts may tend to differ slightly in their interpretation of the directives as well as individual officers; but since all referrals are screened by the Intake Department, gross violations of these orders do not occur. No child is accepted by the Intake Department until it has been established that a sufficient attempt was made to contact the parents of the child and to review the case. Even when a child is picked up by the police in the early hours of

the morning, some attempt must be made by the police to locate the parents or to obtain data that would help in locating the parents as soon as possible. Occasionally, children who are tired, hungry, or insufficiently clad are picked up by the police and are referred with only a cursory check made so as not to endanger the health of the child. However, this type of case would be referred to the Intake Department even if the parents were located.

In the original design of the research it was hoped that the cases would represent a cross-section of the city of Chicago and thus provide a degree of variability. If all the referrals from the police were included in the research, there would exist therein a good sample of cases from the Chicago area. There are, however, two problems associated with the use of all the police district dependent referrals, i.e., the cohesiveness of the neighborhood and the unequal distribution of dependent cases in all districts.

Some neighborhoods are very stable and cohesive, whereas others are in a constant state of transition. If a child is picked up in a transition neighborhood, it is difficult to locate relatives or friends who might know someone interested in caring for this dependent child. The only recourse for the police is to detain the child in the Intake Department.

A second problem concerns the distribution of dependent cases and the effect that constant handling of dependent cases has on a district. It would appear that some districts, accustomed to working with dependent children, could be more efficient because of a knowledge of procedure, whereas the reverse might be true of a district unaccustomed to handling dependent cases. However, it is further possible that a district familiar with dependent cases may be more inclined to circumvent procedure, whereas

district unfamiliar with dependents may do their utmost to avert detention. To ascertain the extent of variability between districts is most difficult and could not be done within this research.

Regarding the similarity of cases from the police referrals, it was desired that referrals of a particular type, i.e., abandonment, desertion, etc., be obtained. If all the dependent cases referred to Intake from all sources were used, this similarity of type might have been possible. However, similarity of type would not have given to the research other desired similarities that exist in the police referrals. It was also desired that only cases referred during specified hours and on specified days be used. It was thought that some referrals made to Intake on a weekend or late at night might ordinarily have been made to other social agencies had their services been available at that time. But the fact that they were not puts them within the focus of this research.

Certain similarities in the police referrals do exist. There is not only a physical sameness about police stations, police wagons, and policemen, but there is an associated psychological sameness in a police referral because of the urgent need for temporary shelter which tends to increase the fear of the child. Being removed from a neighborhood and friends, from the familiar to the totally unfamiliar surroundings, can be a harrowing experience for any child. The necessary separation of the children by the Intake Department according to age and sex contributes to the combined effect of an almost traumatic situation.

It takes a most sympathetic worker to promote a reassuring effect on the child to reduce his fears. The extent or degree of trauma in each case

is not precisely the same, thus making each case dissimilar. Other limiting dissimilarities are referrals for different types of dependency and different time of day of referral.

Since the preliminary research indicated a sufficient number of cases would be available from the police referrals, there was no difficulty regarding an adequate sample. There were 606 cases which fulfilled the desired qualifications. Of these cases 69.5 per cent were non-recidivists, and 30.5 per cent of the cases returned for either dependency or delinquency.

The last consideration relative to the police referrals was the accuracy of the records. Accuracy was assured because each child referred by the police must have an accompanying police referral sheet. This procedure precludes the possibility of sporadic referrals being made by the police. A further discussion of the accuracy of the records will be given as the referrals are related to the Intake Department and the Audy Home.

Having thus discussed the referrals insofar as they are related to the referring agency, the Chicago Police, the referrals were examined in terms of their relation to the Intake Department and to the Audy Home. Generally, the same criteria of consistency, variability, similarity, sufficiency, and accuracy of cases were used. The method of presentation will be the same: what was desired, what was obtained, and the limitations of the cases. To avoid confusion, the Intake Department will be discussed separately from the Audy Home Proper. A brief description of each will be given to distinguish between the Intake Department and Audy Home Proper.

The Arthur J. Audy Home for Children, located in the building adjacent to the Family Court of Cook County, functions primarily as a detention home

for children awaiting Court on delinquency or dependency petitions. There are two departments to the Audy Home, the Intake Department and the Audy Home Proper. The Intake Department was designed to act as a screening department for the Audy Home Proper to avoid unnecessary referrals that result in overcrowded conditions in the Audy Home. The Intake Department was given further jurisdiction in the handling of dependent cases by the Family Court in 1955 and can be considered a complementary agency of the Family Court. As such, Intake aids other Family Court agencies in the Family Court Building. However, the Intake Department functions primarily as a part of the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children.

In considering the consistency of the referrals relative to the Intake Department, it was hoped that neither physical conditions of the Intake Department nor the method and approach in handling dependents has changed over the years. It was found that few major physical changes were made in the Intake Department. Physical changes are important in that they often reflect policy changes. The method and approach in handling dependents was also studied, and it was evident that considerable importance was attached to the proper handling of dependents. This fact tends to substantiate that a general consistency exists in the referrals. For the last six years the writer has observed the manner and importance attached to a dependent case and, a precedent having been established in the past, is reflected by the present method of handling dependents.

A factor limiting the consistency of referrals regards personnel. Some workers are more proficient than others in placing children in temporary homes rather than merely transferring them to the Audy Home Proper. In

addition, by court order in 1955, the Intake Department was officially given the duty of disposing of dependent cases, though they had unofficially been doing so since 1953. Before this change, the Intake Department aided the Complaint Department of Family Court in handling dependent cases. Whether this policy change significantly affected the efficiency of the Intake Department is not known.

Although dependent cases are handled by the Intake Department, not all placement decisions are made by that department. This fact assures variability in the cases. Those cases active with the court divisions are referred to their respective workers who make the decision. This does not affect the hypothesis being tested to any sufficient degree. On cases not active with the court there is the disadvantage of too much variability, insofar as the Intake Department can decide either to release a case, take a complaint, or file a dependent petition. Each of these alternatives represents a serious decision to the Intake Worker, particularly when a petition is filed, since filing a petition means that the parents are in danger of losing their child, i.e., the child may either be transferred to the Audy Home or placed in a temporary-care home if one is available.

Similarity in the Intake cases was achieved by considering only boys' cases referred on their first admission for dependency. The limitations of the Intake referrals in terms of similarities were included in the discussion of consistency and variability. Only those cases which fit into specific age, racial, and religious patterns (includes non-religiously designated cases) and in which recidivism possibly occurred were used in this study. Still, a sufficient number of cases from the Intake Department were available

for purposes of comparison with Audy Home cases.

Accurate records were considered essential to the research, also. When a child is admitted to the Intake Department, an admission blank, called a face sheet, is completed. On the face sheet is recorded the reason for referral, the referring agency, disposition from the Intake Department and the Audy Home, birth date, religion, race and other pertinent data. When a child is transferred to the Audy Home or otherwise released from the Intake Department, this information is also recorded on the face sheet by the worker who effected the release or transfer. Errors in recording this data are minimal because of the importance and stress placed upon this procedure by the Intake Department. All of the Intake records are double-checked, particularly in regard to the disposition of a child. The very nature of a detention home demands that all children be accounted for at all times during every day of the year. If a disposition blank is not completed, theoretically that child should be in the Intake Department. In no case did the researcher discover a disposition that was not completed; and, as the time span of some of the cases covers fourteen years, the system of record keeping appears to be relatively precise, continuous and consistent. This fact gives the research the consistency needed, especially in the matter of disposition of the first admission. Had too many errors been found in the recorded data, the final results would have reflected this inconsistency.

Attention can now be given to a consideration of the referrals from the Audy Home Proper relative to consistency, variability, similarity, sufficiency and accuracy in terms of what was desired, what was obtained and what limitations exist. Consistency in method of transfer to the Audy Home was the



first desired characteristic because if changes in policy were such that cases could be referred to the Audy Home Proper from various agencies, then the entire basis for the hypothesis would be affected. Fortunately, there has been a consistent policy over the years whereby the Intake Department is responsible for the transferring of dependent cases. Limitations of the referrals, then, relative to the Audy Home from the aspect of inconsistency are virtually nonexistent.

The variations that occurred in the Audy Home cases, however, stem from two factors: (1) the effect on the child from an association with children in a detention home, and (2) the variations in the length of stay of a child in the Audy Home Proper. The degree to which a child is affected by his stay in an institution is not definitely known. It would appear that some deleterious effects are probable. There are new contacts for the child in a detention home despite the attempt to separate the sophisticated child from the less sophisticated child. Allack of space and facilities adds to the problem. If a ten-year-old child is transferred for dependency, that child may be grouped with other ten-year-old boys, but the difference between ten-year-old boys may be tremendous. It might be that the dependent boy is already sophisticated in regard to delinquent behaviour.

The second problem concerns the difference in number of days a child remains in the detention home once he has been transferred. A child generally remains in the Intake Department for only a day or two. However, the average length of detention of a child in the Audy Home for dependency is about twenty-one days, according to the superintendent, Mr. James Jordan, but who further stated that it is not uncommon for dependent children to remain in

the Audy Home for a month or more. There is no specific duration for a child to remain in the Audy Home Proper after being transferred from the Intake Department. In some cases a temporary home becomes available for a child, and that child is released earlier than a child whose age and circumstances make temporary-care homes not readily available. In many other instances the caseworker obtains a continuance which means the child must remain beyond his original court date because no placement is available for the child. These variations appear to represent limitations on the research.

The next characteristic of the referrals relative to the Audy Home concerns the similarities in these referrals. It was desired that Audy Home cases concerned a more serious situation than the Intake cases. This factor seems to exist since those cases that are referred to the Audy Home either have a court caseworker assigned to investigate the child's home or actually have a dependent petition filed on the case. The limitation, however, is that the Audy Home cases are all similar whereas the Intake Department cases generally represent varying degrees of seriousness.

The fourth fact considered in the Audy Home cases was sufficiency in number. It was expected that enough cases would be available to compare the recidivists from the aspects of age, race, and religion. However, as with the Intake cases, the number of recidivists, although sufficient for the more general comparisons, tends to be lacking when the specific comparisons are made.

The fifth factor considered in the Audy Home referrals was accuracy in the Audy Home records. Specifically, the researcher was interested in knowing to whom the child was released from the Audy Home so that the factor

of migration could be controlled. When a child is released from the Audy Home, the disposition is given to the Intake Department to record on the same admission blank that was used when the child was referred. If a child was released to someone and was removed from the area of Cook County, this type of case was excluded in the research because the chances of this child returning as a recidivist were so slight. The limitation in regard to migration is that there is no way of knowing how many cases were released to individuals living in Cook County who subsequently moved away from Cook County. Other than this factor, there are no apparent limitations relative to accuracy in recording the Audy Home cases since the Intake Department is primarily responsible for this task.

Having discussed the three variables of age, race, and religion, as well as the referrals insofar as they were related to the police, the Intake Department and the Audy Home Proper, attention can now be centered around the second major phase of this chapter which concerns how the sample was chosen and what general data was obtained in the sample.

