

8-1951

Changes in mental maturity after periods of residence at the Richmond Home for Boys

Mabel McLain Nanouski

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/masters-theses>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nanouski, Mabel McLain, "Changes in mental maturity after periods of residence at the Richmond Home for Boys" (1951). *Master's Theses*. Paper 982.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

CHANGES IN MENTAL MATURITY AFTER PERIODS OF
RESIDENCE AT THE RICHMOND HOME FOR BOYS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty of
The University of Richmond

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science in Education

*Approved 8/9/51
E. J. Overton*

by
Mabel McLain Nanouski

August 1951

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Importance of the problem | 1 |
| Purpose of the study | 5 |
| Sources of material | 7 |
| II. BRIEF HISTORY OF THE HOME FROM 1846 - 1951 | 9 |
| Meeting of the citizens of Richmond | 9 |
| Financial aid from City Council | 10 |
| First location of the Home | 11 |
| Expansion and second location | 11 |
| Removal to its present site | 11 |
| Period of progress | 13 |
| Administration - the Board of Governors, the staff and cooperative agencies | 15 |
| III. RESULTS OF TESTS | 20 |
| Types of boys tested | 20 |
| Explanation of tests | 22 |
| Comparison of scores | 22 |
| IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 31 |
| Explanation for increase in scores | 31 |
| Some generalizations | 33 |

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|------------------------|------|
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 35 |
| APPENDICES | |
| Appendix A | 39 |
| Appendix B | 40 |
| Appendix C | 44 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. Schools Attended by Richmond Home Boys | 14 |
| II. Ages of Children in the Boys' Home | 18 |
| III. I.Q. Level of the Largest Apparent Increases | 25 |
| IV. I.Q. Changes From December to June | 28 |
| V. Net Increase in I.Q. Points | 30 |
| VI. A Comparison of the I.Q.'s for Group I and Group II | 40 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation to Dr. Edward F. Overton, Professor of Education and Dean of the Summer School, University of Richmond, under whose direction this thesis was written.

For encouragement and advice the author is also grateful to Dr. John F. Showalter, Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent, Richmond Public Schools.

Thanks are due the following:

Professor Austin Grigg, University of Richmond

Dr. Jack Boger, Research Department of the Richmond Public Schools

Mrs. John G. Wood, Co-superintendent of the Richmond Home for Boys

Mrs. Catherine Giblette, Psychologist at the Memorial Guidance Clinic

Further appreciation is expressed to the principals and teachers of the Richmond Public Schools who participated in the study.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Each year more than a million American homes are broken by death, desertion, separation and divorce. The story of these broken homes reveals that important, intimate human relationships are shattered and millions are deprived of a normal, happy family life.¹

Sometimes a broken home means the loss of economic security. This is especially true when the father dies or deserts his family. The Federal Security Agency estimates that there are about 2,500,000 paternal orphans under eighteen years of age and that nearly 750,000 dependent children are receiving aid through the Social Security Act.²

A considerable amount of money is spent each year to maintain children's institutions, both public and private, in order to provide temporary or long-term care for children from broken homes.³ Public and private welfare agencies also spend large sums of money to provide special services when other forms of assistance fail to meet these children's needs.

1 George Thorman, Broken Homes, Pamphlet No. 135, Public Affairs Committee, Inc., New York: N.Y., 1947, p. 6

2 Ibid., p. 5

3 Ibid., p. 6

The price of broken homes cannot be measured alone by monetary standards. Desertion, death and divorce are also costly in terms of human values. When the home becomes disorganized the child becomes personally disorganized. He frequently feels bitter and hopeless.

It is commonly recognized that jails and prisons contain a disproportionate number of inmates who were illegitimate, neglected and unwanted children.

Studies show that almost 25% of all delinquents come from homes where one or both parents have deserted them, and one out of every two boys sent to reformatories and industrial schools was found to have come from a broken home.⁴

In further support of the above idea, Rudolph Reeder, who has had experience in children's institutions says:

The most valuable asset of a nation is its children. All other possessions, whether they be mines in the earth, the timber of the forests, cereals of the fields or the cattle on a thousand hills, have value only as related to this human factor -- the children of today who are to possess these vast resources. The hundred thousand children in the institutions of this country may be so trained, as to become a great national asset, or so neglected and poorly trained, as to become a great menace to society.⁵

Gesell, in his developmental studies, and Ribble, in her "Rights of Infants," are in practical agreement that as

⁴ Ibid., p. 22

⁵ As quoted by Ellen Lyon Trigg, "The Richmond Home for Boys Yesterday and Today," Unpublished thesis, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1938, p. 5

early as the eighth week of life the growth rate slackens in children deprived of parental love and care.

Not only do these children fail to develop physically at the normal rate but their mental life slows. Psychologists testing children brought up in orphanages or infant homes are required to make a correction on their findings in terms of what is called institutional retardation.⁶

Edith and George and Johnny and millions of other children come to school bringing their emotions with them as well as their bodies and their intellects. Schools cannot any longer work only on the mind and ignore the rest of the child.

We have gone far since the days when Mario's mother answered his teacher's request to have Mario bathed, with a note saying, "He comes to school for to teach, teacher. He don't come to school for to smell."⁷

Today's children present new problems. Willard E.

