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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquency in all its aspects furnishes the sociologist with much matter for consideration and research. Such topics as rise in delinquency studies, personality of the delinquent, physical traits, intelligence, age, environment, have all been treated to a greater or lesser extent.

Behavior patterns in any given society are not only the result of a long history of past experiences and events but are also intimately bound up with a people's beliefs, values, attitudes, and expectations in life. There is probably no aspect of modern social phenomena in which this can be seen more clearly than in the modern rise of juvenile delinquency. Of the many factors that play a role in this matter even the layman is quite convinced that the paralleling rise in the number of mothers who work outside the home is in some way connected with the increasing number of children whose behavior brings them into conflict with the mores of society.1,2 Conjecture often names with great accuracy a respon-

1"Between 1947 and 1956 the number of women on the work force, aged thirty-five and over, jumped from 8.5 million to 13 million. Though less than one-third of the working age population they have provided more than one-half the growth of the work-force. The me-
sible factor but there is a problem in proving in a scientific man-
ner the reliability of the speculation. The object of this re-
search is to try to validate the hypothesis that there is a defi-
nite relationship between the increase in the number of working
mothers in the United States and the incidence of juvenile delin-
quency.3

Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck have done extensive investigation
in the field of juvenile delinquency. These authors in their stu-
dies through the years have included from time to time the aspect
of the working mother although the studies themselves were not fo-
cused primarily on the working mothers. In one study of five hun-
dian age of the worker now is thirty-nine, in 1947 it was thirty-
five. What is disturbing about this development is the suspicion
that modern women, in becoming more productive economic agents,
have in too many cases come to skimp their duties as wives and
mothers. The increase in juvenile delinquency and the rise in
married women in the work-force may not be merely coincidental."  
America, XCVII (August 24, 1957), 519-520.

2"But going to work raises doubts--in her mind as well as in
those of some moralists--as to whether she will be able to combine
job and home, and be a good mother. In fact, a whole host of pa-
thologies, from rising delinquency to increasing divorce, is being
charged to working women." Quoted from Fortune, LIV (July 1956),
172, in Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck's article, "Working Mothers and
Delinquency," Mental Hygiene, XLI (July 1957), 327, footnote 1.

3Juvenile delinquency will be used throughout this paper in
the broad definition: Any child coming into contact with the law
because of some delinquent act. "A boy or girl is not a delin-
quent just because he commits a delinquent act .... A delin-
quent is one who has been treated as such by society. He must be
considered by the people in the community to be a delinquent. In
other words, he must have an official record." E. W. Burgess,
"The Economic Factor in Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Criminal
Law and Criminology, XLIII (May 1952), 29.
dred delinquent women in an eastern city the Gluecks found that over half the mothers of the girls worked occasionally. In a later study it was shown that three hundred eighty-nine of one thousand delinquents (41.5%) had working mothers. In one of the latest researches by these authors, two hundred thirty-three delinquents of five hundred (46.4%) had mothers employed as compared to one hundred sixty-four of five hundred non-delinquents (33.0%) who had working mothers. On the basis of this latest research the Gluecks gave consideration to this problem of the working mothers in a separate paper. As far as the writer can determine no other specialist in the field has done any extensive research in this area of the working mother and delinquency. Much speculation in this area is being done but, as the Gluecks affirm, "the issue remains speculative as long as some factual foundation is not supplied."

---


7S. & E. Glueck, "Working Mothers and Delinquency," *Mental Hygiene*, XLI (July 1957), 327-352.

8A complete survey was made of the Sociological Abstracts and the International Indices of the years 1953 through 1958.

In the article, "Working Mothers and Delinquency," the Gluecks drew from the volume of data collected in their ten years of study and reported in Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Information collected by the authors covers every possible area: family, personal background, body types, health, intelligence, temperaments, age, companions, school life, character. The Gluecks suggest that this situation, mothers working outside the home, endangers wholesome family ties and puts into a crucial condition the building of character, inculcation of basic habits, and the child's sense of security, and gives rise to emotional conflicts, hostile attitudes, and unsuitable supervisory habits.10

This study of the Gluecks was analyzed in detail by the writer since its object was to discover what impact the mother's working has on the lives of the children, to determine, if possible, "the direct and the indirect relationship between a mother's working and the delinquency of her children."11 However, their findings do not reveal any relationship existing between working mothers and the eighty-eight factors differentiating delinquency from non-delinquency.12 The Gluecks state: "This does not necessarily mean that a relationship definitely does not exist, but only that

10 Ibid., 349.
11 Ibid., 334.
12 Ibid., Appendix A-1, 351.
it is not revealed in our data."^{13}

Maccoby, a social scientist at Harvard, states:

The effects of the single factor, maternal employment, if any, may be small, and they will not be the same on all children. What happens to a child will depend upon the effects of other factors interacting with effects of the mother's absence from the home.\(^{14}\)

The following considerations are made by the Gluecks in an attempt to test their hypothesis "that the absence of the mother from the home for lengthy stretches is markedly implicated in the complex of criminogenic influences."\(^{15}\)

It was found by the Gluecks that more delinquent than non-delinquent children had mothers employed either regularly or occasionally (Table I).\(^{16}\)

\[^{13}\text{Ibid., footnote *, 351.}\]

\[^{14}\text{Eleanor E. Maccoby, "Children and Working Mothers," Children, V (July-August 1958), 83.}\]

\[^{15}\text{S. & E. Glueck, "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 329-330.}\]

\[^{16}\text{A mother designated as a regular worker is one who has been gainfully employed for all or most of the time since the birth of the particular child included among the cases of Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency . . . . She has been regularly away from home for several hours a day five to seven days a week, so that her absence is an accepted part of the family routine. An occasional worker is one who has been gainfully employed now and then. There has been no fixed pattern in her employment. She has drifted from one job to another with unpredictable frequency, laying off at will and resuming at will." Glueck, "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 333.}\]
TABLE I

USUAL OCCUPATION OF MOTHERS OF DELINQUENT AND NON-DELINQUENT GROUPS STUDIED BY THE GLUECKS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Delinquents</th>
<th>Non-Delinquents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>263 53.0%</td>
<td>333 67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly employed</td>
<td>101 20.4%</td>
<td>91 18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally employed</td>
<td>132 26.0%</td>
<td>73 14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>496 100.0%</td>
<td>497 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


These mothers were of the lower socioeconomic class. In many instances this working of the mother was an economic necessity. It left "little free choice as to whether the mother should or should not seek outside employment."17

The Gluecks stressed the fact that the greater proportion of mothers (26.0%) having delinquent children worked irregularly as compared to the mothers (14.7%) of the non-delinquent group. To the writer, more significant than this irregularity of work is the fact that the proportion of working mothers (46.4%) of delinquents is greater than that of the non-delinquent group (33.0%), because the theme of this paper is upon the total number of working mothers, not upon the number of regularly or occasionally employed mothers.

17Ibid., 328.
The next table presented by the Gluecks refers to unsuitable supervision\textsuperscript{18} by the mothers of both groups, those with delinquent children and those with non-delinquent children. Three hundred fourteen (63.5\%) mothers with delinquent children and sixty-one (12.5\%) mothers with non-delinquent children failed in securing proper supervision of their children as shown in Table II.

TABLE II

UNSUITABLE SUPERVISION OF CHILDREN BY MOTHERS OF DELINQUENT AND NON-DELINQUENT GROUPS STUDIED BY THE GLUECKS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Delinquents</th>
<th>Non-Delinquents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>126 48.1%</td>
<td>23 7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly employed</td>
<td>85 84.2%</td>
<td>25 28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally employed</td>
<td>103 78.6%</td>
<td>13 18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>314 63.5%</td>
<td>61 12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Glueck, "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 331.

Interpretation of these findings are succinctly stated in the article by the Gluecks. In general, they found:

1. low income groups of working mothers were not as conscientious as non-working mothers in arranging supervision of their children;

\textsuperscript{18}"Supervision by the mother is considered unsuitable if the mother, whether in the home or absent from the home, . . . leaves the boy to his own devices without guidance or in the care of an irresponsible person." Glueck, "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 331.
2. supervision of those children who actually became delinquent was far less suitable on the part of the working mothers than of the non-working mothers;

3. the carelessly supervised boy whose mother works occasionally was far more likely to become delinquent than a poorly supervised boy whose mother did not work outside the home.19

Table II gave the picture of the number (126) and percent (48.1%) of the housewives who had delinquent children and whose supervision was unsuitable, to the total number of housewives (263 in Table I) who had delinquent children; the number (85) and percent (84.2%) of the regularly employed mothers of delinquent children whose supervision was unsuitable, to the total number (101 in Table I) of regularly employed working mothers of delinquent children; the number (103) and percent (78.6%) of the occasionally employed working mothers of delinquents, to the total number (132 in Table I) of occasionally employed working mothers of delinquents. The same procedure was followed for the mothers of non-delinquent children. It was concluded by the Gluecks that the housewife in both cases, with delinquent children and with non-delinquent children, had better supervision than the working mother.

To make the picture more complete and to throw the focus specifically on the total number of delinquents (314 in Table II) and non-delinquents (61 in Table II) who had poor supervision rather than on each factor: housewife, regularly employed, occasionally

---

19 Ibid., 332.
employed mothers, Table II-A was constructed by the writer.

**TABLE II-A**

UNSUITABLE SUPERVISION OF CHILDREN BY MOTHERS OF DELINQUENT AND NON-DELINQUENT GROUPS STUDIED BY THE GLUECKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delinquents</th>
<th>Non-Delinquents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>126  40.2%</td>
<td>23  37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly employed</td>
<td>85  27.2%</td>
<td>25  40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally employed</td>
<td>103 32.6%</td>
<td>13  21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>314 100.0%</td>
<td>61  100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Gluecks asked: "What percent of the housewives, regularly employed, occasionally employed mothers, having delinquent children have unsuitable supervision of children?" The writer, more concerned with the variables Working Mothers and Non-working Mothers than with Supervision of Children by Mother unsuitable, asked: "What percent of delinquent children whose mothers are housewives, regularly employed, occasionally employed, has unsuitable supervision of children?" It seemed obvious that working mothers rather than non-working mothers would have less suitable supervision of children. Were the working mother to employ one to supervise, it would at best be a substitute. This does not mean that all working mothers will necessarily have delinquent children; it does not mean that all delinquents have mothers who work; it could mean that one of the causes for the increase in juvenile delinquency in the
United States could be the fact that there are so many working mothers. Any substitute in a well-geared machinery is at best a substitute and liable to the inexorable laws of nature which have established all things in order. Indirectly, Richard Clendenen included working mothers as a contributing factor to juvenile delinquency when he said:

Broadly speaking, juvenile delinquency results from unsatisfactory conditions within the home and the community. By unsatisfactory conditions within the home, I include disturbed family relationships, parental rejection, exaggerated sibling (brother or sister) rivalry, marital conflict, or any other conditions which subject the child to tense abnormal relationship to members of his family. I also include conditions which deprive a child of normal guidance, care, training and supervision.20

In all the other tables, II to XVIII, constructed by the Gluecks,21 the ratio of working mothers to the individual factors connected with juvenile delinquency seemed, more or less, consistently to follow the general relationship pattern between working mothers and delinquents and between working mothers and non-delinquents as given in Table I of this paper.22 The general relationship pattern was established as follows:


22 See page 6 of this paper.
Total no. of working mothers = \frac{233}{496} = 46.4\% \text{ WM}

Total no. of working mothers = \frac{164}{497} = 33.0\% \text{ WM}

To show this relationship between working mothers and delinquents and between working mothers and non-delinquents for each set of factors studied by the Gluecks, Table III was constructed by the writer.
TABLE III

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORKING MOTHERS AND DELINQUENTS
AND BETWEEN WORKING MOTHERS AND NON-DELINQUENTS
FOR EACH SET OF FACTORS STUDIED
BY THE GLUECKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glueck's table numbers</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Number of delinq.</th>
<th>No. of WM of D.</th>
<th>% of WM having D.</th>
<th>Number of Non-D</th>
<th>No. of WM of Non-D</th>
<th>% of Non-D having WM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II*</td>
<td>(Boy) Mental pathology</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>(Boy) Emotional conflicts</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>(Boy) Deep-seated hostility</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>(Boy) Defensive attitude</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>(Boy) Leisure away from home</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>(Boy) Attends movies 3x weekly</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>(Boy) Truant 10 yr. or younger</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>(Father) Work habits not good</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>(Boy) Reared in broken home</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>(Father) Emotionally disturbed</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>(Family) Financially dependent</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>(Mother) History of delinquency</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>(Parents) Lack self-respect</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>(Mother) Dominates family affairs</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>(Father) Discipline of boy</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Father) Discipline of boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inconsistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>(Parents) Incompatible</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>(Family) Not a cohesive unit</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers identical with Table Numbers in the Glueck's study, "Working Mothers and Delinquency," Mental Hygiene, 334-348.
In each case in Table III to find the percent of delinquents having working mothers the total number of working mothers was divided by the total number of delinquents who had some mental pathology, emotional conflicts, deep-seated hostility, defensive attitude, etc. The same procedure was employed for the non-delinquent group.

To construct a frame of reference a norm was established based on a deviation of ±5 points from the general relationship pattern, 46.4% for delinquents and 33.0% for non-delinquents. Accordingly, the range of accepted values for delinquents with working mothers was taken as 41.4% to 51.4%; for non-delinquents with working mothers, 28.0% to 38.0%.

When the factors under consideration were concerned with emotional dynamics of the delinquent himself (Tables II to VIII in the Glueck study) the ratio \( \frac{WM}{D} \) fell within this range, 41.4% to 51.4%, and did not vary markedly from the general value of this ratio \( \frac{\text{Total WM}}{\text{Total D}} \) (46.4%). Exceptions were Table VII, boy attended movies three times a week or more, and Table VIII, boy began to be truant at ten years or younger. These performance traits result from the interplay of circumstances and personality characteristics and involve too many variables to warrant a valid interpretation of the wide disagreement of the percentage ratios from the general values.

When the factors under consideration concern the sociocultural factors and/or the pathology of the parents the variations
were consistently higher than the general percentage, 41.4%-51.4% (Tables X to XVIII in the Glueck study).