By checking through a sample of the Intake admission records in the preliminary research, it was found that about 330 referrals a year were made by the Chicago Police for all ages. It was then estimated that for a given year of birth the same should be true if all the dependents over a given period of years are used that would extend from a child's third birthday to about the thirteenth birthday. Some slight variations between each year would occur, however, due to population changes, modification of policy by agencies handling dependents, as well as by the Intake Department and Audy Home Proper. The projected estimate for the four age brackets used in the

research would be about 1,300 cases if both boys and girls' cases are included. Since only boys were to be studied, the estimated number of cases available would be about 650.

Based on previous experience, it was estimated that a large percentage of the cases would not become recidivists. However, it was not known whether the estimate would be verified when the actual research data was obtained, nor was it known what percentage of the cases would become recidivists, since no statistics were available. A few cases were eventually eliminated from the research. There were some cases of mongoloid children, some Jewish children and a number of cases referred for delinquent acts but probably regarded as dependents because of their ages that were eliminated as types of cases. Also eliminated were some cases that were referred to an area outside of Cook County. Following these limitations the total number of cases was reduced to 606.

The method used to obtain the data was as follows. In the Intake Department are kept records of all cases that have been referred and which are still considered as active. In the file cabinets are about 30,000 records. Each of these cases was examined individually to determine which cases fit the research design according to age, race, and religion. From each case the necessary data was taken and recorded on a master sheet. From these master sheets various other research information was transposed on other specific charts. Before a discussion of the data obtained is started, an understanding of the method of classifying cases as Intake cases or Audy Home cases is necessary.

A child becomes either an Intake case or Audy Home case after a dispo

disposition is made the first time a child is referred for dependency. If a child is referred for dependency and is transferred to the Audy Home Proper, he is considered an Audy Home case. This applies even if the child returns a second time for either dependency or delinquency and is released from the Intake Department. Conversely, any child referred to the Intake Department who is not transferred to the Audy Home for Children after the first admission but is referred elsewhere from the Intake Department is considered an Intake case. This applies even though a child is transferred to the Audy Home Proper on all subsequent admissions other than the first.

Some of the general characteristics of the sample will now be given. In the next chapter a more thorough analysis of the data will be made. The sample basically involves 606 cases, all of which are either Caucasian or Negro, Catholic, Protestant or unclassified religiously, born between January 1, 1945, and December 31, 1948, and referred on the first occasion by the Chicago Police for dependency before January 1, 1961, to the Intake Department of the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children. The final statistics reveal that 69.5 per cent of the 606 cases would not be used for all practical purposes except when considering recidivism to non-recidivism. The recidivist total of 185 cases is divided between the Intake Department and the Audy Home with 114 and 71 cases, respectively. (See Table I.) The general distribution of the 606 cases according to race and religion is as follows: Caucasian Catholic cases represent 156 children, or 25.7 per cent of the total. Caucasian Protestant cases number 127, or 21.0 per cent of the total cases; the Caucasian religiously unclassified group, hereafter to be known as the Caucasian "Other" group, totaled 59 cases, or 9.7 per cent of the total;

TABLE I  
GENERAL RECIDIVISM FOR ALL ADMISSIONS

GROUP	NUMBER OF ADMISSIONS			PER CENT OF ADMISSIONS		
	INTAKE	AUDY HOME	TOTAL	INTAKE	AUDY HOME	TOTAL
NON- RECIDIVISTS	271	150	421	70.1	61.9	69.5
RECIDIVISTS	114	71	185	29.9	32.1	30.5
TOTAL	385	221	606	100.0	100.0	100.0

Negro Catholics represent 24 cases, or 3.5 per cent; Negro "Other" cases represented 37 cases, or 6.3 per cent; Negro Protestant cases numbered 206 (which is the largest single group), or 33.8 per cent of the total cases. (See Table II.)

Next to be considered is the average age of each of the various religions and racial groups for their first admission from both the Intake Department and the Audy Home. (See Table III.) The average age for the Caucasian Protestant Intake cases was 7.75 years of age for the Audy Home cases. The Negro Protestant Intake cases' average age was 7.10 years of age as compared to the Negro Protestant Audy Home group that averaged 8.20 years of age. The three other groups considered only in instances where recidivism concerning general racial characteristics have the following admission age averages. The Intake Caucasian "Other" group, the Negro Catholic group and the Negro "Other" group averaged 5.1, 6.3 and 5.8 years of age respectively. The Audy Home Caucasian "Other" group, the Negro Catholic and the Negro "Other" group averaged 5.7, 7.0 and 6.5 years of age respectively. These averages tend to indicate that the "Other" groups probably were unclassified as to religion because of their inability to give very accurate information at the time of admission. Also, it must be noted that the recidivist rate is almost nothing for this group. If the "Other" group had more recidivists, that might indicate a laxity on the part of a caseworker, but merely because religion was not recorded on the Intake sheet is no reason to make this implication.

These figures indicate that very little difference exists in the admission ages for the specifically designated religious groups. This difference could be expected because of the previous explanation concerning the "Other"

TABLE II

GENERAL DISTRIBUTION OF ADMISSIONS  
ACCORDING TO RACE AND RELIGION

RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE	CAUCASIAN		NEGRO	
	ADMISSIONS	PER CENT	ADMISSIONS	PER CENT
CATHOLIC	156	25.7	21	3.5
PROTESTANT	127	21.0	206	33.8
OTHER	59	9.7	37	6.3
TOTAL	342	56.4	264	43.6



**TABLE III**  
**MEAN AGE OF ADMISSIONS**

RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE	INTAKE		AUDY HOME	
	MEAN AGE	ADMISSIONS	MEAN AGE	ADMISSIONS
CAUCASIAN CATHOLIC	7.7 7.7	94	7.3	62
CAUCASIAN PROTESTANT	7.7	73	7.3	54
CAUCASIAN OTHER	5.1	35	5.7	24
NEGRO CATHOLIC	6.3	13	7.0	8
NEGRO PROTESTANT	7.2	148	8.2	57
NEGRO OTHER	5.8	22	6.5	16
TOTAL	7.0	385	7.4	221

groups. The general average for the Audy Home groups was expected to be higher than the Intake groups because it was assumed that those cases transferred to the Audy Home would be more difficult to place because of their age. Consequently, a greater number of older children, difficult to place, was expected to increase the average of the Audy Home group. There is a difference for the Negro Protestant group, which appears to substantiate this assumption, but not for the Caucasian groups; therefore, this supposition needs further investigation.

Next to be considered is the average age for the dependent recidivists. Only the three major groups will be considered: the Caucasian Catholics, Caucasian Protestants and Negro Protestants. The Negro Catholic, Negro Other and Caucasian Other groups will not be considered. The Caucasian Catholic recidivists from the Intake Department averaged 8.2 years of age and 7.6 years of age for the Audy Home group. The Caucasian Protestant group averaged 9.4 years of age for the Intake group and 7.5 years of age for the Audy Home group. The Negro Protestant group averaged 9.5 years of age for the Intake group and 10.3 years of age for the Audy Home group. (See Table IV.)

From this data, it appears that definite distinctions exist between the Intake groups and the Audy Home groups but that the difference is not consistent for all three groups. Both the Caucasian Catholic and Caucasian Protestant Intake groups have a higher age for dependent recidivism than their respective Audy Home groups. The Negro Protestant Intake group, however, is less than the Audy Home group. The difference in age between the Caucasian groups and the Negro groups is rather marked inasmuch as the average age of recidivism is about two years more than all the Caucasian Catholic cases plus

TABLE IV

MEAN AGE OF RECIDIVISM FOR DEPENDENCY  
FOR THE THREE MAJOR GROUPS STUDIED

RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	ADMIS- SIONS	RECIDI- VISTS	MEAN AGE	ADMIS- SIONS	RECIDI- VISTS	MEAN AGE
CAUCASIAN CATHOLIC	94	135	8.2	62	19	7.6
CAUCASIAN PROTESTANT	73	8	9.4	54	15	7.5
NEGRO PROTESTANT	148	40	9.5	137	49	10.8
TOTAL	315	43	9.3	173	43	8.4

the Caucasian Protestant Audy Home cases but with little difference between the Caucasian Protestant Intake group.

It was expected that the group having the highest average age for rate of recidivism for dependency as well as admission rate would have the lowest average age for rate of recidivism for delinquency. The reasoning for this assumption is that the older a child is, the more he has been exposed to disrupting personality influences and would, therefore, have difficulty making adjustments after being placed or remaining in the Audy Home. It was expected that the Audy Home group would more likely have a lower delinquent recidivist age because they would engage earlier in some objectively delinquent act, such as running away. It was also expected that the Negro would have a lower average age for recidivism for delinquency than the Caucasian group because of these factors.

Upon checking the average age for delinquency for the group, it was found that the Caucasian Catholic group average age was 12.5 years of age for the Intake Department cases and 13.0 years of age for the Audy Home cases. The Caucasian Protestant Intake group averaged 12.8 years of age, and 12.9 years was the average for the Audy Home cases. For the Negro Protestant group the average age for delinquency recidivism was 12.0 years for the Intake cases and 11.3 years of age for the Audy Home cases. (See Table V.) From these averages, it appears that the higher the average age for dependency, the lower the average age for delinquency recidivism. Each group bears this out in statistical data thus obtained; but since so few aspects of this problem have been investigated in the research, it appears that the assumption has to be qualified. It does indicate that the Negro groups return for

TABLE V

MEAN AGE OF RECIDIVISM FOR DELINQUENCY  
FOR THE THREE MAJOR GROUPS STUDIED

RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	ADMIS- SIONS	RECIDI- VISTS	MEAN AGE	ADMIS- SIONS	RECIDI- VISTS	MEAN AGE
CAUCASIAN CATHOLIC	24	20	12.5	62	10	13.0
CAUCASIAN PROTESTANT	73	9	12.8	54	12	12.9
NEGRO PROTESTANT	148	46	12.0	57	18	11.3
TOTAL	315	75	12.2	173	40	12.2

delinquency earlier than the Caucasian group and the Negro groups have a distinctly higher admission age average than the Caucasian groups. This data concerning the average age for admissions, recidivism for dependency, and recidivism for delinquency indicate that differences exist between the Intake cases and the Audy Home cases and between the different racial and religious groups. With this preliminary data in mind, attention can be given in the following chapter to data that will more directly test the hypothesis.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

The present chapter will attempt to evaluate recidivism among the Intake and Audy Home cases relative to age, race and religion. Recidivism in general will be considered first; then, recidivism for dependency and recidivism for delinquency will be separately related to the above variables. Finally, a general summary of the data for both dependency and delinquency will be presented.

Of the 606 cases used in our sample, 421 or 69.5 per cent had not returned as of the final day of referral, which was December 31, 1960. The children who were recidivists numbered 185 cases, or 30.5 per cent. These were recidivists for either dependency or delinquency or both, but a boy was considered a recidivist only once, regardless of cause or frequency of return. (See Table 3.) Also, these 185 recidivists were readmitted after their initial referral for dependency a total of 587 times, which is an average of 3.1 readmissions per recidivist. It must be understood, however, that not all recidivism was for dependency or delinquency. Some cases were referred for other reasons, e.g., hold for court, hold for transportation, hold for psychiatric examination, or various other reasons. At least one of these readmissions of each boy considered a recidivist, however, was for dependency or delinquency or both.