Givens, Executive Secretary of the National Education

Association says:

There is still a sound core of well-adjusted, well-reared children, but the cumulative effects of broken homes, the tensions of war, family transiency, lack of parental control, and the overstimulation of moving pictures, radio and television are being felt in almost every classroom.⁸

6 As quoted by Sister Mary de Lourdes, "The Developmental Basis of Continuity," Childhood Education, 25:100, November, 1948

7 Dorothy Baruch, "The Whole Child Goes to School," Childhood Education, 25:341, April 1949

8 Editorial, "Teacher's Work Week More Than Forty Hours," in the Richmond Times-Dispatch, March 27, 1951

In this study, only the effect of broken homes on the child's mental and emotional growth will be treated since much has been written about its effect on the social and economic security of our country. This study is concerned primarily with children from eight to eighteen years of age. Adults will be referred to only as they concern the lives of these children.

As far back as 1925, H.T. Wooley reported that 43 children at the Merrill Palmer School gained an average of 14 I.Q. points with one year's attendance, while 33 comparable children on the waiting list lost 2 points over the same period.⁹

Skeels reports consistent findings for children residing in underprivileged homes: for samplings of all ages, a difference of three-year's stay in an impoverished home leads to a significant difference in I.Q. The longer the residence in such a home, the lower the average I.Q. But when such children are removed from their inferior homes to an institution, they make slight gains; when the children are placed in foster homes, the gains are marked.¹⁰

Beth Wellman, in the Iowa Studies on Nursery School Children (1934) reported on fall-to-spring changes in I.Q. for 34 pairs of nursery school and non-nursery-school

⁹ As quoted by G. D. Stoddard, "Intellectual Development of the Child," School and Society, 51:529, April 27, 1940

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 31

children of closely similar age and initial I.Q. (as taken in the fall). The preschool children gained an average of 7 points; the non-preschool children lost, on the average, 3.9 points.¹¹

After an average attendance of one and a half years in nursery school the mean gain in I.Q. for 45 children first tested at 2, 3 or 4 years was 15.6 I.Q. points.¹²

G. D. Stoddard thinks it strange that persons have ever expected I.Q.'s to remain constant or to be unrelated to the nature of environmental effects:

Studies on canal-boat children, on families in remote or impoverished regions, on Negroes living in the South have been consistent. We know that young children as they grow up in such circumstances tend to lose in I.Q. Sherman, for example, showed that among the hollow folk in Virginia there may be a shift from I.Q. averages in the 90's to averages in the 60's and 70's over a ten-year range.¹³

This investigation has a two-fold purpose:

- (1) to determine whether boys who live in the Boys' Home show a greater growth in mental maturity than do boys who live in homes under comparable conditions
- (2) to summarize the differences through the interpretation of some significant case histories

11 Beth Wellman, "Iowa Studies on the Effects of Schooling," Thirty-Ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1936, p. 386

12 Ibid., Part I., p. 308

13 Stoddard, op. cit., p. 34

In order to determine whether living at the Boys' Home affected more growth in mental maturity than in the homes selected for study it was necessary to test these boys and to compare the results with boys tested outside of the Home.

The California Mental Maturity Test was chosen, since it has the dual advantage of measuring both verbal and non-verbal ability.¹⁴

The experimental group (which will be referred to through out the study as Group I) included all of the boys in the Home, ranging in ages from eight to eighteen years of age. Because of this wide variation in age, three different forms of the test were used: elementary, intermediate and the advanced S. Form, 1947.

The control group (which will be referred to in the future as Group II) consisted of boys selected from broken homes of similar social and economic backgrounds to those boys in the Home. Both groups were equated as to age, I.Q. and family status.

The above mentioned groups were selected in the following manner:

- (1) Conferences with teachers
- (2) Home visitation

¹⁴ Mrs. Catherine Giblette, Chief Psychologist at the Memorial Guidance Clinic, recommended this test.

- (3) Use of cumulative folders
- (4) Screening through the use of the Minnesota Home Status Index
- (5) Aid of school nurse
- (6) Information from visiting teacher

The two groups were tested the first time on December 7, 1950 and the scores were recorded for the purpose of comparison. Both the control and experimental groups were tested again on June 7, 1951, six months after the first test.

The following sources of information have been utilized in making this study:

1. Conferences and interviews

- A. Interviews with principals of schools

- B. Conferences with:

- (1) Teachers

- (2) Visiting teachers

- (3) The school nurse

- C. Personal interviews with each boy

- II. Periodicals

- A. Old Richmond Newspapers since 1846 (available at the State Library)

- B. Magazine articles on the subject of "Broken Homes"

- III. Books and bulletins

- A. The Handbook published by the Federal

Children's Bureau

B. Books dealing with similar institutions

IV. Letters

A. Old letters kept in a scrapbook at the Home

B. Letters from the Superintendents of similar institutions in other states

V. Case Studies

A. Case studies of pupils -- some of them under the daily supervision of the writer as a teacher in the Richmond Public Schools

VI. Miscellaneous

A. Personal inspection of the Home

B. Records kept at the Home

CHAPTER II

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE HOME FROM 1846 THROUGH 1950

Over a hundred years ago a small, ragged boy rapped timidly on the door of the Female Humane Association (now the Memorial Home for Girls) and begged for a few pennies.¹ This incident gave the directress the idea of establishing a similar institution for unfortunate boys. She spoke to her husband concerning her idea. He called it to the attention of the public.

On March 28, 1846, the following notice was put in the Richmond Daily Whig: "The Citizens of Richmond, who are friendly to the establishment of an asylum for orphan boys, are requested to meet at Rev. Hoge's Church, on Monday evening, March 30, at 7½ o'clock. Several addresses will be delivered."²

At the meeting a committee was appointed to formulate a constitution for a "male orphan society." It was agreed that the Home be non-sectarian and that provision be made to take in destitute children other than orphans.