In the non-delinquent group only one ratio fell far below the norm, 23.0%-38.0% (Table VI in the Glueck study), boy spends leisure time away from home. The total number of boys (32) in this non-delinquent group was extremely small. For this reason it does not appear to the writer to be weighty. In the other tables for the non-delinquent group the ratio was consistently higher than the general over-all picture. These higher ratios seemed to stress the point that there is danger ahead: boy has a mental pathology, emotional conflicts, deep-seated hostility, defensive attitude, etc. The important consideration is of these other conditions which are present and which might play havoc during the mother's absence from the home. The danger evolves from these other situations, and while the working of the mother is not the main factor it is a contributing one.

Obviously there is no one cause for juvenile delinquency. The solution to the problem does not lie in over-simplification. As Mihanovich states:

Neither poverty nor overcrowding nor demoralizing conditions nor bad companions, nor malnutrition nor school retardation nor gangster movies and radio thrillers nor broken homes nor old-world culture clashes nor any of the other handicaps of environment is enough in itself to always cause delinquency. Therefore there can be no magic formula that will eliminate or effectively reduce juvenile delinquency. Any program of delinquency must be many-sided and all-inclusive.23

The extreme degree of involvement of factors is exemplified in the occurrence of delinquency of one child in a large family of non-delinquents, or the non-delinquency of a child who has been subjected to all factors to which juvenile delinquency is attributable.

Information collected by the Gluecks\textsuperscript{24} covers every possible related area. So many variables have been tabulated in \textit{Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency} it is difficult to set up valid relationships. Shaplin and Tiedemann suggest that a major source of error in the Glueck study lies in the fact that the non-delinquent is not representative of the general population of non-delinquents.\textsuperscript{25} Rubin in his review of this study states that the Gluecks in matching the five hundred delinquents versus the five hundred non-delinquents or a basis of residence in underprivileged area suggest that it is not the environment that causes delinquency but rather the physical and mental make-up of the individual. The Gluecks ignore the fact that the underprivileged areas do produce relatively high delinquency rates and that this condition is perhaps one of the main causes of juvenile delinquency in so far as it contributes to the development of other undesirable factors. Rubin also argues that the parents of non-delinquents, even in the underprivileged area, are not so

\textsuperscript{24}\textit{Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency}.

\textsuperscript{25}Judson T. Shaplin and David V. Tiedemann, "Comment on the Juvenile Delinquency Prediction Tables in the Glueck's 'Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency'," \textit{American Sociological Review}, XVI (August 1951), 544-548.
markedly overburdened by serious social, physical, and psychological difficulties as are the parents of delinquents. Better home conditions do prevail for the non-delinquent and therefore these closely matched groups are emotionally different.26 Reiss in his writing of this study states that the social environment of a child, six to sixteen years of age, is not to be considered negligible nor is the role of the primary group relationships and controls in forming personality and behavior patterns to be ignored.27 These observations may be interpreted as implying that the home, and those factors which make for ideal conditions in the home, will decrease juvenile delinquency.

The present study was undertaken to demonstrate that working mothers are a contributing factor to juvenile delinquency. In the application of their data to the working mother and delinquency the Gluecks suggest that all working mothers can be charged with contributing to the delinquency of their children to the extent that the absence of the mother from the home in gainful employment contributes to the weakening of the family ties.28

In order to test this hypothesis that working mothers are a


27 Albert J. Reiss, Jr., "Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. II. An Appraisal of the Research Methods," American Journal of Sociology, LVII (September 1951), 115-120.

28 Glueck, "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 349.
contributing factor to juvenile delinquency a study was made of the Chicago Park District Police records in regard to the family conditions of the non-institutionalized delinquent children.29

Questionnaire procedure for collecting data was used for the institutionalized delinquents as well as for the working mothers. At the initial inquiry four Illinois correctional institutions for children were willing to co-operate in administering the questionnaire. At the time of distribution of the questionnaire, however, only the two large state institutions responded, one for boys and the other for girls. The other two institutions did not reply. Five hundred questionnaires were administered under supervision of the institutional personnel. An 89.30% return was realized, or four hundred forty-nine questionnaires.

In order to get a cross-section of women workers from white collar workers to clerical workers to factory workers, five large business firms, employing many women, were contacted. Four of these firms are located in a medium-sized industrial city of the midwest; the fifth firm operates in the core city of a Standard Metropolitan Area. The personnel manager of each of the five firms was very accepting of distributing the questionnaires to the married women in his employ. But again at the time of distribution difficulties were encountered. Fewer questionnaires were administered.

29 The Youth Bureau of the Chicago Park District Police has excellent current files with pertinent detailed data about each child with whom contact was made.
taken by the managers of these firms than had been anticipated.
The writer feels that the employers feared to weaken labor-management relationship. Distribution of two hundred five questionnaires was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original plan was to distribute five hundred questionnaires to working mothers, two hundred ninety-five more than were distributed through the business firms. This necessitated other plans. Through the cooperation of the principal of a large girls' high school in the area, the remaining two hundred ninety-five questionnaires were given to the students to be given to their mothers who worked outside the home. Results of the distribution of the five hundred working mother questionnaires were 50.40% returns, or two hundred fifty-two questionnaires.

It was determined that in this study the information gathered would have to be reliable in regard to the following statements in order to be of value:

1. The child must be a teenager.
2. The delinquent or non-delinquent status of the child must be definitely established.
3. The group studied should represent a fairly good cross-section of a given area.
4. All types of locations should be represented, that is, city, town, country.
5. All religious denominations should be represented.
6. All various types of school influences, public, private, should be represented.

7. All socioeconomic levels should be represented.

8. All types of family life situations, unity separation, divorce, divorce and remarriage, should be included.

In addition to these points questionnaire reliability in general must be considered. Since in all questionnaires memory, judgment, and honesty greatly influence the answers given, only those sources should be used, or at least, given greatest weight in consideration, where the reliability of the data in regard to these three qualities is at a maximum level.

Accordingly, the possibility of securing workable data from each of the four above-mentioned groups, working mother, non-working mother, delinquent, non-delinquent, was considered, weighed, accepted, or rejected. Final decision was to work with two groups, delinquents, institutionalized and non-institutionalized, and with working mothers. In applying the criterion of value, both as regards the eight points listed and the three questionnaire qualities mentioned, it was found that in the present study reliable data from non-working mothers and from non-delinquents was almost impossible of attainment. Questionnaires were sent to five hundred working mothers and to five hundred delinquents. Since the ratio of delinquents to non-delinquents is one to two, a valid study would necessitate reaching twice the number of non-working mothers.

---

30 Shaplin and Tiedemann, p. 548.
mothers as working mothers and also twice the number of non-delinquents as delinquents. Thought was given to administering questionnaires to students enrolled in the two large high schools, one public, one private, in the midwestern city where the writer resides. The primary objection to pursuing this method of research was the almost impossible task of proving the non-delinquency of these students with respect to the definition in this paper. This point alone would render results from these sources invalid. This decision was strengthened by a criticism on this particular aspect of the Glueck study:

Glueck's control group was far from adequate. In the first place, the homes of the non-delinquent boys were explicitly approached as ones where "good boys" in those families would be compared with others who were not. This knowledge may have tended to make the families present more favorable information. Since the delinquent group was institutionalized, it was less difficult to obtain knowledge about them.

Finally, in matching the group on a neighborhood basis it was fallaciously assumed that a neighborhood is experienced in the same way because a person lives in it.31

The same author stated:

Whom to use for the non-criminal control group presents a difficult problem, particularly when there are indications that undetected or unprosecuted delinquency and criminal behavior are fairly extensive in the general population. When compared with 2,049 delinquent boys who appeared before the juvenile court, a group of 337 college boys were found to have committed more offenses. In another study Wallerstein and Wyle found that 91 percent of a supposed sample of the general population had

committed offenses after the age of 16 for which they could have received a penal sentence.\textsuperscript{32}

In addition to this problem other points were not fulfilled either in one or other of the schools, namely, the groups studied would not represent a good cross-section of the area; only city students would be represented; not all religious denominations would be represented.

As regard non-working mothers many points would offer complexities varying in degree and dependent upon how one planned to reach a given group of women and how to select this group; for example, not all mothers have teenagers; the delinquent or non-delinquent status of the child would be difficult to establish; the group studied would be representative of a small given area and not a cross-section of a large area; not all types of locations, city, town, country, would be represented; not all socioeconomic levels would be represented. While it is true that these same problems arose in the case of the working mother group the main point of difference is that, the latter were able to be contacted in some organized manner. It did not seem feasible to attempt the unpromising task of contacting one thousand non-working mothers.

Probably the most reliable data judged on adherence to points listed\textsuperscript{33} are that from the Youth Bureau in Chicago. Since these

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., p. 490.

\textsuperscript{33}Points listed on p. 18 of this paper.
are records there is not the fallibility of answers expected in a questionnaire. The only two points to which these data do not conform are points 4 and 7:

(4) All types of locations should be represented, that is, city, town, country;

(7) All socioeconomic levels should be represented.

Probably these children are all city children and are from about the same socioeconomic level.34

Next in degree of reliability is the information gathered by means of questionnaires from the institutionalized delinquents. Although this method of gathering data is less authentic than that mentioned above, it is valid in regard to all of the eight points listed except perhaps the socioeconomic level of the youths.

Least reliable are the data obtained from the questionnaire administered to working mothers. Honesty failure, intentional or not, would be the greatest source of error as regards the questionnaire data; in regard to the eight points listed it is difficult to contact a representative number of mothers having teenagers; the delinquent status of a child would be most difficult to establish; the majority of working mothers would be from the city.

Keeping these considerations in mind the results obtained were applied to the hypothesis: working mothers are a contributing factor to delinquency. To substantiate this, the findings should show that the mother's working outside the home bears a signifi-

34 See Occupation Table on p. 44 of this paper.
cant relationship to the delinquency of her child. The fact of the mother's working should show intensity in the one or more negative factors present in the delinquent child's universe.

The task here was essentially to find the percentage of delinquents who had working mothers and to evaluate the data within the framework of the Gluecks' findings reported in "Working Mothers and Delinquency."

The Gluecks in their study gave special emphasis to five social factors:

- discipline of boy by father
- attention of father for boy
- affection of mother for boy
- supervision of boy by mother
- cohesiveness of family

which, if one or more or all were present negatively, would predict delinquency in the child. The task of the present writer was confined to the effect of the mother's working on the child, therefore, only two of the factors, supervision of the boy by the mother and cohesiveness of the family, would be considered in this paper. To establish a frame of reference the Gluecks' values of these two factors were employed in all the groups studied here. The value found by the Gluecks were:

Supervision of the boy by working mother unsuitable

Delinquents . . . . 81.4% 37
Non-delinquents . . 23.3%

35 Mental Hygiene, XLI (July 1957), 327-352.
37 "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 331.
Family of working mother not a cohesive unit

Delinquents . . . 89.7%  
Non-delinquents . . 48.6%  

The data gathered from the Park District Police Bureau files and from the questionnaires sent to the two state institutions were tabulated and analyzed with concentration always on working mothers and delinquency and on the two factors of supervision and cohesiveness.

The profile of the working mothers in Chapters II and III includes the marital status, work schedule, financial dependence, residential area, and, most important of all, supervision and cohesiveness of the family. Since the major contribution in this field was done by the Gluecks, the factors found in this study were compared with the findings of these investigators wherever this was possible, especially with supervision and cohesiveness.

The children studied in this thesis included pre-delinquents (first and second offenders) and institutionalized delinquents. The facts surrounding the child were brought into prominence where obtainable, such as age, siblings, rank in family, kinds of offenses, religion, truancy, adult with whom child lives, child's love for mother.

The working mothers in Chapter IV included all the factors of the working mothers in the previous chapters with more details included, such as age, size of family, age group of children, reason

38 Ibid., 348.
for work.

It was distinctly advantageous to be able to employ the Gluecks' values as standards concerning supervision and cohesiveness. The writer could profit by avoiding mistakes for which the Gluecks were criticized, such as choice of control groups, relative numbers compared, biologic tendencies, etc. 39

The material gathered in this thesis permitted more factorial analysis because the delinquent group was more representative in many aspects, such as residence, ethnic group, intelligence, sex, and the study included a group of working mothers. The writer feels that the evaluation of data was more objective since the conclusions drawn were based directly on comparison of values with those established by the Gluecks.

39 See pp. 15-16 of this study.
CHAPTER II

NON-INSTITUTIONALIZED DELINQUENTS AND THEIR MOTHERS

A sharp rise in law breaking among juveniles was reported by the F.B.I. with the release of figures on juvenile delinquency for 1957. This report showed youths accounted for 47.20% of major crime arrests in 1957. Since 1952 the crime rate among persons under eighteen has increased 55%; for 1957 over 1956, the rate increase was 9.30%.¹

In Chicago in 1957 twenty-four hundred twenty-two children, six to seventeen years of age, came into contact with the Youth Bureau of the Chicago Park District Police. This shows an increase of only thirty-seven cases over the number handled in 1956, or 1.6%. Of these twenty-four hundred twenty-two children apprehended by the Park District Police in 1957, eighteen hundred thirty-one were residents of Chicago and had committed bona fide offenses. The other five hundred ninety-one were either non-resident children or had not committed bona fide offenses. This number, eighteen hundred thirty-one, shows a slight decrease of

thirty-five cases less than 1956. In fact, since 1952 the number of resident children apprehended by the Chicago Park District Police for the commission of an antisocial act has shown relatively slight variations with a tendency toward a decline.

**TABLE IV**

**TOTAL NUMBER OF RESIDENT CHILDREN APPREHENDED BY THE CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT POLICE 1952-1957**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>2249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Youth Bureau Report for 1957, 11.