The distribution of the 606 cases between the Intake Department and Audy Home was 385 and 221 respectively. This means that 63.5 per cent of all cases are considered Intake cases, and 36.5 per cent of all cases are

classified as Audy Home cases. The general recidivist rate was 29.9 per cent for the Intake cases and 32.1 per cent for the Audy Home cases. (See Table VI.) This small 2.2 per cent difference does not support to any important degree the hypothesis that the Audy Home cases will have a much higher rate of recidivism for dependency and also delinquency than the Intake cases.

Recidivism for dependency between the Intake cases (12.9 per cent) and the Audy Home cases (20.8 per cent) did indicate a considerable difference, while recidivism for delinquency among Intake cases (20.2 per cent) and Audy Home cases (19.0 per cent) show much less variation. Therefore, recidivism for dependency but not delinquency seems to be different for the two types of cases. It was expected that recidivism for delinquency would be much higher in the Audy Home cases than in the Intake cases. To fully evaluate the meaning of this reversal of expectation in the general data, it was necessary to further examine them in terms of the variables of age, race and religion.

When the variable of race was considered, a modification of the general data occurred. (See Tables VII and VIII.) The distribution of cases on the basis of race reveals that the Negro constituted 43.6 per cent of all admissions but represented 47.5 per cent of the Intake cases and only 36.7 per cent of the Audy Home cases. At first glance, the impression would be given that since transfer to the Audy Home is not a desired disposition, more facilities are available for the placement of Negroes. However, since no institutions exist primarily for Negroes and since only a few of the available dependent institutions accept Negroes, the possibility of handling cases differently exists because practically less alternatives exist for a



TABLE VI

## COMPARISON OF RECIDIVISM: GENERAL, DEPENDENCY AND DELINQUENCY

GROUP	INTAKE		AUDY HOME	
	ADMISSIONS	PER CENT	ADMISSIONS	PER CENT
NON-RECIDIVISTS	271	70.1	151	67.9
GENERAL RECID.	114 <sup>a</sup>	29.9	71 <sup>a</sup>	32.1
TOTALS	385	100.0	221	100.0
NON-RECIDIVISTS	335	87.1	175	79.2
DEPENDENT RECID.	50 <sup>b</sup>	12.9	46 <sup>b</sup>	20.8
TOTAL	385	100.0	221	100.0
NON-RECIDIVISTS	307	79.8	179	81.0
DELINQUENT RECID.	78 <sup>b</sup>	20.2	42 <sup>b</sup>	19.0
TOTAL	385	100.0	221	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Total reflects only whether a boy returned after his initial referral for delinquency or dependency.

<sup>b</sup>Total of dependents and delinquents will be greater than general total since 14 boys returned for both dependency and delinquency for Intake, and 17 boys returned for both categories from the Audy Home cases.

TABLE VII  
NUMBER OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DEPENDENCY FOR  
CAUCASIANS AND NEGROES

RACE	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	NON-REC.	REC.	TOTAL	NON-REC.	REC.	TOTAL
CAUCASIAN	177	25	202	106	34	140
NEGRO	134	25	183	69	12	81
TOTAL	307	50	385	175	46	221

TABLE VIII

PER CENT OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DEPENDENCY FOR  
CAUCASIANS AND NEGROES

RACE	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	NON-REC.	REC.	TOTAL	NON-REC.	REC.	TOTAL
CAUCASIAN	87.6	12.4	100.0	75.7	24.3	100.0
NEGRO	86.3	13.7	100.0	85.2	14.8	100.0
TOTAL	87.1	12.9	100.0	79.2	20.8	100.0

caseworker. It could then be expected that the rates of recidivism for dependency and delinquency should not be significantly different among the Negro Intake and Negro Audy Home cases. Conversely, the rates of recidivism for the Caucasian Intake and Audy Home cases could be expected to support the hypothesis. However, there still should appear distinct differences between the Caucasian and Negro cases.

When considering recidivism for dependency within each race, there was in the Intake group 25 Caucasians (12.4 per cent) and 25 Negroes (13.7 per cent) who were recidivists. In contrast in the Audy Home group, there were 34 Caucasians (24.3 per cent) and 12 Negroes (14.8 per cent) who were recidivists. A distinct difference existed for the Caucasian groups but not for the Negro Intake and Audy Home groups. However, it was unexpected that the Caucasian rate would be higher than the Negro rate for recidivism among the Audy Home cases, since one of the assumptions was that family disunity would be more characteristic of the Negro group, which would tend to increase the recidivist rate for that group.

Recidivism for delinquency, though, presents a somewhat different pattern. (See Tables IX and X.) Again, since more family disunity was presumed to be more prevalent among Negro groups as opposed to Caucasian groups, it was hypothesized that recidivism for delinquency among Negroes would be higher than among Caucasians for both Intake and Audy Home groups. Also, it was expected that the Audy Home groups would be higher than the Intake groups in recidivism, irrespective of race. Unlike the dependency rates, the Caucasian delinquent rates as well as the Negro rates did not appear to substantiate the later assumption, but there is a rather distinct

TABLE IX  
NUMBER OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR  
CAUCASIANS AND NEGROES

RACE	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	NON-REC.	REC.	TOTAL	NON-REC.	REC.	TOTAL
CAUCASIANS	173	29	202	118	22	140
NEGRO	134	49	183	61	20	81
TOTAL	307	78	385	179	42	221

TABLE X

PER CENT OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR  
CAUCASIANS AND NEGROES

RACE	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	NON-REC.	REC.	TOTAL	NON-REC.	REC.	TOTAL
CAUCASIANS	85.6	14.4	100.0	84.3	15.7	100.0
NEGRO	73.2	26.8	100.0	75.3	24.7	100.0
TOTAL	79.7	20.3	100.0	81.0	19.0	100.0

difference between the racial groups. The Negro groups for both Intake and the Audy Home have about a 10 per cent higher recidivist rate than the respective Caucasian groups, which tends to lend support to the hypothesis in that the variable of race applied to the cases would result in distinct differences in recidivist rates.

On the basis of the comparisons illustrated in Tables VII, VIII, IX and X, it appears that the hypothesis was substantiated by the Caucasian group for dependency but not by the Negro group. For delinquency, neither the Caucasian nor Negro groups tended to support the hypothesis other than that distinct differences in the rate of recidivism existed on the basis of race. It also appears that more reliability can be attached to the dependent comparisons since the delinquent comparisons involved other important factors, such as type of offense and readmissions for delinquency. Dependent cases generally were not as complicated statistically, since the frequency of readmissions for already dependent recidivists is minimal. (See Glossary of Terms.)

Continuing with the analysis of dependency relative to the specific variables of age, race and religion, there appeared to be a substantial difference between the Caucasian Catholic Intake and the Audy Home cases where the per cent of recidivism was 15.9 and 30.8, respectively. With the Caucasian Protestant cases, a similar difference existed, the recidivist rate being 11.0 and 30.6 for the Intake and Audy Home cases respectively. (See Table XIII.)

The Caucasian Other groups have only two recidivists; therefore, the Caucasian Catholic and Protestant rates for recidivism can be assumed to be

slightly less than what was given, the reason being that the Other groups are considered such only because of a failure to designate the religious affiliation upon being admitted to the Intake Department.

The Negro Intake and the Audy Home groups show less difference than the Caucasian groups, 13.5 and 15.8 per cent of groups being recidivists respectively. Since the Negro Other groups have a similar rate of recidivism, the Negro religiously classified groups would not be altered if these cases were included in the religious category. The difference between the Caucasian and Negro cases was not expected. If, however, a high per cent of recidivism for running away occurs in the Negro early age groups, e.g., under 12, then in effect these children should be regarded as delinquent recidivists; yet for all practical purposes, they are considered as dependents by the court. A large number of early recidivists for running away would tend to lower the dependent rates but raise the delinquent recidivist rates. Also, there would be many cases that would not be considered as dependents for this research because the child was referred as a delinquent after running away yet who would be processed as a dependent. This factor would tend to minimize the admissions for the group with the largest number of early runaways, or other types of offenses. Though this is not a full explanation of the differences in dependency recidivist rates for Negroes and Caucasians, it is important to consider the above factors when analyzing the data for the racial and religious groups.

From Table XI, the distribution of recidivists indicates that the Caucasian and Negro Other groups and the Negro Catholic group have so few recidivists that these groups are excluded in any additional analysis of the



TABLE XI

NUMBER OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DEPENDENCY ON THE  
BASIS OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION

RACE AND RELIGION	INTAKE						AUDY HOME					
	ADM.	RECIDIVISTS OF AGE GROUP <sup>a</sup>				TOTAL	ADM.	RECIDIVISTS OF AGE GROUP <sup>a</sup>				TOTAL
		13	14	15	16			13	14	15	16	
CAUC. CATHOLICS	94	3	2	7	3	15	62	6	4	3	6	19
CAUC. PROTEST.	73	2	1	33	2	8	54	2	4	6	3	15
CAUC. OTHER	35	2				2	24					0
NEG. CATHOLICS	13	1				1	8				1	1
NEG. PROTESTANTS	148	2	7	5	6	20	57	3	3	2	1	9
NEG. OTHER	22	1	1	1	1		16	1	1			2
TOTAL	385	11	11	16	12	50	221	12	12	11	11	46

<sup>a</sup>Each age group represents a year of birth from 1945 for the sixteen year olds to the year 1948 for the thirteen year olds.

dependency data. The three major groups to be finally considered, then, are the Caucasian Catholics and Protestants and the Negro Protestants, relative to the variables of age, race and religion. (See Tables XII and XIII.)

What was expected was that (1) the admissions would vary for each age, racial and religious group; (2) variations for racial and religious groups would occur in the number of transfers to the Audy Home relative to total admissions; (3) the per cent of recidivism for the lowest age group and the highest age group should not vary since the mean age for dependency recidivism is well below thirteen years of age; (4) the rate of recidivism for the Audy Home groups would be significantly higher than the Intake groups; and (5) the rate of recidivism for the Negro Intake and Audy Home groups would be significantly higher than the Caucasian groups. With the exception of the Caucasian groups having a higher rate of recidivism than the Negro and a few age groups from Intake differing considerably from the corresponding Audy Home groups, the expected results were obtained. (See Tables XII and XIII.)

On the basis, then, of all the comparisons, there does appear to exist evidence to support the hypothesis that transfer to the Audy Home, which generally represents a more serious placement problem and more family disunity, results in a higher rate of recidivism for dependency than for those cases released from the Intake Department. Further, distinct differences do exist among the age, racial and religious groups. The task of substantiating the hypothesis from the aspect of delinquency, however, is more complicated, especially since the factors of type of offense and readmissions must be considered relative to age, race and religion.