On the 12th of May 1846, the first Board of Managers

¹ One Hundred Years of Achievement, 1846 - 1946, Richmond, Virginia: The Board of Governors, Richmond Home for Boys, April 1946, p. 2

² News item in the Richmond Daily Whig, March 28, 1846

was elected, and included the following:³

Samuel Taylor, President
 Issac Davenport, First Vice President
 Samuel Reeve, Second Vice President
 William Allison, Third Vice President
 James C. Crone, Fourth Vice President
 J. B. Minor, Secretary
 J. J. Fry, Treasurer

Managers:

| | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| Dr. A. Snead | William Sands |
| John C. Hobson | Dr. F. Marx |
| Richard Whitfield | J. B. Morton |
| Fred Bransford | Dr. J. G. Wayt |
| Micajab Bates | |

On the 8th of August 1846, an arrangement was made with Major John Hargrove to board and educate such orphan boys as the managers might assign to him at \$80.00 each per annum, for any number from ten upwards. The first annual report of the managers commenting on Major Hargrove as a competent and suitable person of high respectability, stated these children are thus placed in a respectable boarding school, where they associate with other children, learn to respect themselves and become identified with those with whom they are to mingle in the walks of life.⁴

Through the overseers of the poor, a plan was presented to the City Council by the Society agreeing to take boys from the poor house providing the Council would make an allowance toward their support equal to what these boys cost at the poor house. The Council accepted this offer and agreed to allow \$40.00 per year for each boy thus taken, to the extent of \$300.00.⁵

3 Ibid., May 12, 1846

4 Ibid., May 10, 1847

5 Loc. cit.

The original home of the Richmond Male Orphan Asylum was located between Church and Union Hills, just on the edge of Henrico County. This location was thought to "combine the advantages of economy and retirement; and the boys were able to indulge in a wide range of healthful exercises, without falling into any injurious contacts and temptations."⁶

The Society found it difficult to operate efficiently on its income which came from donations and annual subscriptions. It was decided to conduct a campaign to raise \$10,000 to provide a permanent asylum instead of boarding the boys out. The drive was a success and over \$10,000 was collected from various sources.⁷

Major Hargrove, the first superintendent, died in March 1854, the year the institution moved to its new home at St. James and Baker Streets. Elam succeeded him as superintendent and his wife became matron. Thirty boys could be cared for now.

In 1870 the Home was moved to its present site at the intersection of Amelia and Meadow Streets, just east of Byrd Park. Much deliberation was given to this change.

The board in a body visited the new site, and after having the buildings there examined by a practical

6 Loc. cit.

7 One Hundred Years of Achievement, op., cit., p. 4

mechanic, determined to purchase the property, consisting of a two-story building 85 by 31 feet, almost new, with four and one-half acres of land beautifully situated attached. The whole property was bought at the low figure of \$1,750 -- the building at \$300 and the land at \$350 per acre. We at once insured the house for \$1,000, though bought at the low price of \$300.⁸

An entire change of management followed the removal of the Home to its new location. J. R. Gill became superintendent and his wife became matron. Although total development of the child was unheard of in those days, Gill taught the boys a trade -- first the manufacture of matches and later the manufacture of cigars.⁹

The boys were treated with understanding and kindness. The Gills discouraged corporal punishment, and the matron seemed to possess a keen insight concerning the needs of children. The grounds were beautified, the boys had far more privileges, recreational programs were planned and outside contacts were encouraged.¹⁰

William Barrett, a wealthy tobacconist, was burned to death January 21, 1871, while lighting his pipe at his home at Fifth and Cary Streets. Four days later it was learned that

8 Editorial in the Daily Dispatch, May 26, 1871

9 One Hundred Years of Achievement, op. cit., p. 5

10 Loc. cit.

he had left the Home \$50,000.¹¹

Gill died on May 24, 1885, and his wife succeeded him as superintendent. The annual report of President John L. Williams on May 29, 1910 showed the institution to be in a fine condition of progress and usefulness.¹²

A forward step was taken in 1921 when it was decided to discontinue school on the grounds, and to send the boys to public schools. There they met children of their own age and became far more closely associated with life in the community. The boys were allowed to dress in the same manner as more fortunate children in the community. Table I, page 14, gives the number of Home boys attending the various Richmond Public Schools as of 1951.

The building that had housed boys since 1870 was condemned by the city in 1924 and had to be replaced by a temporary frame structure. W. L. Carneal and the late Richard Cwathmey, aided by the American Business Men's Club, raised \$42,000, and the present main building was constructed.¹³

In 1926 the Home became a member of the Richmond Community Fund. This meant an increase in funds for equipment and supplies for the Home.

11 Loc. cit.

12 Editorial in the Times Dispatch, May 30, 1910

13 Henry Hutzler, Annual Report From the Minute Book, Richmond, Virginia, May 13, 1924

TABLE I
SCHOOLS ATTENDED BY RICHMOND HOME BOYS AS OF 1951

| <u>Schools</u> | <u>Number of Children</u> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| John B. Cary Elementary School | 15 |
| William Fox Elementary School | 2 |
| East End Junior High School | 1 |
| Binford Junior High School | 6 |
| John Marshall Senior High School | 8 |
| Thomas Jefferson Senior High School | 6 |
| <u>Total</u> | <u>38</u> |

In 1927 the State Planters Bank and Trust Company became the custodians, and accurate records were kept by an Investment Committee composed of a representative of the bank and two members of the Board (later reduced to one member).

The Home now (1951) has a Board of Governors composed of forty-four men and women who are business men, teachers, housekeepers, bankers, doctors, dentists and others interested in improving the lot of the underprivileged boy.