Table IV presents a reversal in juvenile delinquency figures of the Chicago Park District Police from that of the nation. "Slight though this amount appears, it becomes gigantic when viewed in relationship to the reported experiences of law enforce-

---

2This decrease would have been greater but the 1957 figure included, for the first time, the seventeen year old boys. This is the result of the recent Illinois State legislation which raised the age limit of the male delinquent child from sixteen to seventeen years. *Illinois Welfare News*, XI (February 1958), p. 2.
ment throughout the nation."³

Table V and Table VI show the type of offenses committed by the eighteen hundred thirty-one children (1957) in two age groups, ten to seventeen years of age and six to nine years of age respectively. The classifications in the tables are listed according to the police reports at the time of apprehension. Disorderly conduct includes any law violation or misdemeanor not specifically stated in the other definitions but which constitutes a breach of peace. Under the term "Other" are those which encompass several unrelated offenses which separately produce few apprehensions, for example, riding in stolen car, committing arson, escaping from correctional institution, violating parole.⁴


⁴Ibid., 12.
# TABLE V

OFFENSES COMMITTED BY CHILDREN 10-17 YEARS OF AGE AND APPREHENDED BY THE PARK DISTRICT POLICE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total boys</th>
<th>Total girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault and Battery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying Deadly Weapon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious Mischief</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Youth Bureau Report for 1957, 24, 28.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total boys</th>
<th>Total girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault and Battery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying Deadly Weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious Mischief</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Park Police files record names of boys as young as six and seven years of age (Table VI), whereas the Gluecks studied teenage boys. Table V showed that the ten and eleven year old children were apprehended for offenses similar to the older boys with the exception of traffic violations and "other". This agrees with the Gesell researchers who stated that nearly all delinquent children had adjustment difficulties before they were eleven years of age. Since this study is related to the Glueck study, Table VI (which included six to nine year age group) has not the same value as Table V, ten to seventeen year age group. Therefore only the older age group will be included hereafter in this study.

In each of these cases a home visit was made by an officer of the Park District to interview the parents of the offender. Whenever possible, efforts were made to strengthen and improve the parent-child relationship by guidance, counseling, supervision of the Youth Bureau or another social agency. Frequently it was found that these children coming into contact with the law were denied many of the privileges of adequate home and community living. For example, in the case of the runaways, of the forty-nine children found to be deliberately absenting themselves from their homes, twenty-eight of these homes, 37.10%, were adjudged undesirable abodes by the Bureau and the children in these cases seemed re-

bellious to the indifferences and inadequacies of their homes.6

"Among the more viciously serious aggressions, approximately four homes of every ten were found to contain a definite negative influence."7

These statements made it apparent to the writer that here one could find data pertinent to the present study, working mothers and juvenile delinquency, for the evidence of delinquency pointed, not to the child, but to the parents who appeared to be in need of special counseling because of the inadequacy of the home.

The records of these non-institutionalized delinquent children offered available material to apply in endeavoring to determine what percent of non-institutionalized delinquent children had working mothers and what effect this might have had on these children. The Gluecks are of the conviction that damage to the personality and character of children may result from the fact of the mother's absenting herself from the home.8

A child's coming into the hands of the law indicates that there are unmet needs, symptoms of causative ills. Society may be failing him. "Delinquents aren't born, they are created."9 Each child is unique and reacts individually and singly to his social

7Ibid., 15.
8Glueck, "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 350.
milieu, setting up his own values, goals, and behavior patterns. Particularly recognized as a basic influence in forming these values and goals is a life revolving around a parental figure. It is this early personal interaction within the framework of the familial climate that directs the child's future thinking, feeling, acting. "All experts, self-styled and real, agree that one of the most serious contributing causes in non-conformance manifestations is the lack of communication between child and parents."

This lack of communication may be caused by a parent, who wittingly or unwittingly blocks the child's opportunity to express his problems or to release his tensions. Although it is not only working mothers' children who lack this opportunity, the fact remains that there were many day-time orphans in 1957 with unresolved problems which led to aggressive acts and to the attention of the police.

Of the seventeen hundred twenty-three children, ten to seventeen years of age, coming in contact with the Park District Police in 1957, six hundred forty-seven (37.55%) had mothers working away from home.

---

10 Ibid., iv.
11 Real, step, or foster mother.
In Table VII the 37.6% value for working mothers of delinquents agrees more closely to the Gluecks' working mother-nonde‐
linquent group value, 33.0%, and falls within the range of varia‐
tion established for this group by the writer, 28.0%-38.0%. In
view of the criticism stated in Chapter I of this work in regard
to the Gluecks' selection of their control group of non-delin‐
quents, this might be significant. The YBP offenders, perhaps,
do not represent a valid picture as true non-delinquents compared
to the Gluecks' group of non-delinquents who were never appre‐
hended for any infraction of the law. But when one considers that
the highest number of offenses (524) committed by these non-institu‐
tionalized delinquents was for disorderly conduct, which in many
cases were very minor infractions of the law, society can hardly

---

12 Shaplin and Tiedemann, p. 548.

13 YBP—Youth Bureau Police offenders.
consider these YBP offenders as delinquents. Larceny, next in rank of offenses (278), meant, many times, appropriating the use of another's car for nothing more than the thrill of getting behind the wheel;\textsuperscript{14} traffic violations, fourth in rank (182), followed because of this driving-urge; truancy was third in rank (203). The Gluecks admit the occurrence of truancy among their non-delinquent group.\textsuperscript{15} In view of this, in the case of the YBP group, where truancy was the only offense, the offenders are not, on the basis of the Gluecks' rating, true delinquents.

Children must be taught the correct principles of behavior by word and example. It is a conviction of the Youth Bureau "that no substitute exists for spiritual teachings in learning among other things to differentiate between right and wrong."\textsuperscript{16} Religious affiliations of the YBP children were noted on the records of the Youth Bureau.

\textsuperscript{14}The writer in no way intends to minimize the seriousness of larceny. In many cases larceny involves long-range planning and deliberation. Hit-and-run accidents, robbery, and other serious criminal acts often follow on the heels of larceny.

\textsuperscript{15}"Working Mothers and Delinquency," 339.

\textsuperscript{16}Youth Bureau Report, 14.
TABLE VIII
CHURCH AFFILIATIONS OF YB P CHILDREN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>52.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>44.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Youth Bureau Report for 1957, 34.

The officers of the Youth Bureau attempt to encourage and reaffiliate the children who are irregular or indifferent in their church attendance.

Of the six hundred forty-seven working mothers (Table VII) who had children apprehended by the Park District Police in 1957 four hundred fifty-two were living with their husbands, the majority of whom were also employed; only six cases noted the fact that the husband was incapacitated due to illness. It is evident from the police records that the children of these working mothers were denied the privileges of a normal home life by reason of lack of supervision and control, due in part or in whole to the mother's working outside the home. Children with working mothers are more vulnerable to delinquency than those with non-working mothers because of the poor supervision by these mothers. The Gluecks state
that the factor of unsuitable supervision of the boy by the mother "markedly differentiates delinquents as a whole from the total control group of non-delinquents (irrespective of whether or not the mother works outside the home) . . . ,"17 but the supervision of those children who became delinquents was far less adequate on the part of the mothers who worked.18

All of the children apprehended by the Park District Police in 1957 can be said to have had poor supervision because they were roaming the streets during the hours of the day or night delinquentizing and were picked up by the police. Table IX shows the hours of the apprehension of the seventeen hundred twenty-three non-institutionalized YBP offenders.

17 Ibid., 331.
18 Ibid., 332.
TABLE IX
HOURS OF APPREHENSION OF THE SEVENTEEN HUNDRED TWENTY-THREE NON-INSTITUTIONALIZED DELINQUENTS, 10-17 YEARS OF AGE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:01 a.m. to 4:00 a.m.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:01 a.m. to 8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:01 a.m. to noon</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>17.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:01 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>27.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:01 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>25.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:01 p.m. to midnight</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>20.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Youth Bureau Report for 1957, 39.

Some of these apprehended children have spent much of their childhood delinquentizing, trying to find in such overt acts a recognition, an emotional response, a security, a new experience, which are their rightful inheritance. The Gluecks imply that warm and consistent relationships with parents deter children from spending their free time in a deleterious manner. 19

It is clearly understood and accepted that a mother's working outside the home is not the only factor which enters into making a juvenile a delinquent. Another important phase is the stability

19 Ibid., 329-330.
of the family. Surely, a more stable family is found where both parents are living, and living together as husband and wife. Table X shows the marital status of the six hundred forty-seven working mothers who had children apprehended by the Park District Police in 1957.

TABLE X

MARITAL STATUS OF THE SIX HUNDRED FORTY-SEVEN WORKING MOTHERS HAVING CHILDREN 10-17 YEARS OF AGE WHO WERE APPEHENDED BY THE PARK DISTRICT POLICE IN 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother-father living together</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>69.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother widowed, not remarried</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother separated, not remarried</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>21.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried mothers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table X one might deduce that 69.86% of YBP offenders whose mothers worked had fathers whose work habits were not good or whose families were financially dependent. Comparing this

20 This is extending the definition of the Gluecks' work habits of father not good (Table IX) and family financially dependent (Table XII) to include economic pressure due to insufficient wages of husband.
69.86% with the Gluecks' study\textsuperscript{21} it was found that:

Children of WM whose fathers' work habits were not good

YBP offenders \ldots 69.9%
Gluecks' delinquents \ldots 68.1%
Gluecks' non-delinquents \ldots 35.6%

Children of WM whose family was financially dependent

YBP offenders \ldots 69.9%
Gluecks' delinquents \ldots 36.0%
Gluecks' non-delinquents \ldots 14.7%

In each case the value for the YBP offenders was higher than that of the delinquents and non-delinquents of the Gluecks.

Table X showed a total of 30.14% YBP offenders having working mothers who were widowed, separated, unmarried. This percentage can be compared to the Gluecks' group whose family was not a cohesive unit.\textsuperscript{22}

Children of WM whose family was not a cohesive unit

YBP offenders \ldots 30.1%
Gluecks' delinquents \ldots 89.7%
Gluecks' non-delinquents \ldots 48.6%

In this comparison the percentage of the YBP offenders was closer to that of the non-delinquent group of the Gluecks. This could be significant in view of the criticism of Shaplin and Tiedemann,\textsuperscript{23} quoted in Chapter I.

\textsuperscript{21}Gluecks' Tables IX and XII in "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 341, 342, respectively.

\textsuperscript{22}See pages 23-24 for Gluecks' values.

\textsuperscript{23}Shaplin and Tiedemann, p. 548.
As was shown in Table VII, 37.6% of all YEP offenders had mothers who worked outside the home. To test this figure with special regard to the home situations, a random sampling\textsuperscript{24} was taken from the 1957 police files. One hundred eighty-nine cases thus chosen were studied and the data tabulated.

**TABLE XI**

WORKING MOTHERS AND NON-WORKING MOTHERS OF ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY-NINE CASES RANDOMLY CHOSEN FROM THE 1957 FILES OF THE PARK DISTRICT POLICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Working Mother</th>
<th>Non-working Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother-father, both working</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only father works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother separated, not remarried</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother widowed, not remarried</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-father, both unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father works. No mother figure in the home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of 189 cases</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{24}Every 11th record.
36.50% 
working mothers 
(69)

63.50% 
non-working mothers 
(120)

FIGURE 1
PERCENT OF WORKING MOTHERS AND NON-WORKING MOTHERS OF ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY-NINE CASES RANDOMLY CHOSEN FROM THE PARK DISTRICT POLICE FILES of 1957

1723 children . . . . 37.6% had working mothers
189 random cases . . . 36.5% had working mothers
Difference . . . 1.1

Nineteen of these one hundred eighty-nine randomly chosen records show the father of the family to be deceased. The occupation of the other one hundred seventy fathers is shown in the following table.
TABLE XII

*OCCUPATION OF THE FATHERS OF ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY-NINE YBP CHILDREN WHOSE RECORDS WERE RANDOMLY CHOSEN FROM THE YOUTH BUREAU FILES OF 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation of father</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers and farm management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, officials, proprietors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and kindred workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm laborers and foremen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients in hospital</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No record</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For these one hundred eighty-nine randomly chosen cases special attention was given by the writer to comments of the recording officer regarding supervision of the children by the mother. Comments about supervision were made on all the records where, according to the judgment of the officer, the supervision was above or below normalcy, for example, mother always at home, children well supervised, inadequate supervision, mother incapable of supervising.

Of the one hundred eighty-nine cases, sixty (31.6%) were found to have poor supervision in the home. This 31.6% fell within the two percentages found by the Gluecks in their study of the delinquents and non-delinquents who had poor supervision by the mother.

\[
\text{(Gluecks) } \frac{\text{Poor supervision}}{\text{Delinquents}} = \frac{314}{496} = 63.5\% \text{ poor supervision}
\]

\[
\text{(Gluecks) } \frac{\text{Poor supervision}}{\text{Non-delinquents}} = \frac{61}{497} = 12.5\% \text{ poor supervision}
\]

\[
\text{(YEP) } \frac{\text{Poor supervision}}{\text{YEP offenders}} = \frac{60}{189} = 31.6\% \text{ poor supervision}
\]

25"There are only two basic requirements for sampling procedures to fulfill. A sample must be representative, and it must be adequate." Wm. J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, Methods in Social Research (New York, 1952), p. 273. The random sampling of one hundred eighty-nine cases is representative of the entire group of YEP offenders as shown by the slight difference (1.1, p. 42 of this paper) between the two percentages of working mothers. Therefore, it seems justifiable to use this random sampling in ascertaining with sufficient reliability the adequacy of the supervision of the YEP children by their mothers. "Quite at variance with popular belief, it is a statistical fact that the relatively small samples yield remarkably high precision." David Krech and Richard Crutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology (New York, 1948), p. 299."
Thirty-three of these sixty YBP offenders were found to have both poor supervision and working mothers; and represented 47.8% of all YBP working mothers. This figure (47.8%) of the YBP group having poor supervision and working mothers fell within the range of percentages of working mothers and non-working mothers found by the Gluecks in their delinquent and non-delinquent groups who had poor supervision by the mother. 26

Poor Supervision of the child by the working mother

YBP offenders . . . . . . . . 47.8%
Gluecks' delinquents . . . . . . 81.4%
Gluecks' non-delinquents . . . 23.3%

The figures show that in many cases where a child has inadequate supervision and a working mother the child will delinquentize and be apprehended by the police. The Gluecks emphasize the fact that "supervision of those children who actually became delinquents was far less suitable on the part of the working mothers . . . than on the part of the mothers who were housewives." 27 Again the Gluecks state the "working mothers, at least of the low-income groups, are not as conscientious about arranging for the supervision of their children as are those who remain at home." 28

The positive aspect in proof of this statement that inadequacy of supervision is directly linked to the mother's working can be

26 See pages 23-24 of this paper.

27 "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 332.