The first phase of our analysis of delinquency concerns the general

TABLE XII

DISTRIBUTION OF NON-RECIDIVISTS AND RECIDIVISTS  
FOR DEPENDENCY FOR THE THREE MAJOR GROUPS  
ON THE BASIS OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION

AGE <sup>a</sup>	INTAKE						AUDY HOME					
	CAUC. CATH.		CAUC. PROT.		NEGRO PROT.		CAUC. CATH.		CAUC. PROT.		NEGRO PROT.	
	NON- REC	REC	NON- REC	REC	NON- REC	REC	NON- REC	REC	NON- REC	REC	NON- REC	REC
13	11	3	12	2	35	2	16	6	7	2	14	3
14	20	2	18	7	30	7	12	4	9	4	15	3
15	19	7	18	5	34	5	5	3	10	6	10	2
16	29	3	17	6	29	6	10	6	13	3	11	1
TOTAL	79	15	65	20	128	20	43	19	39	15	48	9

<sup>a</sup>Each age group represents a year of birth.

TABLE XIII

PER CENT OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DEPENDENCY FOR THE  
THREE MAJOR GROUPS STUDIED ON THE  
BASIS OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION<sup>a</sup>

AGE <sup>b</sup>	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.
13	21.4	14.3	5.4	27.3	22.2	17.6
14	9.1	5.3	18.9	25.0	30.8	16.7
15	26.9	14.3	12.8	37.5	37.5	16.7
16	9.4	10.5	17.1	37.5	18.8	8.3
TOTAL <sup>a</sup>	15.9	11.0	13.5	30.6	27.8	15.8

<sup>a</sup>All per cents based on admission of each age group as appears on Table XII.

<sup>b</sup>Each age group represents a year of birth.

distribution of delinquent recidivists on the basis of age, race and religion. (See Table XIV.) The general recidivist rate for all cases was 20.2 and 19.0 per cent for the Intake and Audy Home cases. (See Table VI.) When the variable of race is considered, these statistics become modified. The Caucasian groups from Intake numbered 29 recidivists, or 14.4 per cent as compared to the Audy Home recidivists which numbered 22 cases or 15.7 per cent. The Negro Intake group numbered 49 recidivists or 26.8 per cent as opposed to 20 recidivists or 24.7 per cent for the Audy Home. Generally, then, the rates for Intake do not differ considerably from the Audy Home cases, but there does appear to be an important difference in the per cent of recidivism between Negro and Caucasian delinquents.

The next variable applied was that of religion. Since the per cent of recidivism for the religiously unclassified groups, called "Other" in the data, was so small, they, with the Negro Catholic group, will not be considered.

The Caucasian Catholic Intake group represented 94 admissions and 20 recidivists for a per cent of recidivism for delinquency of 21.3 as compared to the Audy Home group that numbered 62 admissions and 10 recidivists for a per cent of 16.1. For the Caucasian Protestants there were 73 admissions, 9 recidivists, or a per cent of 12.3 for Intake, and 54 admissions, 12 recidivists, or a rate of 22.2 per cent for the Audy Home group. For the Negro Protestants, the Intake cases numbered 188 admissions, 46 recidivists, or a per cent of 31.3, to 57 admissions, 18 recidivists, or 31.6 per cent for the Audy Home. Only one group, the Caucasian Protestants, appears to substantiate the hypothesis; this group also, as will be seen in the following

TABLE XIV

NUMBER OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DELINQUENCY ON THE BASIS  
OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION

RACE AND RELIGION	ADM.	AGE GROUP OF RECIDIVISTS				TOT. REC.		ADM.	AGE GROUP OF RECIDIVISTS				TOT. REC.
		13	14	15	16				13	14	15	16	
CAUC. CATH	94	1	3	6	10	20		62	4	2	1	3	10
CAUC. PROT.	73	1	1	3	4	9		54	1	3	4	4	12
CAUC. OTHER	35					0		24					0
NEGRO CATH.	13	1			2	4		8		1			0
NEGRO PROT.	148	10	12	11	13	46		57	4	4	3	7	18
NEGRO OTHER	22					0		16	1				1
TOTAL	385	13	16	20	29	78		221	10	10	8	14	42

analysis of the age variable, is the most consistent in relation to admissions and transfers for all four age groups used. (See Tables XV and XVI.)

It was expected that the thirteen year olds would have less recidivism than the other age groups and that there would be a graduated increase in recidivism for the other age groups. This would seem logical in that the thirteen year olds would have fewer years in which to become involved in delinquency. Assuming that the number of admissions was the same for each age group, the expected pattern of recidivism would be similar to that which occurred for the Caucasian Catholic Intake group. However, since the admissions vary, the per cent rates should be more accurate and should represent an upward trend for each age group. There should exist differences for the racial and religious groups in the pattern of increased per cent rates, however. Only the three major groups will again be considered in our analysis of the age variable.

Generally, all three Intake groups follow the expected pattern, the per cent of recidivism increases with each age group, and all three groups differed from each other. However, the per cent of recidivism for the Audy Home groups do not follow this pattern. The rates for the Caucasian and Negro Protestant groups were almost the same for two out of four of the age groups, and the Caucasian Catholic groups differ only slightly from each other. The reason for this distinct difference between the Intake and Audy Home cases is uncertain to the researcher, especially since the Audy Home rates are not much higher than those for the Intake cases, contrary to expectations.

Also, it was expected that the different racial and religious groups

TABLE XV

DISTRIBUTION OF NON-RECIDIVISTS AND RECIDIVISTS  
FOR DELINQUENCY FOR THE THREE MAJOR GROUPS  
ON THE BASIS OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION

AGE <sup>a</sup>	INTAKE						AUDY HOME					
	CAUC. CATH.		CAUC. PROT.		NEGRO PROT.		CAUC. CATH.		CAUC. PROT.		NEGRO PROT.	
	NON- REC	REC	NON- REC	REC	NON- REC	REC	NON- REC	REC	NON- REC	REC	NON- REC	REC
13	13	1	13	1	27	10	18	4	8	1	13	4
14	19	3	18	1	25	12	14	2	10	3	14	4
15	20	6	18	3	28	11	7	1	12	4	9	3
16	22	10	15	4	22	13	13	3	12	4	5	7
TOTAL	74	20	64	9	102	46	52	10	42	12	39	18

<sup>a</sup>Each age group represents a year of birth.



TABLE XVI

PER CENT OF RECIDIVISTS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR THE  
THREE MAJOR GROUPS STUDIED ON THE BASIS  
OF AGE, RACE AND RELIGION<sup>a</sup>

AGE <sup>b</sup>	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.
13	14.3	7.1	27.0	18.2	11.1	23.5
14	9.1	5.3	32.4	12.5	23.1	22.2
15	23.1	14.3	28.2	12.5	25.0	25.0
16	31.2	21.1	37.1	18.8	25.0	<del>38.3</del>
TOTAL	20.2	12.3	31.3	16.1	22.2	31.6

<sup>a</sup>All per cents based on admission of each age group as appears on Table XV.

<sup>b</sup>Each age group represents a year of birth.

would have different rates of transfer to the Audy Home, but that within a given racial and religious category there would be relative consistency for each age group. The only group reflecting this consistency was the Caucasian Protestant group. The number of admissions for this group relative to transfers to the Audy Home showed little difference between Intake and the Audy Home. (See Table XV.) The Negro Protestant and Caucasian Catholic, however, indicated more variations. For example, if the thirteen and fourteen-year-old Negro Audy Home admissions are added up, the total is 35 as compared to the 24 total for the fifteen and sixteen year olds. Likewise, the Caucasian Catholic comparative groups totaled 38 and 24 admissions. (See Table XV.) Relative to the total admissions for these age groups, these variations should not have existed. Also, the thirteen and fourteen-year-old groups for the Caucasian Catholics are distinctly different from the other two age groups.

From all appearances, the Caucasian Catholic and Negro Protestant groups are more prone to change. Actually, the Negro increase in per cent of transfers for the younger age groups (13 and 14) more closely approximates those per cent rates for the Caucasian groups. On the basis of total admissions and transfers for each group, the Caucasian Protestants have the highest rate of transfers to the Audy Home, followed by the Caucasian Catholics and the Negro Protestants.

The next aspect of delinquency that must be considered is the type of offense for which a boy returns. To say merely that a boy is a recidivist for delinquency leaves a void that can be partially filled in with the type and number of readmissions for delinquent behavior. (See Table XVII.)

From all appearances, the mean number of admissions for delinquency after

TABLE XVII

FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR DELINQUENCY AFTER  
INITIAL REFERRAL FOR DEPENDENCY

TYPE OF OFFENSE	INTAKE					AUDY HOME				
	AGE AT TIME OF OFFENSE					AGE AT TIME OF OFFENSE				
	9- 10	11- 12	13- 14	15- 16	TOTAL	9- 10	11- 12	13- 14	15- 16	TOTAL
ASSAULT		1	6	4	11			3	2	5
AUTO LARCENY		1	3	10	14		1	2	3	6
BURGLARY	2	11	8	10	31		7	3	5	15
INCORRIGIBLE	7	3	5	8	24	1	2	5		8
LARCENY	4	10	6	1	21	2	8	4	4	18
LESS SERIOUS OTHER	5	11	14	1	31	1	6	1	1	9
MORE SERIOUS OTHER	1	1	5	4	11		1	2	4	7
PURSESNAATCHING	1	3	5	4	13					0
RUNAWAY	40	34	16	6	100	22	18	13	5	58
STRONG-ARM ROBBERY		1	4		5		4	4	6	12
TOTAL	60	76	72	48	261	26	47	37	30	138

the initial dependency referral for the Intake recidivists, 3.4, as compared to the Audy Home mean, 3.3, indicated little overall difference between the two groups. Generally, there was also similarity in types of offenses, although some striking contrasts existed, such as in the area of purse-snatching, where thirteen offenses occurred for the Intake group and none for the Audy Home group. For strong-arm robbery, twelve offenses occurred for the Audy Home group and only five for the Intake group. It must be remembered when looking at Table XVII that the sixteen-year-old group need not necessarily have more offenses than the others because this chart includes many offenses committed by the sixteen-year-old group when they were younger, and the other groups who have not yet reached sixteen are thereby excluded from this category. (These age groupings are not to be confused with the age groups that represent a particular year of birth.) The importance of this comparison was to discover the extent of recidivism for the Intake and Audy Home groups and to determine if the children referred to the Audy Home return at an earlier age for delinquency. From the data in this table, there appears to be little substantiation of the hypothesis from the aspect of readmissions and age of recidivism.

The next comparison is the distribution of the delinquent readmissions for the Caucasian Catholics. (See Table XVIII.) The Caucasian Catholic Intake group mean number of readmission, 2.4, is slightly lower than the Audy Home rate, 3.1, and lends some support to the hypothesis. The readmission relationship changes, however, if the runaway group is discounted. The number of readmissions becomes 1.9 for the Intake group and 1.2 for the Audy Home group. This relationship now does not support the hypothesis. Therefore,

TABLE XVIII

FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR THE  
CAUCASIAN CATHOLICS AFTER INITIAL REFERRAL  
FOR DEPENDENCY

TYPE OF OFFENSE	INTAKE					AUDY HOME				
	AGE AT TIME OF OFFENSE					AGE AT TIME OF OFFENSE				
	9- 10	11- 12	13- 14	15- 16	TOTAL	9- 10	11- 12	13- 14	15- 16	TOTAL
ASSAULT			1	1	2			11		1
AUTO LARCENY			1	3	4					0
BURGLARY		2	1	3	6		1			1
INCORRIGIBLE	2		1	4	7		1	1		2
LARCENY		2	2		4				1	1
LESS SERIOUS OTHER <sup>a</sup>	2	2	3	1	8		3	1		4
MORE SERIOUS OTHER <sup>b</sup>			1		1					0
PURSESNAATCHING			1	1	2					0
RUNAWAY	1	2	3	3	9	11	4	3	1	19
STRONG-ARM ROBBERY		1	2		3		1	2		3
TOTAL	5	9	16	16	46	11	10	8	2	31

<sup>a</sup>Includes offenses such as malicious mischief, curfew, etc.