In 1929 Mr. and Mrs. John G. Wood became co-superintendents of the Home.

In 1931 the Optimist Club of Richmond began to sponsor the Home and enter into its activities, particularly athletics.

In 1933 Mr. W. Leigh Carneal was elected president of the Board of Governors. Soon after this the name was changed from the "Richmond Male Orphan Society" to the "Richmond Home for Boys."

The personnel of the staff of the Richmond Home for Boys consists of the following:

- (1) Paid personnel
- (2) Part-time personnel
- (3) Unpaid and volunteer personnel

The paid personnel includes two co-superintendents, two matrons, a cook and a laundress. Each is responsible for certain parts of the administration of the Home.

The part-time paid staff is composed of the football coach. He is employed from August 15 each year to December 15.

The unpaid staff consists of four doctors and nineteen dentists who take care of all the medical and dental needs of the boys. Sheltering Arms Hospital takes boys without charge for hospitalization.

The volunteer staff at the present time is composed of one member. A "story teller" and dramatics leader comes each Thursday afternoon and entertains the smaller boys.

The present location of the Home has adapted itself to a program of expansion. The eighteen acres of high ground provide the advantage of both country and city life."¹⁴ It is within walking distance to schools, churches, parks and playgrounds.

The main building was finished and occupied in 1926. In 1930 cottages were built with double rooms for the older boys instead of housing them in the two large dormitories. A dining hall was built. Previously meals were served in the basement of the main building. This dining hall seats about one hundred people and serves also for meetings and social gatherings.

¹⁴ One Hundred Years of Achievement, op. cit., p. 8

Today the Home has a modern dining hall, a combination woodhouse, laundry and maid's quarters, garage, new barn, tool shed and a club house for storing athletic equipment.

Football was included in the athletic program about twenty years ago. In 1936 a football field located across the street from the Home was purchased.

The boys take part in Sunday school, church, Y.M.C.A. and Scout activities. They attend public meetings, movies and summer camps.

The children in the Richmond Home for Boys are dependent or neglected boys of the City of Richmond or adjacent territory. Admissions to the Home are brought about through the cooperation of the Children's Aid Society, the Children's Memorial Clinic and the Social Service Bureau.

Only normal children between the ages of six to fourteen are accepted. However, some of the boys stay until they are eighteen or more. At the time of this study, only five boys were below 10 years of age, fourteen were between 10 and 14 years of age and nineteen were between the ages of 15 and 18. Only one was 20 years of age. Table II shows the distribution of ages.

Every boy is put on the work list when he is admitted to the Home, and a definite schedule is followed so that the work is continually educational. No child is kept at one

TABLE II
AGES OF CHILDREN IN THE BOYS' HOME AS OF 1951

| <u>Age</u> | <u>Number of Children</u> |
|------------|---------------------------|
| 8 years | 2 |
| 9 years | 3 |
| 10 years | 2 |
| 11 years | 3 |
| 12 years | 2 |
| 13 years | 2 |
| 14 years | 5 |
| 15 years | 6 |
| 16 years | 6 |
| 17 years | 3 |
| 18 years | 4 |
| 20 years | 1 |
| Total | 39 |

thing until he loses interest.¹⁵

The entire plant is maintained by the boys. They raise vegetables and flowers, take care of the cows, serve food, wash and dry dishes, clean rooms and make beds. They are taught laundering, and pressing of clothes and simple cooking. Allowances are given for service rendered and range from thirty to seventy-five cents a week.

If a boy is ambitious for college and has average grades, definite efforts are made to send him to college. The Home does its own follow-up work of boys who have gone on to jobs and homes of their own. "Seventy-five per cent of the boys establish themselves in this city when they complete their training at the Home."¹⁶

"There are many success stories in the archives of the Home. Among its alumni are business and professional men of high rank, a research chemist, several accountants, a research technician, a bacteriologist and ministers."¹⁷

"Ninety-five boys were in the service of their country during World War II. Several were officers. Two Home boys lost their lives."¹⁸

15 Ibid., p. 13

16 Ibid., p. 15

17 Loc. cit.

18 Loc. cit.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF TESTS

Three forms of the California Mental Maturity Test were given (the elementary, the intermediate and the advanced S. 1947 Form) and entailed the use of two groups of boys, namely an experimental group (Group I) and a control group (Group II).

The experimental group consisted of 37 boys from the Richmond Home for Boys, ranging in ages from eight to eighteen years. Every available boy in the Home was tested. There were thirty-nine boys on roll at the time that this test was administered. Two of the eighteen year olds were omitted because one is in the Navy and gets home only on furloughs. The other was in choir practice at church when the test was given.

These boys entered the Home for the following reasons:

- (1) Death of one or both parents
- (2) One or both parents deserted
- (3) Parents separated or divorced
- (4) Parents incompatible
- (5) Illegitimacy

The control group consisted of 37 boys from broken homes (homes broken in one or more of the five ways listed above). This group was equated as far as possible with the experimental group in age, I.Q. and family status. Social

and economic backgrounds were considered. The ages were ascertained through the use of registration cards with the dates of birth corresponding to those on their birth certificates.

In the comparison of I.Q.'s the writer used Terman's classification. Terman suggested the following on the basis of I.Q.'s earned on the Standard Revision of Binet-Simon Intelligence Scale:¹

| | |
|----------------------|-----------|
| Genius or near ----- | above 140 |
| Very Superior ----- | 120 - 140 |
| Superior ----- | 110 - 120 |
| Average ----- | 90 - 110 |
| Dull Normal ----- | 80 - 90 |
| Dull ----- | 70 - 80 |
| Feebleminded ----- | below 70 |

Family background was determined through the use of cumulative records, home visits, use of the Minnesota Home Status Index and information obtained from the school nurse and from the visiting teacher.