28 Ibid.
further demonstrated by the fact that 85.5% of the YBP records having a definite statement, such as supervision O.K., occurred in the case of the non-working mother; but the records of YBP offenders with working mothers indicated that only 14.5% received this high rating with regard to supervision.

It is to be noted that much subjectivity occurs in evaluating supervision of the children adequate or inadequate. Some YBP officers automatically label a home as inadequately supervised if the mother works full time; others do not do so if the mother works while the husband is at home. As for part-time working of the mothers, if the work occurs during school time it is not even mentioned in the records so that a part-time working mother, working only during the time the children are away at school is not recorded in the Park District records as a working mother at all. There is no record of the number of such cases.

The same subjectivity occurs in labeling a home desirable or undesirable. Some juvenile officers may be more lenient in judging conditions in a home. Thus one may find that certain police officers are quick to label a home undesirable if there is illegitimacy involved. Another officer may judge the same home desirable despite the illegitimacy factor, if other conditions are favorable to normal living.

One must keep always in mind that to measure adequacy of supervision with accuracy and precision is difficult. One must proceed with caution in working with records involving judgments by
the recorders. Adequacy and inadequacy of supervision are not two fixed points of standard reference but extend over a whole range of undefined values. Also, interpretation of circumstances is often an arbitrary one subject to the judgment of the investigator, as stated above.

Another example of this subjectivity of judgment is shown in the very pertinent quotation just cited in which the Gluecks use the term "conscientious" in comparing the supervision of children of working and non-working mothers. Conscientiousness itself not only admits of degrees but introduces new factors, both psychological and sociological, as well as moral and situational. A very concentrated effort must be made to maintain an objective viewpoint in a case like this. A mother confronted with the accusation of not being "conscientious" in providing for the supervision of her delinquent child will attempt to justify herself with any one of a number of excuses which will tend to efface the investigator's opinion that she is not conscientious.

Even in the face of this danger just discussed the most significant fact remains that amid the mosaic of factors that play a causative role in the behavior of children, absence of the mother from the home engaged in work elsewhere seems to be correlated with delinquency in a remarkably high percentage of cases.

It is obvious that this absence of the mother from the home, her attempt to fulfill two consuming roles that often conflict with each other, together with many other factors that derive therefrom,
set in motion events and conditions that easily bring about delinquency in the child. That the mother works does not necessarily imply that she is not conscientious in arranging for the supervision of her children; and the tendency of the investigator to link with the factor of inadequacy of supervision in the case of working mothers a lack of conscientiousness is not objective proof. But in the last analysis the facts, as have been pointed out so often, indicate a direct association between working of mothers and the delinquency of their children, and in a parallel fashion, the labeling of the conditions in the home of the working mother and delinquent children as inadequately supervised. These are the objective facts. How one judges them, and more important, what society should do about them, involve considerations and decisions that are far beyond the compass of this research project.

In view of this close relationship between working mothers and poor supervision, one may conclude that in the construction of the Social Prediction Table by the Gluecks in Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, along with supervision as one of the five factors, should have been included the sixth factor, working mothers.
CHAPTER III

INSTITUTIONALIZED TEENAGERS AND THEIR MOTHERS

According to the 1957 report on juvenile delinquency, commitments to boys' institutions in a midwestern state showed an increase of 48% over 1956. "The figure represents nearly one thousand more juveniles than the average number of commitments for the five-year period from 1951 to 1955, and more than triple the total commitments of ten years ago."\(^1\) It should be noted, however, that about twenty percent of the increase in population in the institutions resulted from the new law raising the commitment age of boys to eighteen years. The correctional school for girls in the same state had a decrease of 33% in commitments for 1957. The average daily population of the girls' school was below capacity in 1957 as compared with the boys' school which stretched over the maximum capacity in its average daily population.\(^2\)

The children in these institutions are termed delinquent. There is an antisocial behavior problem in each case. Each antisocial behavior problem was brought about by a complexity of fac-

\(^1\)"The Hour Glass," *Illinois State Training School for Boys*, XVI (February 1958), 1.

\(^2\)Ibid.
tors, some one factor, perhaps, precipitating the delinquent act which led to the child's being institutionalized. The contributing factors may be many or few but each factor is of major importance since each serves as a link in the chain of circumstances binding the child to a release behavior almost inevitable. Working mothers may be such a contributing factor to this problem of delinquency because "the home is still regarded as the key to the prevention of juvenile delinquency. It is here that the basic formation of the human personality goes on, the habits and customs that are foundational and the view of the world--including religion--are absorbed."  

To further test the hypothesis, working mothers are a contributing factor to juvenile delinquency, a representative group of teenagers from two correctional institutions in a midwestern state was interviewed by means of questionnaire. Two hundred fifty questionnaires were distributed to the boys in their school. One hundred sixty (70.80%) were returned with all questions completed; sixty-five (28.76%) questionnaires were returned fairly well completed; one blank questionnaire (0.44%) was returned with the notation: "Questionnaring is to [sic] personal." Two hundred fifty questionnaires were sent to the girls in their school of which one hundred sixty-one (72.19%) were returned with all questions completed; sixty-two (27.81%) returned with most of the

questions answered.

All the returned questionnaires (449), both completed and incompleted ones, were considered in the analysis of the institutionalized delinquents. The questionnaire was designed so that occasional omissions of answers to questions would not radically change the value of the findings.

The most significant question (Did your mother have a job away from home?, Q. 25) was answered by the majority of the institutionalized children. Only twenty-two of four hundred forty-nine delinquents failed to indicate "yes" or "no" in regard to the working of the mother outside the home.

Of these four hundred forty-nine institutionalized children four hundred seven had mothers living at the time of this study; forty-two had mothers deceased. Table XIII shows the number and percent of working mothers of the four hundred seven institutionalized children.
TABLE XIII

WORKING MOTHERS AND NON-WORKING MOTHERS OF THE
FOUR HUNDRED SEVEN INSTITUTIONALIZED
DELINQUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working mothers</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>58.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-working mothers</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>35.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine whether or not use of all questionnaires, in
preference to using only wholly completed ones, would give a true
picture a comparison was made between the values for question
twenty-five for the set of completed questionnaires (321) and for
all the questionnaires (449).

TABLE XIV

WORKING MOTHERS AND NON-WORKING MOTHERS OF THE THREE
HUNDRED TWENTY-ONE DELINQUENTS WHO ANSWERED THE
QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETELY AND WHO HAD
MOTHERS LIVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent Total Q.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working mothers</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>59.81</td>
<td>58.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-working mothers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>40.19</td>
<td>35.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table XIII
The difference of percentages between $\frac{WM}{D}$ from total questionnaires returned and from completed questionnaires returned was 1.09, which difference is not significant. Therefore, in the tables which follow the total number of questionnaires will be used: four hundred forty-nine for all the delinquents; two hundred thirty-nine for delinquents with working mothers.

Figures 2 and 3 give graphically the distribution of the working mothers and the non-working mothers of the institutionalized boys and girls.
FIGURE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF WORKING AND NON-WORKING MOTHERS OF TWO HUNDRED ELEVEN IDC BOYS
FIGURE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF WORKING AND NON-WORKING MOTHERS OF ONE HUNDRED NINETY-SIX IDG GIRLS
The comparison of values for the IDC group studied by the writer with those of the Gluecks follows:

(Gluecks) Working mothers of delinquents . . 46.4%
Working mothers of IDC group . . 58.7%

Difference . . +12.3

Where the total number of working mothers was considered, the ratio $\frac{WM}{D}$ for the IDC group was higher than the Gluecks' value for their $\frac{WM}{D}$ by 12.3. Although both groups of delinquents were institutionalized, the present study included both boys and girls. Were only the boys to be compared the IDC ratio $\frac{WM}{D}$ would yet have the higher value:

(Gluecks) Working mothers of delinquent boys . . 46.4%
IDC boys (Figure 2) . . . . . . 55.0%

Difference . . +8.6

The percentage of mothers working full time and of those mothers working part time of the two hundred thirty-nine working mothers of the IDC group was found in order to compare these figures with those of the Gluecks.

---

4 IDC--Institutionalized Delinquent Children.
TABLE XV
WORK SCHEDULE OF TWO HUNDRED THIRTY-NINE WORKING MOTHERS OF THE IDC GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>88.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Gluecks) Regularly employed M. of D. . . 43.3%
(IDC) Full time working mothers . . 88.3%
Difference . . . +45.0

(Gluecks) Occasionally emp. M. of D . . 56.6%
(IDC) Part time working mothers . . 11.7%
Difference . . . -44.9

This comparison shows that the IDC group does not follow the pattern of the Gluecks' results as to the sporadic working mother: among delinquents, a higher proportion of mothers worked only irregularly. The IDC group exceeds the Gluecks by a wide margin of 45.0 in full time employment and a difference of 44.9 less than the Gluecks in the percentage of part time working mothers.

It was necessary to make a profile of the IDC groups in order that the factor selected for this study, working mother, be in its complete and proper setting. Figure 4 shows the age level of the boys and girls to whom the questionnaires were distributed. The

5"Working Mothers and Delinquency," 349.
highest number of boys was in the fifteen year age group\(^6\) with one hundred eighteen boys; the highest number of girls was in the fifteen and sixteen year age groups, each group having sixty-six girls. There were five boys twelve years old and one boy nineteen years old. The three youngest girls were twelve years, the two oldest girls were twenty years of age. The median age of the boys was fifteen years; the median age of the girls was sixteen years. The Gluecks in their study, *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*, found the median age of the boys to be fourteen and eight-tenths (14.8) years.\(^7\) The Children's Bureau gave the average (median) age of the children in training schools as sixteen years.\(^8\)

---

\(^6\) This does not give a true age level of all the boys in the institution but only of the group to whom questionnaires were distributed. This group represented about 31.3% of the entire enrollment at the time of distribution.

\(^7\) Rubin, 110.

FIGURE 4

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-SIX BOYS* 
AND TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-THREE GIRLS IN TWO 
STATE CORRECTIONAL SCHOOLS

*Three boys omitted ages.
Although the child at odds with society is younger today than a generation ago the fertile ground for delinquency has not changed. It is still the urban community.9 The city offers more leisure without proper guidance and urban life is often characterized by impersonal relationships. These impersonal relationships create a thriving climate for the emergence of variant norms, values, attitudes, group standards. This is not so prevalent in the country or small town. There, neighbor knows neighbor and all assume greater responsibility for the welfare of individuals, especially for the children.10 The IDC groups studied in this thesis follow the urban pattern in regard to residence. The majority of boys and girls lived in large cities while only a very small number of each group lived in the country. The small town was fairly well represented by both groups.11


10Clendenen, p. 178.

11Large cities here mean urbanized areas having 50,000 or more inhabitants. Country means any rural area. Small town means any area not included in the other two definitions. These are not the usually accepted definitions. According to the 1950 Census of Population the definition of urban includes: (1) places of 2500+ inhabitants incorporated as cities, borough, villages; (2) incorporated towns of 2500+ except in New England, New York, or Wisconsin where towns are simply minor civil divisions of counties; (3) densely settled urban fringe, both incorporated and unincorporated, around cities of 50,000+; (4) unincorporated places of 2500+ outside any urban fringe. 1950 Census of Population, U. S. Bureau of Census, I (Washington, 1953).
Figure 5 shows the areas of residence of the total IDC group. Because of the specificity of this study, working mothers and delinquency, Table XVI was constructed to show the areas of residence of the IDC group who had working mothers to compare with the percentage found in Figure 5.
TABLE XVI

AREAS OF RESIDENCE OF TWO HUNDRED THIRTY-NINE IDC'S WHO HAVE WORKING MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>62.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The city was most represented in both the total group of IDC as well as the working mother group of IDC. The highest percentages, representing city dwellers, give strength to the validity of the statement made by Sheriff Lohman "that juvenile delinquency is largely an urban phenomenon."12

Whether the child lives in a city, in the country, or in a small town, he needs companionship to develop his personality. Good family living can contribute a great deal to this development. Many of the child's experiences, from simple emotional relationships in early infancy to the more complex moral, social, and religious experiences of adolescence, can be satisfied in normal family living. "It is within the home environment that the requisite

give and take of genuine social effectiveness is developed or aborted.\textsuperscript{13} Large families can provide more experiences and develop better social relationships than small families of one or two children. Overstreet states:

The larger the number of children in a home the more effective the community of children is likely to be. While they will, on occasion, have feuds among themselves and form subgroups of companionship, each child—where there are a number—is likely to have someone to be with in time of need. Also, the larger the number of children the less intense is likely to be the competition for adult notice and affection.\textsuperscript{14}

It is interesting to note that in the two IDC groups there is an inverse ratio between delinquency and number of siblings where the number of siblings is equal to or exceeds three (Tables XVII and XVIII).

In Table XVII and Tables XVIII the left vertical numbers represent the position of the delinquent child in the family: number one representing the oldest child; number two, the second oldest child, etc. The horizontal numbers on the top of the tables represent the number of children in the family: number one means an only child; number two means two children in the family; the last number represents twelve or more children in the family.

The oldest child, including the only child, has the highest frequency in both boys' and girls' groups (63 boys, 62 girls). The


\textsuperscript{14}Quoted by Schneiders in "Family Culture," pp. 164-165.
second child of the family is next in frequency in the boys' group (55 boys); in the girls' group the youngest child\textsuperscript{15} holds the second place (52 girls). The third child is next in frequency in the boys' group (48 boys), while the second child comes next in rank in the girls' group (46 girls). The ninth and tenth children of the boys' group are the least represented in the frequency table, three boys each. The ninth child of the girls' group is represented by only one girl, while the frequency for the tenth child has a slight increase, six girls in this group.