<sup>b</sup>Includes offenses such as murder, armed robbery, narcotics, etc.

unlike the general comparison chart, the Intake group appears to be different from the Audy Home group on the basis of serious offenses. If, however, the number of readmissions is not considered relative to the seriousness of offenses, the data could be easily misleading. It appeared that the Intake group tended to disprove the hypothesis when this factor was considered in the analysis.

The next similar type of comparison concerns the Caucasian Protestant group. (See Table XIX.) Here the mean number of readmissions for the Intake Department, 3.9 per delinquent recidivist, is much higher than the 2.0 mean for the Audy Home. Again, if the runaways are discounted, the readmission rate drops sharply to 1.6 and 1.1, respectively. Insofar as seriousness of offense is concerned, there is no particular offense that stands out either for the Intake or Audy Home groups; and thus a similarity to the general comparison is characteristic of the Protestant Caucasian group. For this group, it can be said that the rate of recidivism is higher for the Audy Home group but that the rate of readmissions per recidivist is not. Also, the Audy Home cases seem to return for more serious offenses.

In contrast to the Caucasian Catholic and Protestant groups, the Negro Protestant mean number of readmission for delinquency was 3.6 and 4.6 for Intake and the Audy Home. (See Table XX.)

Again, if the runaways are discounted, the altered means were 2.2 and 3.1. Relative to seriousness of offenses for each group, it would appear that the Audy Home cases by virtue of the higher number of recidivist readmissions do tend to engage in more serious offenses. It must be remembered that when analyzing readmissions there is a tendency for a

TABLE XIX

FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR  
CAUCASIAN PROTESTANT AFTER THE INITIAL  
REFERRAL FOR DEPENDENCY

TYPE OF OFFENSE	INTAKE					AUDY HOME				
	AGE AT TIME OF OFFENSE					AGE AT TIME OF OFFENSE				
	9- 10	11- 12	13- 14	15- 16	TOTAL	9- 10	11- 12	13- 14	15- 16	TOTAL
ASSAULT					0					0
AUTO LARCENY		1		2	3		1		1	2
BURGLARY				2	2		2		1	3
INCORRIGIBLE					0		1	3		4
LARCENY	1	1	1	1	4		2		2	4
LESS SERIOUS OTHER <sup>a</sup>		2	1		3					0
MORE SERIOUS OTHER <sup>b</sup>					0					0
PURSESNAATCHING	1		1		2					0
RUNAWAY	10	3	6	2	21	1	4	4	2	11
STRONG-ARM ROBBERY					0					0
TOTAL	12	7	9	7	35	1	10	7	6	24

TABLE XX

FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR DELINQUENCY FOR  
NEGRO PROTESTANTS AFTER THE INITIAL  
REFERRAL FOR DEPENDENCY

TYPE OF OFFENSE	INTAKE					AUDY HOME				
	AGE AT TIME OF OFFENSE					AGE AT TIME OF OFFENSE				
	9- 10	11- 12	13- 14	15- 16	TOTAL	9- 10	11- 12	13- 14	15- 16	TOTAL
ASSAULT		1	5	2	8			2	2	4
AUTO LARCENY			2	4	6			2	2	4
BURGLARY	2	9	7	3	21		4	3	4	11
INCORRIGIBLE	5	3	4	5	17	1		1		2
LARCENY	3	7	3		13	2	7	4	1	14
LESS SERIOUS OTHER <sup>a</sup>	3	6	10		19	1	3	1	2	7
MORE SERIOUS OTHER <sup>b</sup>	1	1	3	3	8		1	2	2	5
PURSESNAATCHING		3	3	3	9					0
RUNAWAY	24	32	3		59	9	10	6	2	27
STRONG-ARM ROBBERY			2		2		3	3	3	9
TOTAL	38	62	42	20	162	13	28	24	18	83 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Includes malicious mischief, curfew, drinking, etc.

<sup>b</sup>Includes murder, armed robbery, firearms, narcotics, etc.



particular offense to affect these rates; and although much attention was given the runaways, other offenses like burglary, purse-snatching, strong-arm robbery, larceny and others represent a specialty for a boy. Generally, it would not be expected that a boy would have seven or eight readmissions for the same offense; but it does occur frequently. Because this is so, a presentation of the median and mode relative to readmissions of delinquent recidivists will be given.

The median number of readmissions for the Caucasian Catholic Intake and Audy Home recidivists was 1.4 and 1.5. When the median was compared to the mean readmission rates of 2.4 and 3.1 for the same groups, it appeared that the median gave a more representative picture of readmissions per recidivist because it excludes the exceptional cases who have very many readmissions.

Likewise, with the Protestant Caucasian recidivists, the median number of readmissions for delinquency differs from the mean. The median number of readmissions for delinquency for Intake and Audy Home were 2.5 and 1.8, and the mean number of readmissions were 3.9 and 2.0, respectively.

For the Negro Protestant groups, the median number of readmissions was also lower than the mean rates by about one readmission per recidivist, the median number being 2.6 and 3.8, and the mean number being 3.6 and 4.6 for Intake and the Audy Home. Since all of the medians were lower than the mean rates and aligned to the mean when the runaways are discounted, another perspective, that of the mode, will be applied to the data.

For the twenty Caucasian Catholic Intake recidivists, eleven had only one other admission for delinquency after the original admission for delinquency. Relative to total delinquency admissions, then, the other nine

recidivists account for 35 admissions since the entire Caucasian Catholic total was 46 delinquent admissions. With the Audy Home group, there were five recidivists who returned only for that one time; this means that the other five recidivists account for 26 admissions. What is obvious is that a small number of boys account for a disproportionate number of offenses. If this were also true for all delinquents and that group of delinquents could be isolated early, then intensification and specialization of probation services would increase their effectiveness and might prevent countless crimes in the community. In other words, if the per cent of recidivism of a specific group could be determined, then probation officers could be increased for this group. It appears on the basis of this research that such a program should be studied.

The Caucasian Protestant Intake recidivists also had as its modal number one readmissions beyond the original admission for dependency. Since three of the recidivists returned once, the other six returned 32 times. For the Audy Home, seven boys returned once; and the other five boys returned on seventeen occasions, so the same would be true for them.

For the Negro Protestant Intake and Audy Home groups, the variance is even greater between the mode and the other cases. There were fifteen boys who returned once, and the other 31 returned 150 times for delinquency. If the fifteen boys who returned once and thirteen boys twice were combined, they would have accounted for 41 admissions. The remaining eighteen recidivists then were readmitted for delinquency after the initial dependent referral a total of 124 times. The Audy Home cases are more extreme than the Intake cases in that seven of the eighteen recidivists returned three

times for delinquency. If three cases of boys who returned once and one case of a boy who returned twice are combined, they total 26 readmissions. This means that the remaining seven boys accounted for 57 readmissions for delinquency which, if compared, to the other boys, presents a somewhat ominous outlook for these cases. And it must be remembered that these statistics do not purport to be either final or maximum but rather are minimal by nature of the design of the research, since they do not include all years of possible delinquency.

To summarize the readmission rates for the three major groups studied, it appears that the Caucasian Catholic Intake and Audy Home cases differ in several ways. The Intake group has a higher per cent of recidivists than the Audy Home cases but not a higher per cent of readmissions. In regard to the seriousness of offenses, it appears that the Intake cases were for more serious types of offenses.

For the Caucasian Protestants, there exists an opposite pattern than for the Catholic group. The per cent of recidivism is lower for the Intake cases, but the per cent of readmission is higher than for the Audy Home cases. Relative to seriousness of offenses, it is difficult to determine which group returns for more serious types of offenses.

Insofar as the Negro Protestant groups are concerned, the Audy Home cases seem not only to return for more serious offenses but also have a higher per cent of recidivists and of readmissions.

All three major groups differ from each other and from this aspect support the hypothesis; however, when considering the entire Intake and Audy Home cases without applying the variables of age, of offense, race and

religion, there appears to be no clear substantiation of the hypothesis. Neither does any one of the three major groups studied appear to clearly support the hypothesis.

From the previous data, it was learned that boys at a very early age do engage in rather serious types of offenses. In the following analysis, another perspective of age will be applied to Intake and Audy Home cases, that of the year of birth of each recidivist, which ranges from 1945 through 1948. The purpose of this analysis is to determine if the younger age groups return less than each older age group as would be expected and if these patterns are different for the Intake and Audy Home cases. Also to be determined is whether each age group is affected when the variables of race and religion are applied. The expected results would be that the older groups will be more frequently admitted and for more serious offenses. Also, the early age group cases of the Audy Home relative to the Intake cases should be readmitted more frequently; and all Audy Home groups should not only have a higher per cent of recidivism but a higher per cent of readmissions and should return for more serious offenses. Relative to race and religion, it was expected that the Negro Protestant groups from both Intake and the Audy Home would have higher rates than the Caucasian groups.

The first comparison of the frequency of readmissions for delinquency on the basis of age concerns all Caucasian cases, irrespective of religion. (See Table XXI.)

The thirteen and fourteen-year-old totals were twelve readmissions for Intake as compared to the same groups from the Audy Home, whose total was 38 readmissions. When the same comparison is made for the fifteen and

sixteen year olds, an opposite pattern exists, the readmissions being 70 for Intake and 17 for the Audy Home. It is difficult to determine why this occurs, although speculation tends to indicate that such factors as changing administrations, modified detention facilities for dependents, increasing demands on institutions after the war along with increasing birth rates, marriages and separations, are several factors that could affect these rates in such a manner. There does appear to also be a more consistent per cent of recidivism relationship between the Audy Home age groups than for the Intake groups. For example, the per cent of recidivism for the thirteen-year-old Intake group was 5.6 and 23.3 per cent for the sixteen-year-old group; but for the same age groups from the Audy Home, the per cents were 13.3 and 18.4.

For the Negro cases the first three age groups from Intake represent about six per cent more recidivism per group than the Audy Home cases, and the sixteen-year-old Audy Home group is about four per cent higher. (See Table XXII.)

There is a difference in total readmissions for the younger Negro and Caucasian Intake groups, but this difference does not exist as much for the Audy Home younger age groups. However, for the fifteen and sixteen year olds, the Intake groups are closely related, but the Audy Home groups are not. It does appear, then, that the Negro groups in all age brackets have not only a higher per cent of recidivism but also return more frequently and for more serious offenses than the Caucasians.