The following grouping shows the mental status of

1 L. M. Terman, Measurement of Intelligence, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916, p. 78 and p. 95

the 37 boys in the Richmond Home for Boys:

| | | | |
|----------------|-------------|-------|-----------|
| Genius or near | - above 140 | ----- | 1 |
| Very Superior | - 120 - 140 | ----- | 4 |
| Superior | - 110 - 120 | ----- | 4 |
| Average | - 90 - 110 | ----- | 22 |
| Dull Normal | - 80 - 90 | ----- | 5 |
| Dull | - 70 - 80 | ----- | 1 |
| Total | | | <u>37</u> |

The New California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity 1947 S. Form takes about forty minutes to give. It is divided into the following sections:

- (1) Spatial Relationships which deal with sensing right and left and the manipulation of areas
- (2) Logical Reasoning, distinguishing similarities and inference
- (3) Numerical Reasoning, number series and numerical quantity
- (4) Vocabulary
- (5) Reading Ability or Language Factors
- (6) Non-Language Factors

Group I scored an average I.Q. of 96.4 on Total Mental Factors when the first test was given in December. This was the combined score on Language and Non-Language ability.

Group II registered an average I.Q. of 91.7 on Total Mental Factors on the first test.²

In June when the second test was given, Group I showed an average I.Q. of 104.8 on Total Mental Factors -- a gain of 8 points.

Group II scored an average I.Q. of 95.4 on Total Mental Factors -- a gain of 3 points. This is similar to the findings of Skeels and Wellman.³

Both Group I and Group II did better on the Non-Language Factors (non reading material) than on the Language Factors (reading material) on each of the two tests. However, Group I showed a greater gain in this particular area, making an average gain of 13 points. Group II registered a gain of 6 points in this field.

In Language, Group I averaged 93.5 points on the December test and 99.8 on the June test, thus showing a gain of 6 points. Group II scored an average of 88.2 on the December test and 90.6 on the June test -- a gain of 2 points.

It should be remembered that in actual figures both groups improved, but the last test, the one given in June, added six months on to the chronological age (C.A. on the

2 These scores are given in Table VI in the Appendix.

3 Supra, p. 4

tables) of each child, thus when the C.A. is divided into the M.A. (mental age) to obtain the I.Q. his score has the tendency to come down. For instance, a child who in December was 132 months, in June would be 138 months -- making the divisor (C.A.) larger. Therefore, on the tables some children actually have higher scores on the first test than on the second one. Boy Number 13, on the table of Group I actually reads lower on Total Mental and on Language Factors on the second test than on the first test. This boy, however, did not make a normal gain. He was under an emotional strain at the time of the second testing period, since he had gotten into some trouble at school.⁴

In case Number 8, on Table III of Group I, no improvement is seen on Total Mental Factors. Actually this boy increased his score by seven points, but that wasn't enough to offset the increase of six months added to his C.A.⁵

Table III reflects that not all members of either group advanced. Most cases in both groups improved, some remained the same, others decreased their first scores.

Case Number 7 is omitted from Table III because he withdrew from the Home before the second testing period.

⁴ This case history is given in the Appendix.

⁵ This case history may be found in the Appendix.

TABLE III

I.Q. LEVEL OF THE LARGEST APPARENT INCREASES

| Boy No. | Group I | | | Boy No. | Group II | | |
|---------|---------|------|------|---------|----------|------|------|
| | Dec. | June | Gain | | Dec. | June | Gain |
| 1 | 69 | 91 | 22 | 1 | 76 | 83 | 7 |
| 2 | 119 | 122 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 100 | 0 |
| 3 | 103 | 116 | 13 | 3 | 96 | 108 | 12 |
| 4 | 121 | 131 | 10 | 4 | 113 | 110 | -3 |
| 5 | 71 | 93 | 22 | 5 | 81 | 98 | 17 |
| 6 | 100 | 111 | 5 | 6 | 96 | 94 | -2 |
| 7 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 8 | 138 | 138 | 0 | 8 | 117 | 113 | -4 |
| 9 | 91 | 95 | 4 | 9 | 91 | 96 | 5 |
| 10 | 115 | 121 | 6 | 10 | 110 | 111 | 1 |
| 11 | 89 | 104 | 15 | 11 | 86 | 77 | -9 |
| 12 | 129 | 147 | 18 | 12 | 121 | 112 | -9 |
| 13 | 91 | 86 | -5 | 13 | 88 | 91 | 3 |
| 14 | 99 | 104 | 5 | 14 | 91 | 98 | 7 |
| 15 | 94 | 98 | 4 | 15 | 87 | 93 | 6 |
| 16 | 95 | 104 | 9 | 16 | 95 | 97 | 2 |
| 17 | 97 | 107 | 10 | 17 | 97 | 100 | 3 |
| 18 | 102 | 110 | 8 | 18 | 94 | 99 | 5 |
| 19 | 98 | 102 | 4 | 19 | 94 | 97 | 3 |
| 20 | 83 | 92 | 9 | 20 | 79 | 85 | 6 |
| 21 | 100 | * | * | 21 | 95 | * | * |
| 22 | 110 | 117 | 7 | 22 | 107 | 112 | 5 |
| 23 | 74 | 79 | 5 | 23 | 72 | 77 | 5 |
| 24 | 83 | 91 | 8 | 24 | 80 | 92 | 12 |
| 25 | 92 | 99 | 7 | 25 | 84 | 89 | 5 |
| 26 | 84 | 91 | 7 | 26 | 82 | 87 | 5 |
| 27 | 94 | 100 | 6 | 27 | 88 | 93 | 5 |
| 28 | 92 | 94 | 2 | 28 | 86 | 89 | 3 |
| 29 | 87 | 95 | 8 | 29 | 85 | 89 | 4 |
| 30 | 112 | 121 | 9 | 30 | 102 | 105 | 3 |
| 31 | 78 | 95 | 17 | 31 | 76 | 85 | 9 |
| 32 | 94 | 110 | 16 | 32 | 90 | 95 | 5 |
| 33 | 97 | * | * | 33 | 90 | * | * |
| 34 | 96 | * | * | 34 | 93 | * | * |
| 35 | 97 | * | * | 35 | 94 | * | * |
| 36 | 90 | * | * | 36 | 89 | * | * |
| 37 | 80 | 85 | 5 | 37 | 81 | 84 | 3 |