\textsuperscript{15}This is shown in Table XVIII by the diagonal line with arrows.
TABLE XVII
FREQUENCY TABLE SHOWING NUMBER OF SIBLINGS AND RANK IN FAMILIES
OF 226 BOYS IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of siblings in family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVIII
FREQUENCY TABLE SHOWING NUMBER OF SIBLINGS AND RANK IN FAMILIES
OF 223 GIRLS IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of siblings in family</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sibling relationship contributes a great deal to each child's development. The child derives the feeling of belonging, of security, of affection. The sense of belonging, of security, of affection, is of primary importance in the prevention of delinquency. If preventive measures were operative for all children society would not need to concern itself with remedial action for delinquency. Delinquency is like a cancer cell which has a microscopic beginning. There are a number of factors that work unseen, unfelt, until the malignancy gets out of control. A very thorough examination in the early stages by a competent person could perhaps prevent the serious augmentation of the illness. One of the earliest symptoms of delinquency is truancy.

The United States Children's Bureau calls truancy "the kindergarten of crime." Truancy indicates that something is wrong and that help is needed. Truancy is an escapism for the child who finds himself bored. This boredom is likely to have deeper roots than what appears on the surface; a child may be frustrated, confused, insecure, inadequate to compete. The truant child should be studied to discover if his truancy is an indicator of deeper problems. The Gluecks state that "truancy cannot in itself necessarily be regarded as definitively causal of delinquency for a-


17 Higgins and Fitzpatrick, p. 373.
part from the fact that to some extent it occurs among non-delinquents... it often follows (or accompanies) delinquency already embarked upon.\textsuperscript{18} For society truancy has an irritant value: it makes society aware that something is wrong. Truancy also serves a diagnostic purpose: society should find out what is wrong.

To the question "Have you ever been truant from school?" (Q. 10) only a few children stated that they had never been truant from school. The majority of the IDC boys and girls replied that they had tried it a few times.

\textbf{TABLE XIX}

\textbf{TRUANCY OF TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-SIX BOYS AND TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-THREE GIRLS BEFORE COMING TO THE CORRECTIONAL SCHOOL}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few times</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>47.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>20.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer given</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comparison of the truancy factor of the total IDC group (Table XIX) with the IDC group having working mothers, Table XX

\textsuperscript{18}"Working Mothers and Delinquency," 330.
was constructed to show number and percent of the IDC group having working mothers and who had been truant.

TABLE XX

TRUANCY FREQUENCY OF TWO HUNDRED THIRTY-NINE IDC'S HAVING WORKING MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>87.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-truancy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that 87.5% of the delinquents having working mothers had been truant, whereas 82.8% of the total number of delinquents had been truant. This close agreement of values does not allow any statement to be made regarding the relationship of working mothers and delinquency.

The Gluecks found 65.6% of their delinquent group having working mothers had been truant from school at the age of ten years or younger. This particular age factor was not noted in the writer's questionnaire and accounts for the higher value of truancy (87.5%) for the IDC group having working mothers.

Truancy from school may lead to, or result from, truancy from church. Some church affiliation is usually claimed by each child. This is an evidence that the child recognizes society's attitude toward religion and that the child feels, unconsciously perhaps, that his claim to some church affiliation will raise his status in
the adult's mind. Table XXI shows the church affiliation of the four hundred forty-nine children.

TABLE XXI
CHURCH AFFILIATION OF TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-SIX IDC BOYS AND TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-THREE IDC GIRLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>62.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>32.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tabulation of church affiliation as that above is in itself superficial and meaningless. It is the attitude which the child has toward religion and moral behavior which would provide positive correlation between religion and juvenile delinquency. It

19 The child's attitudes toward religion are conditioned by many factors operating within his psychological world, including past experiences and the present state of mind that sees the value of forming an attitude, pro or con. A child forced to attend church services against his will might form hostile attitudes toward religion; a child who feels himself rejected or unwanted by adults might find little solace in attending services every Sunday. Influence of gangs may operate in keeping a child from participation in religious worship. Curiosity, expediency, good example, on the other hand, may inspire a child to form favorable attitudes toward religion. Sister M. Dominic, R.G.S., "Religion and the Juvenile Delinquents," The American Catholic Sociological Review, XI (October 1954), 256-264.
is beyond the scope of this thesis, however, to discuss the ways in which man's religious concern enters into all social problems. Questions about church affiliation and church attendance were included in the questionnaire to the teenagers to show that the average child, as stated above, will claim to go to some church some of the time.

Church attendance is shown in Table XXII. "Sometime" is the child's own interpretation of his attending services, which lies between "Every Sunday" attendance and "Never" attending.

**TABLE XXII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every Sunday</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>39.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometime</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>55.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no factor, no aspect of the child's life, that does not contribute its share of effects, either good or bad, on the individual. The most sensitive and indelible imprint is that made by family living, that face-to-face primary group-living. As Schneiders says:

Let us keep reminding ourselves that the family is the
primary social unit, not the neighborhood or the community within which the family moves. Its responsibilities, and its potentialities for good or for harm, are much greater than those of secondary social units.20

Not all the children in this study were fortunate to have both parents living and to share in normal family living. Table XXIII shows the number of IDC children who had fathers and/or mothers living.

TABLE XXIII

NUMBER OF PARENTS LIVING OF TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-SIX IDC BOYS AND TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-THREE IDC GIRLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mothers living</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>90.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers living</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>57.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No total given as numbers overlap.

The marital status of these parents is given in the following table.

### TABLE XXIV

**MARITAL STATUS OF PARENTS OF FOUR HUNDRED FORTY-NINE IDC BOYS AND GIRLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living together</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>42.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated, mother not remarried</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>19.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated, mother remarried</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>22.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent deceased</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marital status of the working mothers of the two hundred thirty-nine IDC's is given in Table XXV.
TABLE XXV
MARITAL STATUS OF WORKING MOTHERS OF TWO HUNDRED THIRTY-NINE IDC'S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living together</td>
<td>57 (49.13%)</td>
<td>28 (22.76%)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>35.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated, mother not remarried</td>
<td>24 (20.69%)</td>
<td>44 (35.77%)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated, mother remarried</td>
<td>24 (20.69%)</td>
<td>38 (30.89%)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father deceased</td>
<td>9 (7.75%)</td>
<td>10 (8.13%)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2 (1.74%)</td>
<td>3 (2.55%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One might again assume, as in Chapter II, that working mothers who were living with their husbands were economically pressed to seek employment outside the home. This might again be compared to Gluecks' Tables IX and XII.

Children of working mothers--father's work habits not good

| Gluecks' delinquents | . . . . . . 68.1% |
| IDC groups           | . . . . . . 35.6% |
| Difference            | . . . -32.5 |

Children of working mothers--family financially dependent

| Gluecks' delinquents | . . . . . . 36.0% |
| IDC groups           | . . . . . . 35.6% |
| Difference            | . . . -0.4 |

The IDC group whose fathers' work habits were not good was much lower percentage-wise than the Gluecks' delinquent group. The
IDC group whose mothers worked and whose family was financially dependent was very close to the Gluecks' group, difference of 0.4.

The less-cohesiveness of the family of the IDC group who had working mothers separated, remarried, widowed, was not as marked as in the Gluecks' delinquent group whose family was not a cohesive unit and whose mothers worked.

Children of working mothers--family not a cohesive unit

| Gluecks' delinquents | 89.7% |
| IDC groups          | 62.4% |

Difference: -27.3

The above IDC groups includes both boys and girls, whereas the Gluecks studied only boys. Taking only the IDC boys' percentage and comparing it with the Gluecks a somewhat similar pattern to the one above evolves.

Boys of working mothers--father's work habits not good

| Gluecks' delinquents | 68.1% |
| IDC boys            | 49.1% |

Difference: -19.0

Boys of working mothers--family financially dependent

| Gluecks' delinquents | 36.0% |
| IDC boys            | 49.1% |

Difference: +13.1

Boys of working mothers--family not a cohesive unit

| Gluecks' delinquents | 89.7% |
| IDC boys            | 49.1% |

Difference: -40.6

The Gluecks' groups are again higher in all these comparisons except in the financially dependent family where the IDC boys show a difference of 13.1.
Breakup of the home has a pernicious influence on all children. But society today accepts this breakup of the family "with little remorse and a somewhat revolting equanimity." There is no substitute for a wholesome home environment where mother, father, children, function as a unifying whole. This has not always been the case with the four hundred forty-nine institutionalized children studied in this thesis.

TABLE XXVI
ADULT WITH WHOM CHILD LIVED BEFORE COMING TO THE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother and father</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>42.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>33.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of these children seemed to realize their lack of normal family living. One of the sixteen year old girls wrote on her questionnaire: "Most of my life I've been in foster homes." An-

---

other sixteen old girl stated she had lived with foster parents "ever since I was born." A seventeen year old girl's answer to "How long did you live with other relatives?" (Q. 24) read: "Two years with my mother, two years with my aunt, eight years with my father, three and one-half years with my grandmother, and nine months with my husband." Should one expect to find stability and security in such a child!

The answers to the question "Do you love your mother?" (Q. 36) brought forth various responses. To one girl this question seemed superfluous and answered: "Yes, but such a dumb question." Another girl wrote: "Of course I do. Why do you ask?" To other boys and girls (14 boys, 43 girls) this question inflamed their love for their mother once again as was shown in the vehement underlinings of "yes" or "yes, with all my heart" or "very, very, very much" or the "yes" enclosed within a drawing of a valentine heart.
### TABLE XXVII

**ANSWERS GIVEN BY THE FOUR HUNDRED FORTY-NINE IDC BOYS AND GIRLS TO THE QUESTION: "DO YOU LOVE YOUR MOTHER?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>98.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Love for one's parents is not innate. It must be nurtured and fostered. Of the three boys who answered negatively two had lived with their mothers, the third boy had not. The one boy who answered "I don't know" had lived with his mother only three months in infancy, nine years with relatives, and three years with foster parents before coming to the institution. The six girls who answered "No" had mothers living, three of the girls having lived with their mothers before coming to the institution. Of these three girls one wrote: "No, definitely!" Of the three girls who were ambivalent about their love for their mothers, two had lived with their mothers, one had not. One of the girls who had lived with her mother and did not know if she loved her mother or not had this to say: "Yes and no because Sometime I feel that I hate her for Some of the thing [sic] she has done to me. And also I love her for helping [sic] go to school And lots of little things
she has done." Two boys and three girls included their fathers in their answers to their love for their mothers. These five children stated they loved their fathers too.

Of the four hundred forty-nine children, one hundred eighty-six boys and one hundred seventy-four girls had fathers living. Table XXVIII shows the occupation of these three hundred sixty fathers.
TABLE XXVIII

*OCCUPATION OF THE FATHERS OF THE ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY-SIX BOYS AND ONE HUNDRED SEVENTY-FOUR GIRLS WHO HAD FATHERS LIVING AT THE TIME OF THE CHILDREN'S BEING INSTITUTIONALIZED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation of fathers</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers and farm management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, officials, proprietors</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and kindred workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm laborers and foremen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>30.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients in hospital</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Classification based on categories as found in U.S. Census Population 1950, Special Report, P-E No. 2-A; General Characteristics of families, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Prepared under the supervision of Howard Burnsman, Chief, Population and Housing Division, p. 2 A-13.

**In prison.
The laboring class is the most represented in this group of working fathers; the professionals are the least represented. Statistics of detentioned delinquents show the same picture: the children come from the lower socioeconomic class. The Gluecks matched five hundred delinquents with five hundred non-delinquents who were from the lower socioeconomic class and although these authors have been criticized for their selection of this factor it would have been very difficult to get a large representative number of institutionalized delinquents from the higher classes of society.

"Wealth and social position ... do provide a certain degree of immunity against arrest."23

It would appear, if one can judge from the occupation table, that the average family had an income sufficient for present needs but not earning a saving wage.24 The high cost of present-day living would necessitate in some instances the mother's working to supplement the husband's income. In other cases the mothers, being widowed or separated from their husbands, were compelled to become breadwinners if they preferred not to be on the ADC list.

22Rubin, 108; Reiss, 281-282; Shaplin and Tiedemann, 544-548.


24A saving wage means sufficient income to meet, not merely the present necessities of life, but those of unemployment, sickness, death, and old age. "In other words, a saving wage constitutes an essential part of the definition of a living wage." NCWC, The Church and Social Order (Washington, D.C., 1940), p. 12.
Again, in some instances, the working mother, as the Gluecks suggest is the case with the sporadic working mothers in their study, may be "motivated ... by the enticement of getting away from household drudgery and parental responsibility."25

The particular time of day in which the mother is away from the home might affect the supervision26 of the children. Figure 6 shows the distribution of day-time and night-time work of the two hundred thirty-nine working mothers of the IDC groups.

---

FIGURE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF DAY-TIME AND NIGHT-TIME WORK OF TWO HUNDRED THIRTY-NINE WORKING MOTHERS OF THE IDC GROUP

25 "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 349.

The effect that the mother's being away from home had on these children is a most difficult, one might say, impossible, question to answer. It is not debatable that many working mothers have non-delinquent children, as we shall see in Chapter IV. What concerns us here is that these particular two hundred thirty-nine children, now institutionalized, had some particular disadvantageous situation and had mothers working away from the home.

Table XXIX shows the supervision pattern of the two hundred thirty-nine IDC delinquents who had working mothers.

**TABLE XXIX**

**SUPERVISION OF THE TWO HUNDRED THIRTY-NINE IDC'S WHO HAD WORKING MOTHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time spent while mother at work</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under supervision of an adult</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupervised</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>76.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>239</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representative of the manner in which some of these children spent their time while their mother was not at home are the following answers given by the children to the question: "How did you spend the time while your mother was not at home?" (Q. 30):
(Boys) Messed around town  
Went to pool room  
Hung around the corner  
Went to the show or girl friend's house  
Smoked and drank a little  
Went out and got into trouble  
Went to the dime store and stole  

(Girls) Slipped over to my friend's house  
Smoked and watched TV  
Never was home except to eat and sleep  
Stayed in hallways  
Went to a restaurant or hung around a corner  
Went to the park  
Went to school if I felt like it  
Did what I wanted to or got into trouble  
I'm not saying [sic]  

If one were to weigh these answers on a scale of true values it would be highly pertinent to ask whether the addition of the mother's paycheck to the family income is not dissipated by the attendant disadvantages to the children's welfare. "Good family life is never an accident but always an achievement by those who share it. Growing up is life's most unique experience; being a parent is life's most important responsibility."27 Could it be that our social value system should be re-appraised?  