In the next series of tables, some of the data will be slightly modified, since only the three major groups, the Caucasian Catholics, Caucasian

TABLE XXI

COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS FOR  
DELINQUENCY FOR CAUCASIANS ON THE BASIS  
OF AGE

TYPE OF OFFENSE	INTAKE					AUDY HOME				
	AGE GROUP <sup>a</sup>					AGE GROUP <sup>a</sup>				
	13	14	15	16	TOTAL	13	14	15	16	TOTAL
ASSAULT			1	1	2	1				1
AUTO LARCENY			4	3	7				2	2
BURGLARY			4	3	7	1	1	2		4
INCORRIGIBLE	1		1	4	6	3	3			6
LARCENY	1	2	4	1	8	2		1	2	5
LESS SERIOUS OTHER <sup>b</sup>		1	3	7	11	3	1			4
MORE SERIOUS OTHER <sup>c</sup>		1			1					0
PURSESNATCHING				4	4					0
RUNAWAY	3	3	14	11	31	14	6	5	5	30
STRONG-ARM ROBBERY			1	2	3	1	2			3
TOTAL	5	7	32	38	82	25	13	8	9	55

<sup>a</sup>Each age group represents a year of birth.

<sup>b</sup>Includes offenses such as malicious mischief, curfew, etc.

<sup>c</sup>Includes offenses such as murder, armed robbery, narcotics, etc.

TABLE XXII

COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS  
FOR DELINQUENCY FOR NEGROES  
ON THE BASIS OF AGE

TYPE OF OFFENSE	INTAKE					AUDY HOME				
	AGE GROUP <sup>a</sup>					AGE GROUP <sup>a</sup>				
	13	14	15	16	TOTAL	13	14	15	16	TOTAL
ASSAULT	1	2	2	4	10					0
AUTO LARCENY		1	1	5	7			1	3	4
BURGLARY	3	10	7	2	22	1	1	4	5	11
INCORRIGIBLE	1	5	8	5	17	1	1			2
LARCENY	2	3	7	1	13	3	3	3	5	14
LESS SERIOUS OTHER <sup>a</sup>	2	10	8		20		1		6	7
MORE SERIOUS OTHER <sup>b</sup>	1	2	2	5	10	1	1	1	2	5
PURSESNAATCHING	2	2	3	2	9					0
RUNAWAY	37	17	8	9	69	8	2	9	8	27
STRONG-ARM ROBBERY	1	1			2		2	3	4	9
TOTAL	50	53	44	38	178	14	11	21	33	83

<sup>a</sup>Each age group represents a year of birth.

<sup>b</sup>Includes offenses such as malicious mischief, etc.

<sup>c</sup>Includes offenses such as murder, armed robbery, narcotics, etc.

Protestants and Negro Protestants, will be analyzed. Each of the age groups relative to race and religion will be compared to each other as well as to whether they represent either the Intake or Audy Home cases. The first age group discussed will be the thirteen year olds, who were born in 1948. (See Table XXIII.)

There does not appear to be much difference within the Caucasian Protestant cases, but there is a considerable difference within the Caucasian Catholic and within the Negro Protestant cases. At first glance, the Catholic Audy Home group seems to far surpass the Intake group in readmissions for ~~delinquency~~, but upon further investigation, it was learned that this group had more admissions than the Intake group. This is the only group that had more transfers to the Audy Home than disposals by the Intake Department. Also, the fourteen cases of running away could easily have been recorded by one boy, as seems to be indicated by the median readmission rate previously given.

The next group to be considered is the fourteen-year-old group. (See Table XXIV.)

The number of offenses for the Negro Intake group was vastly different from the other Intake groups; yet, the difference between the Audy Home groups is not appreciable. There also appears to be a slight substantiation of the hypothesis for the Caucasian Catholic and Protestant groups where the per cent of recidivism, readmission rate and seriousness of offenses tended to be more predominant for the Audy Home cases. For the Negro group which had the highest per cent of recidivism, of the three major groups, the Intake cases surpass the Audy Home cases in the previously mentioned areas.



TABLE XXIII

COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS  
FOR THE THIRTEEN-YEAR-OLD GROUP  
ON THE BASIS OF RACE AND RELIGION

TYPE OF OFFENSE	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.
ASSAULT			1	1		
AUTO LARCENY						
BURGLARY			3	1		1
INCORRIGIBLE	1		1	2	1	1
LARCENY		1	2		2	3
LESS SERIOUS OTHER <sup>a</sup>			2	3		
MORE SERIOUS OTHER <sup>b</sup>			1			1
PURSESNAATCHING			2			
RUNAWAY	3		35	14		7
STRONG-ARM ROBBERY			1	1		
TOTAL	4	1	48	22	3	13

<sup>a</sup>Includes offenses such as malicious mischief, curfew, etc.

<sup>b</sup>Includes offenses such as murder, armed robbery, narcotics, etc.

TABLE XXIV

COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS  
FOR THE FOURTEEN-YEAR-OLD GROUP ON  
THE BASIS OF RACE AND RELIGION

TYPE OF OFFENSE	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.
ASSAULT			2			
AUTO LARCENY			1			
BURGLARY			10		1	1
INCORRIGIBLE	2		5		3	1
LARCENY	2		3			3
LESS SERIOUS OTHER <sup>a</sup>	1		9	1		1
MORE SERIOUS OTHER <sup>b</sup>	1		1			1
PURSESNAATCHING			2			
RUNAWAY		3	15	2	4	1
STRONG-ARM ROBBERY			1	2		2
TOTAL	4	3	49	5	8	10

<sup>a</sup>Includes malicious mischief, curfew, etc.

<sup>b</sup>Includes murder, armed robbery, narcotics, etc.

The third group to be considered relative to year of birth is the fifteen-year-old group born in 1947. (See Table XXV.) There is a sudden upsurge in the readmission rate for this group as opposed to the previous two age groups for the Caucasian Catholic and Protestant Intake cases, whereas the Negro cases do not reflect this same variance to its two previous age groups. Also of importance is the fact that only eight Catholic boys were transferred to the Audy Home, and 26 cases were handled by Intake. The expected rate of transfer should have been much higher, and no explanation is available as to why this group had such a low transfer rate. This group also did not support the hypothesis from the aspects of per cent of recidivism, readmissions or seriousness of offenses. For the Caucasian Protestant group, support was given to the hypothesis from the aspect of per cent of recidivism only; and for the Negro group, the per cent of recidivism is higher for Intake, but the per cent of readmissions is higher for the Audy Home cases with the seriousness of offense category being questionable. From all appearances, the Caucasian Intake groups tend to resemble the Negro Intake group in the fifteen-year-old bracket, which is unlike the two previous age groups. From all appearances, the sixteen-year-old group indicates a similar relationship in this regard. (See Table XXVI.)

Again, as with the fifteen year olds, the Caucasian Catholic Intake cases had a higher per cent of recidivism, per cent of readmissions, and they returned for more serious offenses. The pattern for the Caucasian Protestant group sixteen year olds is almost the same as for the fifteen year olds, since the per cent of recidivism is higher for the Audy Home; but the per cent of the readmissions and seriousness of offense categories are higher

TABLE XXV

COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS  
FOR THE FIFTEEN-YEAR-OLD GROUP ON  
THE BASIS OF RACE AND RELIGION

TYPE OF OFFENSE	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.
ASSAULT	1		2			
AUTO LARCENY	2	2	1			1
BURGLARY	2	2	6		2	4
INCORRIGIBLE	1		6			
LARCENY	2	2	7		1	3
LESS SERIOUS OTHER <sup>a</sup>	2	1	8			
MORE SERIOUS OTHER <sup>b</sup>			2			
PURSESNAATCHING			3			
RUNAWAY	1	13	6	1	5	9
STRONG-ARM ROBBERY	1					3
TOTAL	12	20	41	1	8	20

<sup>a</sup>Includes offenses such as malicious mischief, curfew, etc.

<sup>b</sup>Includes offenses such as murder, armed robbery, narcotics, etc.

TABLE XXVI

COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF READMISSIONS  
FOR THE SIXTEEN-YEAR-OLD GROUP ON  
THE BASIS OF RACE AND RELIGION

TYPE OF OFFENSE	INTAKE			AUDY HOME		
	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.	CAUC. CATH.	CAUC. PROT.	NEGRO PROT.
ASSAULT	1		3			
AUTO LARCENY	2	1	4		2	3
BURGLARY	5		2			5
INCORRIGIBLE			5			
LARCENY		1	1	1	1	5
LESS SERIOUS OTHER <sup>a</sup>	5	2				6
MORE SERIOUS OTHER <sup>b</sup>			2			2
PURSESNATCHING	2	2	2			
RUNAWAY	5	6	6	3	2	8
STRONG-ARM ROBBERY	2					4
TOTAL	22	12	25	4	5	33

<sup>a</sup>Includes offenses such as malicious mischief, curfew, etc.

<sup>b</sup>Includes offenses such as murder, armed robbery, narcotics, etc.

for the Intake cases. The pattern for the two later Caucasian groups is just the opposite than for the two earlier age groups. Since the expected results were those that occurred in the early age groups, it is not known why the older age groups varied from these patterns. One group that did seem to clearly support the hypothesis was the Negro Protestant sixteen-year-old group that had 37.1 per cent recidivism for Intake and 58.3 per cent for the Audy Home. Also, the Audy Home group surpassed the Intake group in readmissions per recidivist and in seriousness of offenses.

On the basis of the data presented in the previous four tables, it is difficult to say that the hypothesis is substantiated; but there are some important relationships that exist among the Intake and Audy Home cases. First, it can be seen that distinct differences existed within and between the Intake and Audy Home groups for the three major social-religious groups studied when the factor of year of birth was related to race and religion. Second, the Caucasian Catholic group was less consistent than the other two groups in ratio of admissions to transfers to the Audy Home, specifically for the groups born in 1946 and 1948. Third, the Caucasian Catholic and Protestant Intake groups from the thirteen and fourteen-year-old groups appeared to substantiate the hypothesis relative to per cent of recidivism, per cent of readmissions and relative seriousness of offenses. Fourth, the fifteen and sixteen-year-old Caucasian Catholic and Protestant groups who tended not to substantiate the hypothesis and indicated an almost opposite pattern of transfers to the Audy Home relative to admissions to Intake, were transferred least of the three groups. Sixth, the Caucasian Protestant group had the most consistent pattern of admissions to transfers and were

transferred the most of the three groups. Seventh, unlike their Caucasian counterparts, the Negro thirteen and fourteen-year-old groups tended not to support the hypothesis. Eighth, the Negro Protestant's group's per cent of recidivism, readmission rate and relative seriousness of offenses surpassed that of the Caucasian groups with the least variance among the thirteen and fourteen-year-old Audy Home groups and the fifteen and sixteen-year-old Intake groups. Ninth, the greatest variance existed between the Negro Protestant early age groups and the thirteen and fourteen-year-old Caucasian Catholic and Protestant cases. Tenth, the number of runaways gets smaller for the older groups, which tends to indicate a foreboding picture of increased delinquent activity and subsequent high readmission rate for all of the groups.

## CHAPTER V

## GENERAL SUMMARY OF DATA

A general summary of the statements that can be made from the research data will be presented in the following manner: first, all statements that are of a general nature and applicable to both dependents and delinquents; second, all general statements concerning dependency; third, all specific statements regarding dependents; fourth, all statements of a general nature regarding delinquency; and fifth, all specific statements regarding delinquency.