* Boys who left the Home to join either a parent or the armed forces

Case Number 21 left the Home and went back to live with his mother who is now in a position to take care of him.

Cases Number 33, 34, 35 and 36 are eighteen year old boys who have joined the armed forces since the first testing period.

Cases Number 27 and 28 are twins who entered the Home at the same time. It is interesting to note that Number 27 scored a gain of 2 points over his brother. Both boys having the same environment and the same heredity makes that rather difficult to explain.

There are six sets of brothers at the Richmond Home for Boys now. There were eight pairs. Two older boys have joined the armed forces, leaving their younger brothers at the Home.

Case Number 12 made a gain in Total Mental Factors of 18 points. He is recognized under Terman's classification as "Genius or Near." Incidentally, he is the only boy at the Home having an I.Q. of above 140. He was considered so bright at school that he was double-promoted last February. This means that he advanced two grades within one term. He is the brother of boy Number 22, who is rated "Superior" under Terman's study (I.Q. 117) who scored a gain of 7 points in six months.

Cases Number 3 and 8 are brothers. Both are in the "Superior" group. However, case Number 3 gained 13 points on Total Mental Factors, while his brother, boy Number 8 made no gain at all.⁶

Cases Number 9 and 16 are brothers, both in the "Average" group. Case Number 9 gained 4 points while his brother gained 9 points.

Cases Number 10 and 20 are brothers. Number 10 being in the "Superior" group and Number 20 in the "Average" group.

Cases Number 11 and 17 are brothers. Both are in the "Average" group. Case Number 11 gained 15 points.⁷ Number 17 gained 10 points.

Cases Number 15 and 24 are brothers. Both are in the "Average" group. Number 15 gained 4 points and case Number 24 gained 5 points.

Table IV presents the listing of the number of I.Q. points gained in Total Mental Factors from December to June. The greatest gain was 23 points scored by two boys in Group I. The greatest gain for Group II was 17 points. This gain was reached by only one boy.

The greatest loss in Group I was 5 points. Only one

6 This case history is given in the Appendix.

7 This case history is given in the Appendix.

TABLE IV
I.Q. CHANGES FROM DECEMBER TO JUNE

| <u>I.Q. Changes</u> | <u>Group I</u> | <u>Group II</u> |
|---------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| ✓ 22 - 23 * | 2 | |
| 20 - 21 | | |
| 18 - 19 | 1 | |
| 16 - 17 | 2 | 1 |
| 14 - 15 | 1 | |
| 12 - 13 | 1 | 2 |
| 10 - 11 | 2 | |
| 9 - 9 | 6 | 1 |
| 6 - 7 | 5 | 4 |
| 4 - 5 | 7 | 9 |
| 2 - 3 | 2 | 7 |
| 0 - 1 | 1 | 2 |
| - 2 - 3 * | | 2 |
| 4 - 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 - 7 | | |
| 8 - 9 | | 2 |

* Points gained

* Points lost

case in this Group lost points. In Group II, two cases lost 3 points, one case lost 5 points and two more cases lost 9 points.

Table V, page 30, shows that Group I registered 275 total net I.Q. points, while Group II scored 119 total net I.Q. points. In adding all of the I.Q. points gained in Total Mental Factors and subtracting the I.Q. points lost, the total net points earned by each group is ascertained.

In comparing Groups I and II on the basis of results obtained from the California Mental Maturity Tests, it appears that:

- (1) Group I scored the greater gain -- an average of 8 points. Group II registered an average gain of 3 points.
- (2) Both groups scored a greater gain on non-reading material -- Group I an average gain of 13 points -- Group II an average gain of 6 points.
- (3) On strictly reading material Group I showed an average gain of 6 points while Group II registered an average gain of 2 points.

These findings are in agreement with other studies dealing with this problem. Some explanations for the differences in scores between the two groups are summarized in the final chapter of this study.