In view of the considerations of this chapter the writer dares to hazard a statement that the high percentage of working mothers among delinquents (58.7%) is greatly responsible for the steady rise in juvenile delinquency noted in paragraph one of this chapter.  

---

CHAPTER IV

WORKING MOTHERS AND THEIR CHILDREN

In 1957 the number of working wives reached a record high of eleven million. Seven million of these women had children under eighteen years of age and this included over two and one-half million mothers with children under six.¹

Why do women work? To earn money for themselves and others is likely the obvious answer. Sheer economic necessities oftentimes make it imperative for many married women to work.² Secondly, the emphasis which our culture places on success makes many married women enter the labor market each year in order to fill


²"Economic necessity seems to be the principal reason why women with family responsibilities take up paid employment. In the majority of cases their employment is needed to bring the family income, whether derived from the husband's paid employment or from such payment as widow's benefits or pension benefits to which the woman is entitled herself, up to a subsistence level, a need which has become especially urgent because of the rising cost of living in recent years." "Part-time Employment for Women with Family Responsibilities," International Labor Review (June 1957), 545. Quoted in Rev. Jerome L. Toner's paper, "Married Working Women," given at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Economic Association, Philadelphia, December 28, 1957. (Unpublished paper).
their homes with luxuries (the object of success). Thirdly, some married women find the monotony of home life boring and seek employment outside the home in order to achieve more satisfaction in the completion of a career; or they feel such work is necessary for a fuller self-development. All these working mothers are double-duty mothers and their number has steadily increased through the years.

What effect the mothers' working has on the family, especially the children, is still clouded with uncertainty. This uncertainty of society of the effect that mothers' working has on the children gave impetus to this study. Five hundred working mothers employed in office, factory, store, or professional services, were interviewed by questionnaire to ascertain what effect, they felt, their working outside the home had on their children. Two hundred fifty-two (54.0%) of the five hundred mothers returned completed questionnaires.

3 American women today enjoy the highest standards of living in history, are the best dressed, the best housed women anywhere, with the least drudgery, most freedom, widest opportunity to enrich their lives. But all these benefits seem to put pressure on the women to seek for more materialistic goals. Helen Sherman and Marjorie Coe, The Challenge of Being a Woman (New York, 1955), pp. 6-11.

4 A person is not born loving money. One learns to love it and the amount of money one feels one needs is in part culturally determined. William Foote Whyte and Frank B. Miller, "Industrial Sociology," Review of Sociology, ed by Joseph B. Gittler (New York, 1957), p. 308.

5 Toner, 5.
It is well to state here that questionnaires are valid to the extent that the respondents' answers are factually true. The type of questionnaire used in this study was of the kind to elicit truthful answers from the working mothers to all the questions except, perhaps, those regarding the character of their children. It is a strange fact that living in our American society today implies a double standard. Some people in our society attach no stigma to the fact that husband and wife separate, divorce one another, thereby breaking up normal family living for their children. The women interviewed seemed not to deny the fact and stated it blandly. But when the pertinent question was asked about their children, their behavior problem, their tendency to pre-delinquent habits, the working mothers with very few exceptions answered with very defined pen strokes that their children had never been truant from school and definitely were not known to court for any reason. It is notoriously difficult to get an honest answer from parents to questions of this kind. The parents seem to shield themselves under the cloak of their children's seemingly good behavior.

Regardless of any variables in their own lives, the mothers, because of their strategic position in relation to their children, should be the first ones to detect any tendency in their children to pre-delinquency. But parents, especially mothers, as stated above, are usually the last ones to acknowledge any such proneness.

---

in their offspring. Parents do not fail their children through design or malice but through neglect, ignorance, or unwillingness to see the "mote". The question, "Have your children ever been truant from school?" (Q.30), was the most delicate and the one which, perhaps, irked the majority of the working mothers. This question of truancy evoked the answer "No" in two hundred forty-three cases. Some of these negative answers, of course, were understandable—the children were of pre-school age. In the other cases, the answers "decrescendooed" from "Emphatically no!", "Definitely never!" to "Not to my knowledge" or "I hope not." Only nine mothers stated their children had been truant from school.

TABLE XXX

TRUANCY FREQUENCY OF CHILDREN OF TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-TWO WORKING MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times truant</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>96.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few times</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these children who had been truant once or several times, one does not conclude that they are delinquent children, nor even tending toward problem children. "Children appear no worse for
very occasional and slight experimental deviations from socially acceptable norms of conduct."7 However, truancy can very easily lead to other norms of unacceptable behavior and the interested parent should attempt to discover or uncover other inconsistencies in the child's behavior.

One of the children who had been truant a few times had been apprehended and brought before the court for committing delinquent acts. Another child, whose mother stated he had never been truant, had also been known to court for his delinquent acts. In neither case was the boy an only child of the family. In the first case, the boy had three sisters; the second case, the boy had two brothers and one sister. One mother had no high school education; the other mother had completed her high school. This second mother wrote: "This questionnaire cannot be answered accurately because not all the answers apply to all our children. Each one is different in his activities, interests, and behavior. Only one has been a worry to us."

The percent of delinquency found among the children of this group of working mothers was 0.79 ($\frac{D}{WM}$). One must allow for certain latitude in this figure because of the subjectivity with which this problem dealt. Certitude was grounded on human testimony and human testimony is accepted with moral certitude and not

7Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, pp. 13-14
with metaphysical or with physical certitude. 8

The ages of these two hundred fifty-two working mothers ranged from nineteen years to sixty-two years, the median age being forty years. Significantly, this average age coincides with that of all married women in the working force today. The average (median) age of women workers has been advancing ever since the turn of the century, when it was twenty-six years. By 1940, it was thirty-two years. In April 1956, it was thirty-nine and one-half years. 9

---

8 Furfey, p. 64.

TABLE XXXI

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-TWO WORKING MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No age given</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all these age groups the women, with the exception of six, were native born. The six foreign-born women came from Canada (2), Germany, Austria, Italy, Yugoslavia; their residence here in the states varied from two years to thirty years.

Of this group of working mothers the great majority lived in the city; only three lived on farms but were employed in the city.

Church attendance of these working mothers was very high.
TABLE XXXII

CHURCH ATTENDANCE OF TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-TWO WORKING MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every week</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>77.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometime</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The example given to the children by the mother is a dominant factor in the life of the growing child.

The size of the family is important to consider when viewing the question of gainful employment of mothers. No one realizes more than the mother the expense of keeping children in shoes, clothing, to say nothing of medical bills, dental bills, school items, that mount with each successive year of the child's life. However, the size of the family has declined. At the time of the first census, in 1790, the average number of persons per family was 5.7. One hundred years later it was 4.9. By 1940, the average size of the American family had fallen to 3.8; and today it is around 3.6.10 The average size family of the two hundred fif-

---

ty-two working mothers was two children (2.5).

TABLE XXXIII

SIZE OF FAMILY OF TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-TWO WORKING MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in family</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average size of the working mother family was below the average size of all the American families by 1.1 children. There are no national figures available to show the number of children working mothers have in comparison with the number of children non-working mothers have. Complex interaction of various circumstances affect the number of children in a family. The working of the mother might well be one of the more decisive factors resulting in the fewer number of children of these two hundred fif-
ty-two working mothers. However, one must take into consideration the ages of these working mothers. The majority of them (179 or 71.0%) were in their child-bearing years and consequently the true size of the completed family cannot be ascertained at this time.

Although statistically national information is not available giving the number and percentage of children of working mother families, statistics do give the percentage of working mothers living with their husbands who had children six to seventeen years of age, and percentage of working mothers living with their husbands who had children under six years of age.\textsuperscript{11}

In 1957

National average: 36.0% of all working mothers living with their husbands had children 6-17 years of age.

This study: 58.3% of 208 working mothers living with their husbands had children 6-17 years of age.

In 1957

National average: 16.0% of all working mothers living with their husbands had children under six years of age.

This study: 22.7% of 208 working mothers living with their husbands had children under six years of age.

The average number of children per family of the two hundred


\textsuperscript{12}Two hundred eight of the two hundred fifty-two working mothers were living with their husbands. See Table XXXVIII, p. 103.
fifty working mothers was less than the national average but the percentage of dependent children of the two hundred eight working mothers was higher in both the above age levels. This is due in part to the large percentage (71.0%) of working mothers' questionnaires having been distributed to the young-medium age group of mothers (Table XXXI).

Not only the size of family but the age group of the children must be considered in this question of mothers working outside the home. "Many observers have been quick to attribute the reported rise in juvenile delinquency to the absence of working mothers from the home. But others—who also stress the importance of the mother to the child's development—believe that several questions must be answered before a balanced judgment can be reached about the consequences of the employment of mothers for children. How old must a child be—two, six, eighteen—before the mother can safely leave the home for part or all of the day?"13

The Gluecks state that "where sound and organized factual data are lacking, the winds of opinion can blow in any direction."14 It might be true that "after a child grows older (after the crucial years) a woman can pursue work outside the home."15 But when are these crucial years? Every child is unique. To one child the


14 "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 328.

pre-school period may be the important time when he needs much mothering for growth in a healthy personality and inculcation of basic habits; to another, the grade school period is vital to his finding his mother at home all of the twenty-four hours for the building of his character; to a third child, the turbulent teens are the crucial times when he needs to know that his mother is at home to help, guide, direct him. The child at any age, at two, six, or eighteen, has the right to expect the mother to be at home when he needs her. That mother-is-at-home feeling gives the child a sense of security, which in turn makes him able to love and relate himself to other persons sufficiently to make a personal adjustment to social standards in his contact with school, church, and community. It is difficult, one would dare say nigh to impossible, to determine when a child can go on his own motherless-ly. It is a gamble that the working mother takes when she signs up for her employment outside the home.

Absence of the mother from the home means absence of opportunity for the child to be directed by her in his growing emotionally, physically, spiritually. The child must be disciplined consistently, firmly, affectionately, if his personality traits are to develop and intensify to their utmost for good. The home is the main training school of the child. It is in the home under the supervision of the mother where the primary shaping of charac-

ter takes place. A "mother-always-here" home creates a healthy atmosphere and climate where mutual love and understanding between parent and child flourish and develop.\footnote{17}

Many of the two hundred fifty-two working mothers studied had children in the grade and high school age group. Perhaps these mothers had ambivalent feelings about their jobs and the effects on their growing children but to them their work at this time was a necessity.

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Distribution of Two Hundred Fifty-Two Mothers Who Had Children in the Different Age Levels}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Age level of child & Number & Percent \\
\hline
5 months to 5 years & 55 & 21.82 \\
5 years to 11 years & 195 & 77.37 \\
12 years to 18 years & 181 & 71.81 \\
Older & 32 & 12.70 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

No total because numbers overlap. Some mothers had children in two or more age groups.

The age of these children ranged from five months to twenty-two years. Those in the younger age groups were definitely in need of supervision and care while the mother worked outside the home. The Gluecks place much emphasis on supervision. They pre-

\footnote{See pp. 46-48; also p. 105 of this paper on supervision.}
dict proneness to delinquency if supervision is inadequate. 18

The majority of these two hundred fifty-two working mothers were conscientious about arranging for the supervision of their children as given in Table XXXV.

**TABLE XXXV**

ADULTS WHO CARED FOR THE CHILDREN DURING WORK HOURS AWAY FROM HOME OF THE TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-TWO WORKING MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal grandmother</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal grandmother</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeper</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Nursery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage baby sitter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children cared for themselves</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother herself</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 68.3% of the families some supervision was provided by the

18 "Working Mothers and Delinquency," 329.
mother for the children. However, in 31.7% (80) of the cases the children cared for themselves. One cannot claim this to be adequate supervision unless other factors are known, for example, age of child, hours of mother's absence from home, siblings, etc. Of this group of eighty mothers who had provided no supervision for the children during the mother's work hours away from home, sixty-seven were living with their husbands, six were widows, seven were separated from their husbands.

TABLE XXXVI

MARITAL STATUS OF THE EIGHTY WORKING MOTHERS WHO PROVIDED NO SUPERVISION FOR CHILDREN DURING MOTHER'S WORK HOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family status</th>
<th>Age group of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-11 yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(67) Living together</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Husbands dead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Separated from husband</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80) Total</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The children in the older age group were capable of caring for themselves. Of the 12-17 age group the majority of these self-supervised children had siblings in the other group of older or younger children; two boys, 14 and 15 years, and three girls, 12, 13, 14 years, were only children. Of the 6-11 age group, all, except an eleven year old girl, had older siblings. None of these children of the eighty working mothers had been truant from school.
or had been known to court because of delinquent acts. Only two mothers worked evenings: one mother with three children, 12, 13, 15, worked from 5 p.m. until 1 a.m., two nights a week; the other mother with children 10, 11, 15 years, worked six days a week from 2 p.m. until 8 p.m. Both these women were living with their husbands. The other seventy-eight mothers had full time jobs, five days a week, working hours no later than 5 p.m.

The eighty mothers stated they spent much time with their children (Q. 27). Seventy-eight answered that their children always told where they were going when leaving the house; only two mothers answered "sometime" (Q. 25). All the mothers approved of their children's friends and helped entertain these friends often (Q. 22 and Q. 24).

Sixty-seven (26.6%) of these mothers, those having teenage and younger children, can be accused of not providing adequate supervision for their children. Supervision is held by the Gluecks to be of prime importance; it is one of the five factors in their prediction table for delinquency. Not one mother of this group having poor supervision for their children claimed that her child was delinquent or pre-delinquent. A possible explanation the Gluecks might have made to account for the non-delinquency of this group could be in another factor considered important by these authors, body types. It is not within the scope of this paper

19 Mesomorphs, endomorphs, ectomorphs, and the balanced type. The Gluecks state that so far as the problem of working mothers is
to determine if this theory of body types has any substantive va-

tue or if these sixty-seven mothers had any ectomorphic chil-
dren. It could be stated that it might be too early in the lives
of these children to have succumbed to the exposure to this delin-
quency-inducing effect, working mothers.