In general, there was a definite difference in the average age of admission for the Caucasian Catholic, Caucasian Protestant and Negro Protestant groups. The difference in average age for each specific Intake group in comparison to the same Audy Home group showed only a slight difference. There was a similar difference among the three major groups relative to age of admission for the dependent and delinquent recidivists. It was also seen that a greater per cent of Caucasian children were transferred to the Audy Home after the initial referral than were Negro children.

Irrespective of whether a child returned for dependency or delinquency, the per cent of recidivists was higher for the Audy Home group in general. It was found that if a child was a recidivist for dependency and was subsequently transferred to the Audy Home after his first admission, he was more likely to return for delinquency than the boy who was not transferred to the Audy Home after his first admission for dependency. It also appeared that the reliability of the dependency data is higher than the data for delinquency,



since delinquency analysis must consider the types of crimes and the readmission rates. Dependency usually concerns only one readmission for dependency after the initial referral for dependency, but delinquency recidivism often occurs on numerous occasions. In the research, any boy committing an objectively delinquent act was considered a delinquent case, regardless of age. This meant that the group which had the most offenses at an early age (specifically, running away) would not necessarily have a higher dependency rate than the other groups, since runaways under twelve often are dependant cases in the eyes of the court. It is possible for the group with a high delinquency rate at an early age to have a lower dependency rate, especially since a number of eight, nine, ten and eleven-year-old boys were not included in the research because they were referred to the Intake Department as runaways, yet in effect they were dependent cases. However, it appears that the excluded cases would probably follow the same proportions as existed for those same age groups, as illustrated on Tables XVIII, XIX and XX. If this is true, then the tables indicate that Negro dependency would be higher and would alter the rate of recidivism for both dependency and delinquency. The per cents of recidivists for the Caucasian groups tended, therefore, to be more reliable than the per cents of recidivists for the Negro groups. This factor is important to interpretation of the data since numerous comparative per cents have been given concerning dependency and delinquency for the various groups based on cases that fit into a research design. The following generalizations must ~~then~~ be interpreted within the scope of the framework of this design and should not be projected to any race or religious group outside the definitions of this work.

In the analysis of the dependency data, it was found that in general the per cent of dependency recidivists was higher for the Audy Home group. This included all cases, irrespective of race, age or religion. Also, it was determined that the Negro Audy Home cases had a lower per cent of recidivists than the Caucasian cases and that the Caucasian cases from the Audy Home have the highest per cent of recidivists. There was a distinct difference between the Caucasian cases from the Intake Department and the Audy Home, but the difference between the Negro Intake and Audy Home groups was less clear. There are a number of specific conclusions that can be made about the different racial, religious and age groups in our sample.

The Caucasian Catholic dependency per cent of recidivists for the Audy Home cases was twice as high as that for the Intake group, the per cents being 15.9 for Intake and 30.6 for the Audy Home. The per cent of recidivists for the Protestant Caucasian Audy Home group was two and one-half times greater than for the Intake group: the per cent was 27.8 for the Audy Home and 11.0 for the Intake group. The Negro Protestant group per cent of recidivists for the Audy Home cases was only slightly greater than the Intake group; the per cents were 15.7 and 13.5, respectively.

Applying the factor of age to the different groups, it was learned that the Negro Protestant group had the highest recidivist age average of the three major groups, with the Audy Home cases having a higher average than the Intake cases. The same pattern existed for the Caucasian Catholic group but varied with the Caucasian Protestant group, where the Intake group average age for recidivism was higher than the Audy Home group. In all likelihood, the average age of recidivism for the Intake group was higher than the Audy Home

group. In all likelihood, the average age of recidivism for all the groups will not change by any increased recidivism, since the average of dependent recidivists is less than ten years of age and the age groups studied range from thirteen through sixteen.

From all indications, the data obtained verifies the hypothesis that those children transferred to Audy Home from Intake represent the more serious placement problems and do return more often for dependency than those cases who were referred elsewhere from the Intake Department after their initial referral for dependency by the Chicago Police. The hypothesis is also supported in that differences did exist within and between the different groups from the Intake Department and the Audy Home according to age, race and religion.

When analyzing the data for delinquency, there are many more aspects to consider. Generally, the per cent of recidivism was greater for the Intake cases than for the Audy Home cases. However, the Caucasian Intake cases were lower than the Audy Home cases, whereas the Negro Audy Home group had a higher per cent of recidivists than the respective Intake cases. There is a considerable difference in the per cent of recidivists of the Negro Intake and Audy Home cases and the Caucasian Intake and Audy Home cases. The per cent was considerably higher for the Negro groups. The higher delinquency per cent of the Negro may have a close relationship to the fact that the Negro boys returned at an earlier age for delinquency and, therefore, are often regarded as dependents by the court. For the present research, the age of a child is not considered as the determinant in whether a child is considered a dependent but rather the reason for being referred as a

recidivist. Many young boys, then, under twelve were considered as delinquent recidivists. This factor may be offset, however, if the assumption is made that the Negro boy runs away at an earlier age than the Caucasian boy, as appears to be true from the data. Therefore, many boys who ran away at the ages of seven through twelve were not included as dependents, although the court regarded them as such. This factor would also tend to raise the per cent of admissions of both Caucasians and Negroes. It is not certain whether the per cent of dependency and delinquency would be increased proportionately by adding this type of case, but there appears to be sufficient evidence to indicate that the group that has the largest number of delinquent admissions for running away at an early age would also have a higher per cent of recidivists specifically for delinquency as relates to the definition in this research framework.

From the tables, it can be seen that the per cent of recidivists varied with all groups. The Caucasian Protestant group had the most consistent relationship between the Intake and Audy Home cases, since each Audy Home age group had a higher per cent of recidivists than the respective Intake age groups and each age group had a higher per cent of recidivists than the preceding age group. This pattern did not exist for either the Caucasian Catholic or Negro Protestant groups. It was also determined that the runaways tended to affect the readmission average per recidivist. Some extreme cases of readmissions for other types of offenses added to the runaways tended to make the median rather than mean readmission rate appear more reliable. Relative to the type of offenses, there did not seem to be a great deal of difference, except in the categories of pursesnatching and strong-arm

robbery, specifically for the Negro Protestant cases. There was also a similarity in the recidivist rate and readmission rate for the Negro Protestant age groups from thirteen through sixteen. This indicated a trend to a higher per cent of recidivism as well as an increase in total admissions for the younger age groups.

The general mean number of readmissions for the Intake cases, irrespective of race, age or religion, was 3.4 for each recidivist after the original admission for dependency; and the mean number for the Audy Home cases was 3.3 readmissions per recidivist for delinquency. For the specific groups, the Caucasian Catholic Intake cases had a lower readmission mean but appear to return for more serious cases than do the Audy Home cases. The Negro Protestant Audy Home cases had a higher readmission mean and appeared to return for more serious offenses in general. Also, the Negro Protestant group had the highest readmission rate of all the three major groups and appeared to return for more serious offenses. The Negro boys also appeared to return at an earlier age than the Caucasian boys, especially for running away, but also for other more serious offenses.

It was also determined from the data that differences existed between the Intake groups and the Audy Home groups for the Caucasian Catholics, Caucasian Protestants and Negro Protestants when the factor of age was considered. The Caucasian Catholic group was less consistent than the other two groups in ratio of admissions to transfers, specifically in the thirteen and fifteen-year-old age brackets. The Caucasian Catholic and Protestant Audy Home groups from the thirteen and fourteen-year-old age brackets appeared to substantiate the hypothesis when considering the per cent of recidivism, per

cent of readmissions and relative seriousness of admissions. Among the fifteen and sixteen-year-old Caucasian Catholic and Protestant groups, the hypothesis was not supported, since there was almost an opposite pattern for delinquency when compared to the thirteen and fourteen-year-old groups.

Among the Negro Protestant groups of thirteen and fourteen-year-olds, the hypothesis was not supported; whereas among the fifteen and sixteen year olds, it was in terms of the per cent of recidivism, per cent of readmissions and relative seriousness of admissions. The Negroes maintained a comparatively consistent relationship of admissions to transfers but were transferred to the Audy Home proportionately less than the other two major groups. The Negro group seems to have had an opposite pattern for delinquency than the Caucasian groups when considering age as a factor. The Negro Protestant groups from the Intake Department and the Audy Home had a higher recidivist rate, readmission rate and returned for more serious offenses; but there appeared to be less variance in this regard when comparing the Caucasian Catholic and Protestant Audy Home thirteen and fourteen year olds and the Intake fifteen and sixteen-year-old cases to be Negro cases from the same groups. The greatest variation for delinquency recidivism existed in the thirteen and fourteen-year-old Intake cases where the Negro cases were higher in recidivism, readmissions and seriousness of offenses. When the type of offense is analyzed, the number of runaways grew increasingly smaller for the older age groups, which tended to indicate increased delinquent activity and a high readmission rate specifically for the Negro Protestant cases.

It was also learned that several of the Caucasian age groups have

approximately the same per cents as the respective Negro Protestant age groups. (See Table XVI.) The greatest difference in recidivism between any particular groups appeared to exist where there was the greatest variance between admissions and transfers to the Audy Home. Each of the three major groups differed in transfer rates to the Audy Home. The Negro Protestant group had the least ratio of transfers to admissions, followed by the Caucasian Catholic group and the Caucasian Protestant group. These groups have the same order when considering per cents of recidivists, per cents of readmissions and seriousness of offenses. Also, the most consistent transfer rate existed for the Caucasian Protestant group.

It appears, then, that generally the hypothesis is supported for the dependent groups. Specifically, the Caucasian dependent groups more clearly substantiate the hypothesis than the Negro groups. Observing the results of the research relative to delinquency, generally, there does not appear to be any clear indication that those boys transferred to the Audy Home Proper from the Intake Department return more than those not transferred. However, that differences occurred among and between the different age, racial and religious groups was verified relative to both dependency and delinquency. On the basis of this research, there appear to be six areas of research concerning dependency and delinquency that need further investigation.

First, it was obvious that a small number of boys accounted for a disproportionate number of offenses. It appears, then, that the predictability for recidivism for delinquency increases for a child with each return. If this were true for all delinquents, then intensification and specialization of probation services would increase their effectiveness and conceivably

prevent countless crimes in the community.

Second, in relation specifically to the groups studied in this research, it appears also that if a child returns for dependency, then that child is more likely to return for delinquency than a first dependent referral. If this is so, then in all likelihood first dependent referrals would have a higher predictability rate for delinquency than a child not referred for dependency. At least on the basis of this research, there appears to exist a high rate of return for delinquency if a child is referred for dependency.

If the pattern for the thirteen, fourteen and fifteen-year-old groups follows the pattern for the sixteen-year-old group, then it can be predicted that the per cent of recidivism for the Caucasian Catholic, Caucasian Protestant, and Negro Protestant groups would be about 20, 20 and 35 per cent, respectively, for the Intake cases and 19, 25 and 58 per cent for the same Audy Home groups. It must be remembered, also, that the statistics used are minimal for the sixteen-year-old group, since they do not include the entire juvenile age of a boy, which is seventeen years of age. It might also be mentioned that the statistics used are those of apprehension, which means that if the group of cases studied were apprehended, over four hundred times for some sort of delinquency, the actual number of offenses involved can be estimated in the thousands. (See Tables XVI and XVII.)