TABLE V
NET INCREASE IN I.Q. POINTS

| Group I | | | Group II | | |
|------------------|--------|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| I.Q. Changes | Amount | Total | I.Q. Changes | Amount | Total |
| 23 | 2 | 46 | | | |
| 19 | 1 | 19 | | | |
| 17 | 2 | 34 | 17 | 1 | 17 |
| 15 | 1 | 15 | | | |
| 13 | 1 | 13 | | | |
| 11 | 2 | 22 | 13 | 2 | 26 |
| 9 | 6 | 54 | 9 | 1 | 9 |
| 7 | 5 | 35 | 7 | 4 | 28 |
| 5 | 7 | 35 | 5 | 9 | 45 |
| 3 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 21 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | -3 * | 2 | -6 |
| -5 | 1 | -5 | -5 | 1 | -5 |
| | | | -9 | 2 | -18 |
| Total Net Points | | 275 | | | 119 |

* Points lost

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The apparent increase in scores of Group I over Group II on the California Mental Maturity Test, is greater than might occur by mere chance. The following factors may have influenced the difference in scores between the two groups:

(1) Effect of controlled reading and study

The Home boys have a library period from seven to nine o'clock each night, with access to books and magazines; while many of the boys in Group II, having little or no supervision, probably do not spend their leisure time to the best advantage.

(2) Physical health

Group I has the advantage over Group II in having adequate housing, balanced meals, proper clothing and regular medical and dental attention. This is not to imply that none of the boys in Group II have any of these advantages, but it is doubtful if many of them receive such care, since with only one parent, that parent usually has to work outside of the home.

(3) Learning from group experiences

There is general agreement today among specialists on child care that group care for dependent children under

six years of age is not desirable. The ages between 12 and 16 seem to make the most constructive use of group care. It will be observed from Table II, page 18, that most of the boys in the Home fall into this group. In sharing daily experiences with each other they profit from co-operative living.

(4) Contact with outside adults and interests

Group I participates in a variety of activities: planned entertainment by the Optimist Club and other organizations of Richmond, movies, television, radio, sports and church. Group II may enjoy some of these things also, but it is doubtful if much adult planning goes into the selection of these activities.

(5) Better emotional adjustment

It would appear that Group I, living in an atmosphere of regularity, security and order would be better adjusted (for the most part) than many of the boys in Group II who frequently live in confusion and unrest. Most educators agree that environment molds and directs learning.

(6) Feelings of security

Parents, teachers and institutions are becoming aware that children need affection, security and sympathetic guidance quite as much as they need an adequate physical environment. A child frequently feels insecure if his home is lacking in human warmth and

understanding. He reflects what he has received from parents and society. The boys in Group I have security in knowing they are going to have dinner every night at six o'clock. They have security in knowing that their basic needs will be satisfied. Group II (as a whole) does not experience such security.

Evidence from this study, as well as from the studies of Skeels and others seems to indicate:

- (1) That within a wide range, it is the home rather than the child's true-family background that for practical purposes sets the limit of his mental development.
- (2) Intelligence is more responsive to environmental changes than many people suppose.
- (3) Marked changes in I.Q. can be brought about by changes in home conditions.
- (4) Mental level of the child is significantly related to the type of home in which he grows up.
- (5) Continued residence in an inadequate home tends to result in a decline in mental level with increase in age.

It will be observed from Table III, page 25, that two of the boys in Group II decreased their first I.Q. scores by

9 points, one by 5 points, while two others in this same group decreased their scores two and three points respectively.

Skeels found¹ that after six years in homes of a decidedly poor character, the mean level of intelligence drops with each year for seven years.

The fact that rates of growth in mental abilities are variable appears now well established by the studies of various investigators. However, there is much need for further studies of this type, since there is still a great deal of controversy over the constancy and the shifting of the I.Q.

If intelligence is static, then changes in living conditions and kind of education can be expected to have little influence on the mental level of individuals. However, if intelligence shows change in relation to environmental influences, one needs to study more closely child development.

It is apparent from this study, that while no institution can replace the home, unfortunate children from broken homes can be helped to become successful citizens.

1 Supra, p. 4

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Baldwin, James Mark, Mental Development. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1906. 477 pp.
- Bauer, William, These Are Your Children. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company. 1949. 192 pp.
- Bingham, Walter Van Dyke, Attitudes and Aptitude Testing. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1937. 390 pp.
- Blanchard, Phyllis, The Child and Society. New York: Longsman, Green and Company, 1928. 369 pp.
- Haefner, Ralph and Ben Wood, Measuring and Guiding Individual Growth. New York: Silver Burdett Company, Inc., 1948. 535 pp.
- Hurlock, Elizabeth B., Modern Ways With Children. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1943. 393 pp.
- Shoobs, Nahum E., Corrective Treatment for Unadjusted Children, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942, 240 pp.
- Terman, Lewis M., Measurement of Intelligence. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1916. 362 pp.
- Thurston, Henry W., The Dependent Child. New York: Columbia University Press. 1930. 337 pp.

B. PERIODICAL ARTICLES

- Adam, J., "Inquiry Into the Influence of Broken Homes on the Maladjustment of Children," British Journal of Educational Psychology, 16:45, February, 1946.
- Baruch, Dorothy, "The Whole Child Goes to School," Childhood Education, 25:341-4, April, 1949.
- Davis, S. W., "Has the American Home Failed?" Baltimore Bulletin of Education, 22:7-9, October, 1944.