A variety of reasons, some good, some bad, governs choice of
work. The reasons why the two hundred fifty-two working mothers
were employed in gainful occupation indicated that they considered
themselves in some degree responsible for the support of depen-
dents (Table XXXVII).

concerned we need be most seriously concerned about ectomorphic
children because "employment of the mother outside the home was
found to have its most potent delinquency-inducing effect on ecto-
morphic youngsters, in contrast with those of the other body

Rubin states that the Gluecks tend to distinguish a phy-
sique type and yet these investigators admit there are, at this
time, no reliable distinguishable physique types. Rubin argues:
"Then what justification is there to include physique in the
'law'?" Rubin, p. 113.
TABLE XXXVII
REASONS WHY TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-TWO WORKING MOTHERS WERE EMPLOYED OUTSIDE THE HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illness of husband</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time job of husband</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband not living at home</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate wages of husband</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>45.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband deceased</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send children to school</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>45.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieve monotony of home life</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No total given because numbers overlap. Some women indicated several reasons for working.

*Others--help support mother, mother-in-law, invalid relative.

Two-paycheck families are increasing due to necessity and/or the desire to achieve or maintain a high standard of living, to have equal or higher status than the next door neighbor. A very high percentage (82.6%) of the two hundred fifty-two working mothers were living with their husbands, who also were employed, the
remaining small percentage were those who were separated from their husbands or whose husbands were deceased.

TABLE XXXVIII
MARITAL STATUS OF TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-TWO WORKING MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living together</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>82.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband deceased</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As has been stated above, the large percentage (82.6%) of these women were living with their husbands. No valid conclusion regarding the financial dependence or the poor working habits of these husbands can be made here because the majority of the husbands (87.0%) living with their wives were working full time; only a very small percentage (8.2%) were unemployed.
TABLE XXXIX
WORK SCHEDULE OF TWO HUNDRED EIGHT HUSBANDS WHO LIVED WITH THEIR WIVES WHO ALSO WORKED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>87.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be claimed that the two hundred fifty-two working mothers in this study were of a higher socioeconomic status than were those of the Gluecks' non-delinquent group.21 Nevertheless, the fact remains that the forty-four working mothers (17.45%, Table XXXVIII) could not be identified as having strong family cohesiveness. This 17.5%, however, is much less than the 48.6% of the Gluecks' less cohesive group of non-delinquents. Any significance attached to this comparison is undefinable.

A large majority of the two hundred fifty-two working mothers were employed full time; only a small minority worked part time.

Full time workers... 220... 87.3%
Part time workers... 32... 12.7%

21Fifty-nine percent of the writer's questionnaires were distributed to working mothers whose daughters attended a high-tuitioned secondary school. Another thirty percent of the questionnaires were distributed through Firm A to the working mothers employed in their secretarial-stenographic department.
The Gluecks in their study found the mothers who worked sporadically exerted the heaviest influence on the delinquency of their children. This cannot be proved in the present study because of the unreliability of the answers to the behavior of the children. Day and night hours of work would also have to be taken into consideration because of the importance of the mother's supervision of her children in their leisure-time and bed-time activities.

Day-time workers . . . 199 . . . 77.38%
Night-time workers . . . 53 . . . 22.62%

Information gleaned from the questionnaire of the working mothers affords small contribution in establishing the hypothesis that working mothers are a contributing factor to delinquency. Out of two hundred fifty-two working mothers only two acknowledged "delinquency" among their offspring. Much of the material in this chapter, however, offers interesting patterns of conjecture. Supervision of children by working mothers was adequate in a high percentage of cases. Might this not indicate the supercedence of the factor "adequacy of supervision" over working mothers? Supervision is of prime importance. As has been said, supervision affects the child in every aspect of his life. Supervision is the protective covering to insure a healthy growth to maturity physi-

22"Working Mothers and Delinquency," 349.

23See pp. 46-48; also pp. 96-97 of this paper on supervision.
cally, mentally, and morally. It is in a supervised home where a child develops mind, heart, personality, character. There can be no substitute for this important factor of supervision in the child's life. Consistent supervision of the child by the mother gives the child that mother-is-at-home feeling at all times which spells security.

Relative to the working habits of the women studied in this chapter the instance of a large proportion of full time working mother corresponds to the Gluecks' theory of the greater influence of the sporadic working mother toward delinquency. Apparent unity of the families of most of the working mothers could also account for the low delinquency value. This last observation, unity of family, broadly and loosely includes three of the five factors which the Gluecks use in their prediction tables: affection of boy by mother, affection of boy by father, family cohesiveness.24

The fulfillment of the five factors of the Gluecks seems to deter the children from delinquency even in the case where the mother works outside the home. Where working mothers do exert a deleterious influence on the children it is because this working of the mother functions as a cofactor in the case where one or more or all of the five factors are unfulfilled. These five factors of the Gluecks are more directly effective on the behavior of the children than is the working of the mother.

24Fourth factor, supervision, is stated above. No information was gathered in this study about the fifth factor, discipline of boy by father.
Society has established no definite status for the working wife. "It is undecided whether to reward or punish her for her emancipation-form of living, especially the working wife in the middle classes." 25 But there is little doubt that the frequent absence of the modern mother from her home tends to weaken her fundamental relationship with her growing children. "The result has frequently been an increase in insecurity and a strong feeling of rejection on the part of the child. These can be seeds of eventual maladjustment." 26


CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In summing up and evaluating this attempt to submit the Gluecks' study and conclusions to an empirical test by other independent data the compilation of the bare facts does not present as clear a picture as one would have expected. In all procedures of this kind one must be careful to accept the facts in purely objective fashion while at the same time exercise great caution in assessing and interpreting them. Thus on a purely mathematical basis the correlative results obtained had very uneven values.

Non-institutionalized delinquents: \[
\frac{\text{working mothers}}{\text{delinquents}} = 0.37
\]

Institutionalized delinquents: \[
\frac{\text{working mothers}}{\text{delinquents}} = 0.58
\]

Working mothers: \[
\frac{\text{delinquents}}{\text{working mothers}} = 0.0079
\]

Here we see a high value of 0.58 for the institutionalized delinquents, a low value of 0.0079 for the working mothers and falling between these two, the value 0.37 for the non-institutionalized delinquents.

Despite the unevenness of these results evidenced by the bland statistical facts the writer believes that on the basis of
the data collected here the proposed theory that working mothers are frequently a contributing factor to juvenile delinquency meets with clear and well-substantiated confirmation. When all supplementary factors are seen in the total overall pattern the contributing role which the working mother plays in juvenile delinquency is clearly revealed.

An exact understanding of the hypothesis demands that emphasis be placed on the word contributing. Not working mothers per se, but working mothers operating in the milieu of other delinquency-causing factors, augment the probability of delinquency occurring.

The methods employed in this research were decided upon in an endeavor to maintain this concentration on the word contributing. Accordingly eight points were drawn up with the expectation that adherence to them would render the data essentially reliable for the present investigation. As stated in the introduction they are:

1. The child must be a teenager.
2. The delinquent or non-delinquent status of the child must be definitely established.
3. The group studied should represent a fairly good cross-section of a given area.
4. All types of locations should be represented, that is, city, town, country.
5. All religious denominations should be represented.
6. All various types of school influences, public, private, should be represented.
7. All socioeconomic levels should be represented.
8. All types of family life situations, unity, separation, divorce, divorce and remarriage, should be included.

An important consideration which had to be made was whether this method, that is, selection of subjects so that they comprised a group in which all factors were allowed to vary, would give as true a general idea of the relationship of working mothers to delinquency as that employed by the Gluecks. It is to be recalled that the Gluecks had "constant" factors. They matched their delinquents and non-delinquents on a basis of residence in underprivileged area, age, ethnic origin, and intelligence. The criticism of this approach was that the subjects, particularly in the non-delinquent group, were not representative of the general population. In addition to these "constants" the Gluecks confined their study only to boys. With the conviction that greater authenticity would derive by allowing all factors to deviate in any direction, attention was given by the writer to such a selection of subjects as would comply with all eight points of the reliability table established by the writer. While this approach renders the interpretation of results more difficult, any other one would necessitate a modification of the hypothesis to a less general form. The influence of the working mother must function in the complete situational environment in order that its contributing effects be measurable. Were all other factors at an ideal level it is doubtful whether the mother's working would have undesirable effects upon her children's behavior.
To interpret properly the mathematical values quoted above they must be set in the background furnished by a consideration of the eight points established as essential for reliability of data. These mathematical values must be given special attention with reference to the outstanding work done in the field of juvenile delinquency by the Gluecks.

As stated in the introduction and for reasons cited there, the variables measured in this study were delinquents and working mothers. It cannot be denied that corresponding data from non-delinquents and from non-working mothers would certainly strengthen the validity of any final conclusion. However, the gathering of dependable material from a representative number of members of each of these groups was not feasible in the present study.

Juvenile delinquent teenagers were the object of this research. The first requisite, that of having an adequate representation of teenagers, was easily fulfilled in the case of the two children groups, the institutionalized delinquents and the non-institutionalized delinquents. All of the group participants in these two cases were teenagers. In the case of the institutionalized children the questionnaire was administered only to this age level. In the case of the YBP children, data for this age level were selected from the records. But in the case of the working mothers only one hundred eighty-one teenagers were represented in a total of two hundred fifty-two questionnaires returned from the five hundred distributed. However, this deviation from point one of reliability requisites does not present too great a threat to
the validity of the value, 0.0079 for delinquents. The two hundred fifty-two mothers were representative of the general working mother population of the area whose teenage children were non-delinquents. Even if the number of mothers contacted had been such that the number of teenagers represented corresponded with the number of delinquents in the other two groups, five hundred each, the value 0.0079 would not have changed radically.

A greater degree of difficulty was encountered in point two, the problem of establishing the delinquent or non-delinquent status of the child. It was originally the plan of the writer to consider only institutionalized delinquents. A delinquent was defined as any child coming in contact with the law because of a delinquent act. In the case of the institutionalized child, application of the definition was both easy and reliable. Here contact with the law led to judgment of the child's behavior as delinquent with consequent penalty of institutionalization. There was no room for doubt as to the child's status of delinquent. But establishing the delinquency of the Youth Bureau Park District offender on the basis of police apprehension was a questionable procedure. The Youth Bureau Park District records list offenses ranging markedly from repeated delinquent acts to single minor misbehaviors, such as are common to all children. One would be inclined to say that, with the exception of a small percentage who are true delinquents, here is a group of normal children who had the misfortune to be caught in a misdemeanor. An examination of the ratio
value for this group, $\frac{\text{working mothers}}{\text{delinquents}} = 0.37$, shows a close agreement between it and the Gluecks' value for their non-delinquent group, $\frac{\text{working mothers}}{\text{non-delinquents}} = 0.33$. This correspondence of these two values suggests a strong similarity between the YBP and the Gluecks' non-delinquents. One suspects the status of delinquency for the YBP group or of non-delinquency for the Gluecks' group. The difference between delinquents and non-delinquents in the Gluecks' study was more marked in the poor supervision values, 81.4 and 23.3 respectively, than in the family cohesiveness values, 98.7 and 48.6 respectively. Since the YBP poor supervision value, 47.8, and YEP family cohesiveness value, 30.0, lay between the Gluecks' non-delinquent and delinquent values for both factors (but favoring in each case the non-delinquent group), the writer was inclined to modify the label of the YEP to "pre-delinquents".

Finally, in the case of the working mother group there is only the mother's word, possibly biased, regarding the delinquency or non-delinquency status of the child. Argument for the truthfulness of the mothers' answers lies in the anonymity of the questionnaires and the interest of the mothers in answering them. It seems unlikely that this generosity of cooperation would be vitiated by deception when there was nothing to be lost by being truthful or to be gained by deceit. But the unfounded suspicion must be admitted that delinquency on the part of their children may have been the reason why two hundred forty-eight mothers out of five hundred did not answer the questionnaire. This is mere assumption
and certainly there were other reasons, such as lack of time, indifference, procrastination, which caused the working mother to disregard the questionnaire. This assumption, if true, modifies the whole picture of the number of working mothers having delinquents. But it does not change the status of delinquency of these two teenagers represented in the two hundred fifty-two questionnaires returned by working mothers. Other possible influences accounting for the low value, \( \frac{\text{delinquents}}{\text{working mothers}} = 0.0079 \), such as socioeconomic status, family cohesiveness, might be argued. These will be considered in their proper order.

Point three reads: the group studied should represent a fairly good cross-section of a given area. All three groups present a very cosmopolitan picture in this aspect of reliability. The YBP children cover a fairly wide area of Chicago as regards extension of distance, since they come from the north, south, east, and west parts of the city. The IDC delinquents represent a cross-section of the state of Illinois. And the working mothers are a typical selection in this regard from the working mothers in a medium-sized midwestern American city.

Statistics show that the greater number of juvenile delinquents are city residents. In light of this fact representation of different types of locations, that is, city, town, country, as demanded by point four of reliability, appears unnecessary. As in area cross-sectioning, the type of location itself does not cause delinquency but it largely governs the frequency and magnitude of
those factors that do cause it. For full analysis of the manner in which the working mother combines with those other factors to bring about delinquency, an attempt to represent all types of locations was requisite. Residence for the IDC group followed the expected pattern of concentration in cities but all types of location had some representation. The YBP group lived in a large city. Likewise the working mother group was comprised almost totally of city residents. As with delinquency frequency, the number of working mothers is greatest in the city. These being the facts it would be impossible to get a fair representation of city, town, country residents in the three groups. Since both factors, delinquency and working mothers, are inconsiderable in country area, the general conclusion is not modified, that is, that working mothers are a contributing factor to juvenile delinquency.