The third area of research that could be investigated is the possibility that the lower the mean age for referrals for dependency the higher the mean age for delinquency; and the higher the mean age for dependency, the lower the mean age for delinquency. The reason for this might be that:



(1) the longer a child is exposed to disuniting familial influences, the more prone the child is to succumb to some sort of social misbehavior at an earlier age; and (2) the older a child is, the more difficult it is to find a foster placement for that child because the child has more difficulty in adjusting to a new mode of life. Thus, placement facilities diminish with age for dependent children.

A fourth new area of research is that there is evidence that tends to indicate that the Negro child engages in delinquency much earlier, more frequently and for more serious offenses than the Caucasian child. It also appears that dependents who engage in delinquent activity do so at an earlier age than other delinquent children.

Fifth, there is the possibility that court intervention seems to affect the cases. It is conceivable that the reason the hypothesis was not clearly substantiated as was expected was that the Audy Home cases all subsequently had some continuing relation with the court, whereas the Intake cases did not necessarily fall into this category.

Lastly, it would seem that a follow-up study on any one of the age groups would be important and would indicate various trends concerning dependency and delinquency with its subsequent relationship to the effects of family disunity. To facilitate any research in this regard, the researcher has available the names of all cases which would eliminate the meticulous task of thumbing through some 30,000 records as was originally done.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. PUBLISHED MATERIALS

### A. BOOKS

- Abbott, Grace. The Dependent and the Delinquent Child, The Child of Unmarried Parents. Chicago, 1938.
- Abrahamsen, David. Who Are the Guilty? A Study of Education and Crime. New York, 1952.
- Alexander, Franz, and William Healy. Roots of Crime: Psychoanalytic Studies. New York, 1935.
- Annual Messages of President of the Board of Commissioners for Cook County, Illinois, from 1935 to 1961.
- Baker, Ruth E. This Is Cook County. Chicago, 1951.
- Barnes, Harry Elmer, and Negley K. Teeters. New Horizons in Criminology. New York, 1951.
- Barron, Milton L. The Juvenile in Delinquent Society. New York, 1955.
- Beal, Marjorie, ed. The Community and the Correctional Process. New York, 1951.
- Bloch, Herbert A., and Frank T. Flynn. Delinquency: The Juvenile Offender in America Today. New York, 1956.
- California Committee on Temporary Child Care. California Children in Detention and Shelter Care. Los Angeles, 1955.
- Carr, Lowell Julliard. Delinquency Control. New York, 1950.
- Children's Bureau, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Adolescent in Your Family. Washington, 1939.
- The Child, the Family and the Court. Washington, 1939.
- Child Welfare Services: How They Help Children and Their Parents. Washington, 1957.
- Children in the Community. Washington, 1946.
- A Community Plans for Its Children. Washington, 1947.

- . The Court and the Children's Agency: Working Together for Children. Washington, 1949.
- . Essentials of Adoption Law and Procedures. Washington, 1949.
- . Helping Children in Trouble. Washington, 1947.
- . Helping Delinquent Children. Washington, 1953.
- . Institutions Serving Delinquent Children: Guides and Goals. Washington, 1957.
- . Moving Ahead for Sound State Legislation. Washington, 1954.
- . New Perspectives for Research on Juvenile Delinquency: A Report of a Conference. Washington, 1956.
- . Parents and Delinquency. Washington, 1954.
- . Police Services for Juveniles. Washington, 1954.
- . Report on the National Conference on Juvenile Delinquency. Washington, 1954.
- . Standards for Specialized Courts Dealing with Children. Washington, 1954.
- . State and Community Planning for Children and Youth. Washington, 1945.
- . What's Happening to Delinquent Children in Your Town. Washington, 1953.
- Community Mobilization for Youth of Metropolitan Chicago. Work Papers of Sponsoring Organizations. Chicago, 1956.
- Deutsch, Albert. Our Rejected Children. Boston, 1950.
- Donohue, John K. Baffling Eyes of Youth. New York, 1957.
- Ellingston, John R. Protecting Our Children from Criminal Careers. New York, 1948.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. Delinquents in the Making: Paths to Prevention. New York, 1952.
- . Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up. New York, 1940.
- . One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents. Cambridge, 1934.

- . Preventing Crime. A Symposium. New York, 1936.
- . Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. New York, 1950.
- Healy, William, and Augusta F. Bronner. New Lights on Delinquency and Its Treatment. New Haven, 1936.
- Josselyn, Irene, M.D. The Adolescent and His World. New York, 1952.
- . Psychosocial Development of Children. New York, 1948.
- Kvaraceus, William C. The Community and the Delinquent. New York, 1954.
- Lundberg, Emma Octavia. Unto the Least of These. New York, 1947.
- Lunden, Walter C. Social and Economic Bases of Delinquency and Dependency in Iowa. Ames, 1952.
- Mangold, George B. Problems of Child Welfare. New York, 1936.
- Mihanovich, Clement S. Principles of Juvenile Delinquency. Milwaukee, 1950.
- Millis, Savilla. Juvenile Detention Home in Relation to Juvenile Court Policy. Chicago, 1935.
- Murphy, James F. The Dependent Boy. Washington, 1937.
- National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency. Report on Case Work - Group Work. Washington, 1947.
- . Report on Juvenile Court Laws. Washington, 1946.
- Neumeyer, Martin H. Juvenile Delinquency in Modern Society. New York, 1949.
- Nicholds, Elizabeth. A Primer of Social Casework. New York, 1960.
- Norman, Sherwood. The Design and Construction of Detention Homes for the Juvenile Court. New York, 1946.
- . Detention Practice: Significant Developments in the Detention of Children and Youth. New York, 1960.
- Polier, Justine Wise. Everyone's Children: Nobody's Child. New York, 1941.
- Proceedings of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth. Raleigh, 1951.
- Reckless, Walter C., and Mapheus Smith. Juvenile Delinquency. New York, 1932.

- Riley, Ralph. A Working Manual for Juvenile Court Officers. Chicago, 1932.
- Robison, Sophia M. Can Delinquency Be Measured? New York, 1956.
- Shaw, Clifford R., Henry D. McKay, and Others. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago, 1942.
- , and Maurice E. Moore. The National History of a Delinquent Career. Philadelphia, 1951.
- Stott, D. H. Saving Children from Delinquency. London, 1952.
- Tappan, Paul W. Juvenile Delinquency. New York, 1949.
- White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. The Delinquent Child. New York, 1932.
- , Dependent and Neglected Children. New York, 1933.

#### B. ARTICLES

- Cassidy, Richard K. "Public Assistance Services to Children in Columbus, Ohio," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 47-50.
- Class, Norris E. "Neglect, Social Deviance, and Community Action," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 17-23.
- Cooper, Elizabeth. "Pilot Study of Protective Services in Los Angeles," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 59-62.
- Crary, Ralph W. "Neglect, Red Tape and Adoption," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 33-39.
- Eissler, K. R. "Ego-psychological Implications of the Psychoanalytic Treatment of Delinquents," The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, V, 97-121.
- Gardner, George E. "Separation of the Parents and the Emotional Life of the Child," Mental Hygiene, XL, (January, 1956), 53-64.
- Giles, Rosalind. "Facilities and Services for Neglected Children in Texas," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 62-65.
- Gill, Thomas D. "The Legal Nature of Neglect," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 2-16.
- Gilman, Merritt C., and Ruby Little. "Treatment of the Rejected Child," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 24-32.

- Houtz, Fanny, and Evelyn Kostick. "Preparation of Juvenile Delinquents for Treatment," The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XVII, (January, 1947), 143-150.
- Illinois Revised Statutes, 1961. Section 2001-2006, (August, 1961).
- Kvaraceus, W. C. "Preventing and Treating Juvenile Delinquency," School Review, LXIII, (December, 1955), 477-482.
- Lange, Gus B. "Facilities for Neglected Children in the Portland, Oregon, Urban Area," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 44-47.
- McCann, Richard V. "The Self-Image and Delinquency: Some Implications for Religion," Federal Probation, XX, (September, 1956), 14-23.
- Moses, Earl R. "Differentials in Crime Rates Between Negroes and Whites in Comparisons of Four Socio-economically Equated Areas," American Sociological Review, XII, (August, 1947), 411-420.
- Nesi, William A. "Facilities and Services for Dependent Children in Cleveland," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 53-55.
- Norman, Sherwood. "Emergency Service in Child Welfare," Child Welfare, XXXIII, (April, 1954), 3-8.
- , "The Shelter Care of Children for Court and Community," National Probation and Parole Association, XII, (December, 1958), 1-16.
- Scherer, Lorena. "Facilities and Services for Neglected Children in Missouri," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 66-68.
- Studd, Elliot. "The Nature of Hard-to-reach Groups," Children, VI, (November-December, 1957), 219-224.
- Schmidt, Dolores M., and Betty Johnson. "Facilities and Services and Services for Neglected Children," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 40-43.
- Ward, David M. "Citizen Responsibility in the Development of Protective Services," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 50-53.
- Weeks, Ashley. "Male and Female Broken Home Rate by Type of Delinquency," American Sociological Review, V, (August, 1940), 601-609.
- Welsch, Exie E. "The Child and Detention," Child Welfare, XXIV, (October, 1945), 1-6.

Winston, Ellen. "The Responsibility of the State Public Welfare Agency for the Neglected Child," National Probation and Parole Association, VI, (October, 1952), 59-62.

## II. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Anderson, S. M. "Study of Effect of Imprisonment of Father," Unpublished Master's Thesis. Loyola University, Chicago, 1945.

Audy, Arthur. "Comparative Analysis of Birth Rate of 965 Families," Unpublished Master's Thesis. Loyola University, Chicago.

Boyle, John D. "Analysis of School Records of One Hundred Juveniles Appearing before Family Court," Unpublished Master's Thesis. Loyola University, Chicago.

Chambers, James E. "Evaluation of Intake Department," Unpublished Master's Thesis. Loyola University, Chicago, 1954.

Gannon, Thomas M. "Religious Control and Delinquent Behavior," Unpublished Master's Thesis. Loyola University, Chicago, 1961.

Official Procedures of the Intake Department of the Arthur J. Audy Home for Children, 1957.

Somerville, Dana. "Study of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention," Unpublished Master's Thesis. Loyola University, Chicago, 1947.

Walsh, J. A. "Study of History and Organization of Intake Department of the Chicago Juvenile Home," Unpublished Master's Thesis. Loyola University, Chicago, 1938.

Worthington, Charles. "Analysis of Social Histories of Children Known to Juvenile Court," Unpublished Master's Thesis. Loyola University, Chicago, 1947.

**Recidivism for Dependency --** State of returning to Intake Department of the Audy Home for dependency after release from either Intake or Audy Home for dependency.

**Recidivist --** Boy who is returned for dependency or delinquency to Intake Department after initial release from Intake or Audy Home. Boy is counted as a recidivist for dependency or delinquency only once regardless of total readmissions.

**Referral --** Process of getting another person or agency or institution to assume control over a boy either temporarily or permanently.



### APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Wilfred Michael Kozlowski has been read and approved by three members of the Department of Sociology.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts.

---

Date

---

Signature of Adviser