Religious convictions cannot be ignored in an attempt to attain a complete evaluation of the agencies directing the child toward fixed habits of behavior. To ascertain these religious convictions would demand carefully planned and repeated interviews with the individuals. Certainly for the present study contact with over two thousand subjects involved was impossible. But in an endeavor to demonstrate that the writer considers this aspect of religion a major influence, an attempt was made to satisfy point five, representation of all denominations. In all cases, that is, for the YBP group, the IDC group, and the working mothers, this was accomplished to a degree. It must be kept in mind, however, that the claim to belong to a religious sect does not mean that
the claimant knows, believes, or adheres to the tenets of that religion. Church affiliation data from the questionnaires have little statistical value. One significant fact, however, should be mentioned at this time. The majority of working mothers resided in a city which is 66% Catholic. The author feels that if it could be shown that these mothers practice their religion and inculcate in their children the principles of religion, some account might be made for the very low percent of delinquency among the children of this group. At the same time stress must be laid on the fact that other factors are at an ideal level for this particular group of women, that is, socioeconomic level and family cohesiveness. While point five of reliability was satisfied in every group the results are of little interpretive value, apart from the latter observation, higher socioeconomic level and family cohesiveness.

Education, too, is of prime importance in the forming of the child's habits. Very often a deficiency in the home can be compensated for in the classroom. In a system where inculcation of moral values has a part in the development of the whole child it is generally accepted that the child will be more amenable to the demands of society as regards right and wrong behavior. Admittedly, there are the exceptions, but unless this fact of benefits of moral training be accepted, millions of dollars and untold hours of manpower are annually thrown into the air by the private school

---

1Verified, Chancery Office, Joliet, July 1958.
systems. Here again is a factor which if kept at an ideal level would counteract much of the effect of the mother's working. Many of these two hundred fifty-two mothers studied had teenagers whose school life had been spent in the parochial system.

Given time and resources, a thorough study made, where the working mother was the only undesirable factor, would be most revealing. The working mother group in the present study seems to a large extent to be material for such a study.

The hypothesis, working mothers are a contributing factor to delinquency, demanded that every possible influence be considered. Both the YEP and the IDC children were products of every type of schooling. The fact that a large number of working mothers had teenagers in private schools was due to circumstances beyond the investigator's control and was not done designedly. Point six of reliability was probably not fulfilled in the case of the working mothers.

Point seven, the possibility of getting a representative sampling of all socioeconomic levels, was resolved by fact in a manner similar to the way in which residence representation was resolved. The delinquents in the institutions came from the lower and middle class families only. It will be recalled that only two of the boys' fathers and two of the girls' fathers were professional people. A similar picture is presented by the YEP children. The wealthy child is not a frequenter of the Police Youth Bureau. The same classes are represented by the working mother. The wealthy mother does not have to work. There is no financial pres-
sure and she has other avenues of escape to relieve boredom. In so far as the present study deals with those two classes where delinquency seems to occur for all three groups, YBP, IDC, and working mothers, point seven is satisfied.

Reliability of point eight necessitated an inclusion of all types of family situations, unity, divorce, separation, separation and remarriage. With the working mother, family unity existed in a large number of the working mother families contacted. For the other two groups, YBP and IDC, a composite picture of all types of family situations existed.

Adherence to the eight reliability points may be summarily stated as follows:
### TABLE XL

#### EIGHT RELIABILITY POINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The eight points</th>
<th>YBP</th>
<th>IDC</th>
<th>Working mothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teenagers</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Insufficient number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Delinquent status</td>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>Questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Area, cross-section</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Residence</td>
<td>Impossible to represent country proportionally since values are very low for D. and WM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Religious denomination</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Doubtful--largely one denomination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School type</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>As in #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Socioeconomic level</td>
<td>Lower-middle</td>
<td>Lower-middle</td>
<td>Lower-middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Family situations</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of the above, the data collected offered reliable basis for the formation of conclusions.

Relative to the subject of this study, the following contributions of the Gluecks are reviewed.

In general five factors were offered as a basis upon which delinquency could be predicted:

1. discipline of boy by father
2. attention of father for boy
3. affection of mother for boy
4. supervision of boy by mother
5. cohesiveness of family.
II In regard to the working mother and delinquency the Gluecks noted:

1. the sporadic working of the mother exerts greater influence on the delinquency of her children;

2. the working of the mother has greatest potent delinquency-inducing effect on ectomorphic boys.

III The Gluecks concluded that to the extent that the working of the mother contributes to the weakening of the family ties, the working mother can be said to contribute to the delinquency of her children.

To the extent that the values as based on the eight points are reliable and in so far as this research was a modification of the Gluecks in the following aspects:

1. more socioeconomic levels were included
2. working mothers were studied as a group
3. boys and girls were studied
4. other constants of the Gluecks were allowed to vary, for example, ethnic group, intelligence, neighborhood

the writer presents the following table in proof of the thesis that working mothers are a contributing factor to delinquency.
TABLE XLI
PROOF THAT WORKING MOTHERS ARE A CONTRIBUTING FACTOR TO DELINQUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Ratio between WM/D</th>
<th>% of WM families having non-cohesiveness</th>
<th>% of WM families having poor supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gluecks' delinquents</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gluecks' non-delinquents</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBP group</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDC group</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working mother group</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where family non-cohesiveness was high and the mother worked there was delinquency. Where inadequate supervision was high and the mother worked there was delinquency. This was found in the two groups that can be designated as true delinquents: Gluecks' delinquents and the writer's IDC group. Both groups were high in non-cohesiveness, in poor supervision, and in percentage of working mothers. Where the family had cohesiveness and the mother worked there was very little delinquency. Where supervision was good and the mother worked delinquency was rarely found. The working mother group is representative of high family cohesiveness and good supervision and low delinquency value.

In the Gluecks' non-delinquent group and the YBP group there is an interesting interplay of factors operating. The Gluecks' non-delinquent group shows high family non-cohesiveness but moder-
ately good supervision by working mother; the YBP group shows fairly low family non-cohesiveness but high rate of poor supervision by working mother. Both groups show a relatively low ratio of \( \frac{WM}{D} \).

Where one or both of the two important factors, family cohesiveness and supervision, are present in a high degree there is little, if any, delinquency found among children despite the fact of the mother's working. The writer contends that of the two factors, cohesiveness and supervision, supervision is the more vital factor in the prevention of delinquency. This is verified by the fact that in the YBP group a large proportion of the children had poor supervision which resulted in their being delinquent-directed children. In the Gluecks' non-delinquent group, although non-cohesiveness was high, the supervision by the mother was good in a large percentage of cases. Few, if any, were found to be delinquent.

The working mother group, as stated above, had given very good supervision, therefore, no substantial number of delinquent children was found. Both the Gluecks' delinquent group and the IDC group had exceedingly high rate of poor supervision and all became delinquents. Therefore, the combination, working mother and poor supervision, seems to be linked with delinquency more frequently than the other combination, working mother and non-cohesiveness of family.

Cohesiveness of the family means a strong "we-feeling" among the members of the family: husband and wife, parent and child, child and siblings. Any lack of family life operates for the
weakening of this cohesiveness. Each member of the family has his own peculiar role to play. If one member disrupts the family circle either by death, desertion, or divorce, family cohesiveness is lessened. The Gluecks are of the opinion that were self-interest of any member to exceed the group interest, family cohesiveness would be thwarted. 2

These baneful influences may be counteracted. No one denies that separation or divorce endangers the unity of the family. Separation of parents upsets the child's normal relationship within the inner-family circle. Also the death of a parent may be the cause of conflicts due to the shifting of roles. But Mihanovich, Schneppe, and Thomas state that "some families are capable of marvelous response to new situations so that a bereavement only serves to strengthen family solidarity and mutual cooperation." 3 Similarly, one could assume that in some cases of separation of parents the children take on new responsibilities and a semblance of cohesiveness is retained. That one of the members does not play his role does not imply absolutely that the remaining group lacks cohesiveness. But it is not family cohesiveness as defined in the above paragraph.

One concludes that lack of family cohesiveness can be compen-


sated for. There is no compensation for lack of supervision. These considerations strengthen the writer's conviction that the combination of working mother and poor supervision operates as a vehicle for the development of delinquency more frequently than the combination of working mother and non-cohesiveness of the family.

The working of the mother is a cofactor in juvenile delinquency. The working of the mother does not primarily cause delinquency. Where no other delinquency-inducing factors are present, especially the factor of supervision, the working of the mother will not produce delinquency. Where other delinquency-inducing factors are present, the working of the mother abets and magnifies the evil effects of the directly contributing factors. Therefore, working mothers are a cofactor in juvenile delinquency.
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APPENDIX I

LETTER ENCLOSED WITH THE WORKING MOTHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Working Mother:

I need your help.

Only you as the mother of your children can answer these questions. Your answers will help me in a survey which I am making for our college.

Would you do me the favor to answer the enclosed questionnaire but do not sign your name to it?

Please return the questionnaire to me in the stamped addressed envelope as soon as possible.

I am depending on you. I appreciate your cooperation.

Thank you.
APPENDIX II

I. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR WORKING MOTHERS

Place of Birth________________________________________ Age___________

City in which you are now living_____________________________________

How long have you lived in this city? ________________________________

Place an X before the correct answers.

1. Grade School completed
   Attended High School one yr. two yr. three yr. four yr.
   Attended College one yr. two yr. three yr. four yr.

2. Attend church every week sometimes seldom never

3. Work in an office in a factory in a store housekeeper

4. Days of work:
   Sunday Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday Saturday

5. Hours of work:
   from ____ o'clock morning until ____ o'clock evening
   from ____ o'clock evenings until ____ o'clock

6. Is your job necessary because of
   illness of husband unemployment of husband
   part time job of husband inadequate wages of husband
   husband not living at home husband deceased

7. Do you work to help pay
   household expenses send children to high school
   mortgage on home send children to college
   new car and upkeep relieve monotony of home life

8. At present living with husband
   At present separated from husband
   Husband deceased
9. Husband works full time  
   Husband works part time  
   Husband unemployed

10. Does your husband want you to work?  
    Yes  No

11. Would he prefer having you stay at home?  
    Yes  No

12. How many children have you?  
    ___ boys  ___ girls

13. What age is your oldest child?  
    ___ Youngest child?___

14. In what grades are your children in school?  
    Any children in high school?  
    Any children attending college?

15. Was there a time in your child's life when you were not employed outside the home?  
    Yes  No

16. How old was your oldest child when you started to work again?  
    How old was your youngest child when you started to work again? ___

17. Who cares for the children while you are away at work?  
    Mother  Neighbor  
    Mother-in-law  Day Nursery  
    Housekeeper  Teenage Baby Sitter  
    Husband  Take care of themselves

18. Do your children have work to do around the house?  
    many home responsibilities  
    few odd jobs around the house  
    no responsibilities

19. How do your children spend their leisure time?  

20. Have the children too much free time?  
    Not enough free time?

21. Do you know your children's friends?  
    All  Many  Few  None

22. Do you approve of your children's friends?  
    All  Many  Few  None

23. Do your children bring their friends home?  
    Often  Seldom  Never

24. Do you help entertain your children's friends?  
    Yes  No  Sometimes
25. Do your children tell you where they are going when leaving the house? Always Sometimes Never

26. Do your children go out too often? not often enough? occasionally?

27. Do you spend much time with your children?
   Yes No I have no time Children have no time

28. Do your children like school? very much much little very little

29. Do they make good grades?
   in all subjects in many subjects in few subjects in none

30. Have your children ever been truant from school?
   Never few times once often

31. Have any of your children been known to court because of
   accident delinquent acts
   truancy other reasons
   theft

32. Are any of your unmarried children living away from home?
   Yes No

   Reasons: ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
II. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEENAGERS

Circle the correct answer.

1. How old are you? 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
2. How many older brothers have you? 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. How many younger brothers have you? 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. How many older sisters have you? 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. How many younger sisters have you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. In what city were you born? ____________________________________________

7. Where did you live? in a little town in a big city in the county

8. What grade are you in school? ___________________________________________

9. Do you like school? very much a little not at all

10. Did you ever play truant from school?
never a few times often very often

11. How often did you attend church?
every Sunday sometimes never

12. To what church do you belong?
Protestant Catholic Jewish None

13. Where was your mother born? __________________________________________

14. Is your mother living? Yes No

15. If your mother is dead, how old were you when your mother died? ______

16. Where was your father born? __________________________________________

17. Is your father living? Yes No

18. If your father is living, what kind of work does he do? ______

19. Does your mother live with your father? Yes No

20. Is your mother separated from your father? Yes No
21. If your mother is separated from your father is your mother remarried?  
   Yes  No

22. Did you live with your mother before coming here?  
   Yes  No

23. How long did you live with your mother?  

24. How long did you live with other relatives?  
   with foster parents?

25. Did your mother have a job away from home?  
   Yes  No

26. What days did your mother work?  
   Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday Saturday Sunday

27. What time did your mother leave for work?  
   In the morning at ___o'clock
   In the afternoon at ___o'clock
   In the evening at ___o'clock

28. What time did your mother come home from work?  
   In the afternoon at ___o'clock
   In the evening at ___o'clock
   In the morning at ___o'clock

29. How old were you when your mother started to work?  

30. How did you spend the time while your mother was not at home?  

31. Who made the meals.  

32. Were you left alone at night?  
   very often  sometimes  seldom  never

33. Did your mother know your friends?  
   all  only a few  just one  none

34. Did your mother like your friends?  
   all  only a few  just one  none

35. Did you ever have a chance to talk things over with your mother?  
   very often  sometimes  seldom  never

36. Do you love your mother?  
   Yes  No
APPENDIX III

ANSWERS TO WORKING MOTHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE NOT INCORPORATED IN THE BODY OF THE THESIS

TABLE XLII

LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-TWO WORKING MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>99.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>63.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>77.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>99.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XLIII

OCCUPATIONS OF TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-TWO WORKING MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional (teachers-nurses)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office work</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>48.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory work</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeper</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE LXIV

HUSBANDS' PREFERENCES TO THEIR WIVES WORKING OR NOT WORKING OF TWO HUNDRED EIGHT WORKING MOTHERS WHO WERE LIVING WITH THEIR HUSBANDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefers wife at home</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>72.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels necessity for wife's working</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifference to wife's working</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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