- Could, L., "Children Need Parents," Parents Magazine, 19:19, August, 1944.
- Green, M. M., "When Death Came," Parents Magazine, 22:20, April, 1947.
- Issacs, S. S. F., "Fatherless Children," New Era in Home and School, 26:159-66, July, 1945.
- Jackson, C. L., "Very Young in Institutions," Childhood Education, 22:335-8, March, 1946.
- Katz, G. H., "Should the Child be Sent to an Institution?" Nervous Child, 5:172-7, April 1946.
- Lavachery, J., "Belguim School for Fatherless Children," New Era in Home and School, 28:80-4, April, 1947.
- Lewis, W.D., "Influence of Parents on Scores," Pedagogical Seminary and Journal of Genetic Psychology, 67:195-201, December, 1945.
- Linde, Phyllis McGill, "Some Factors Aiding the Development of Security in the Institutional Child," Nervous Child, 5:84-94, January, 1946.
- Lorge, I., "Intellectual Changes," Review of Educational Research, 14:438-45.
- Lourdes, Mary, "The Developmental Basis of Continuity," Childhood Education, 25:100-3, November, 1948.
- Martin, F., "Comparative Study of Intelligence of Children From Private Homes and Those From Institutions," Peabody Journal of Education, 24:198-202, January, 1947.
- McElwee, A. R., "Improving Functional Intelligence," Elementary School Journal, 45:213-19, December, 1944.
- Minkler, M. J., "Home Remedy for Delinquency," Journal of Education, 130:58-60, February, 1947.
- Overstreet, Bonaro, "Lots of People are Human," National Parent-Teacher, 45:22-4, March, 1951.
- Plank, E. N., "We Bargained for Futures," Progressive Education, 22:17-19, October, 1944.

- Sanders, A. P., "Society's Essential Cornerstone, the Home," National Parent Teacher, 41:29-30, April, 1947.
- Schmidt, Edith Taglicht, "When Your Child Does Not Live Up to His Capacity," National Parent-Teacher, 45:25-7, March, 1951.
- Sowers, A., "It's Up to the Home," National Parent-Teacher, 39:28-30, September, 1944.
- Stephens, W. M., "Problem Child's Problem," National Parent-Teacher, 39:17-19, March, 1945.
- Stoddard, G. D., "Intellectual Development of the Child," School and Society, 51:529-36, April 27, 1940.
- Torrance, P., "Influence of the Broken Home on Adolescent Adjustment," Journal of Educational Sociology, 18:359-64, February, 1945.
- Witty, Paul Andrew, "On Feeling At Home in School," National Parent-Teacher, 43:12-14, February, 1949.

C. PUBLICATIONS OF LEARNED ORGANIZATIONS

- Handbook for Junior Primary Teachers, Revised Edition, Richmond, Virginia: Richmond Press, 1949. 144 pp.
- One Hundred Years of Achievement 1846-1946. Richmond, Virginia: The Board of Governors, Richmond Home for Boys, April, 1946, 38 pp.
- Thorman, George, Broken Homes, Pamphlet 1947, Number 135, Public Affairs Committee, Inc., New York: N. Y., 31 pp.
- Wellman, Beth, "Iowa Studies on the Effects of Schooling," Thirty-Ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1936, p. 377-399.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Nutzler, Henry, Annual Report From the Minute Book, Richmond, Virginia: 1924.

Trigg, Ellen Lyon, "The Richmond Home for Boys Yesterday and Today," Unpublished thesis, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1938. 175 pp.

E. NEWSPAPERS

Daily Dispatch, May 26, 1871.

Richmond Daily Whig, March 28, 1846.
May 12, 1846.
May 10, 1847.

Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 27, 1951.
May 30, 1910.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - RECORDS OF THE FIRST TEN BOYS AT THE HOME

RECORDS OF THE FIRST TEN BOYS

| Name of Boy | Name of Mother | Name of Father | Admitted | Remarks |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| A | Unknown | Deceased | Aug.17,1846 | Expelled 1849 |
| B | Unknown | Deceased | Aug.17,1846 | Enticed away |
| C | Nancy | Deceased | Aug.24,1846 | Bound out 1851 |
| D | Susan | John | Aug. 4,1846 | Left in 1849 |
| E | Deceased | Deceased | Aug.14,1846 | Printer's trade |
| F | Deceased | Deceased | Aug.14,1846 | Gun maker, 1854 |
| G | Martha | Deceased | Sept.5,1846 | Drowned in 1850 |
| H | Martha | Deceased | Dec.23,1846 | Died, Dec. 1847 |
| I | Martha | Deceased | Dec.23,1846 | Killed in 1861 |
| J | Unknown | Unknown | Jan.28,1847 | Illegitimate |

TABLE VI

A COMPARISON OF THE I.Q.'S FOR GROUP I AND GROUP II
(December Scores - Group I)

| Boy No. | C.A. | Total M. | Mental Age | | Total M. | I.Q. | |
|---------|------|----------|------------|-----------|----------|-------|--------|
| | | | Lang. | Non Lang. | | Lang. | Non L. |
| 1 | 96 | 67 | 78 | 63 | 69 | 81 | 65 |
| 2 | 99 | 118 | 125 | 107 | 119 | 126 | 108 |
| 3 | 103 | 107 | 93 | 127 | 103 | 90 | 123 |
| 4 | 110 | 134 | 126 | 160 | 121 | 114 | 145 |
| 5 | 117 | 84 | 91 | 72 | 71 | 77 | 61 |
| 6 | 118 | 126 | 123 | 129 | 106 | 104 | 109 |
| 7 | 126 | 118 | 117 | 118 | 93 | 92 | 93 |
| 8 | 129 | 179 | 168 | 195 | 138 | 116 | 151 |
| 9 | 129 | 118 | 112 | 127 | 91 | 87 | 98 |
| 10 | 132 | 152 | 152 | 150 | 115 | 115 | 113 |
| 11 | 138 | 124 | 119 | 129 | 89 | 86 | 93 |
| 12 | 144 | 186 | 179 | 175 | 129 | 124 | 121 |
| 13 | 161 | 147 | 144 | 154 | 91 | 89 | 95 |
| 14 | 167 | 166 | 153 | 185 | 99 | 91 | 111 |
| 15 | 168 | 158 | 142 | 181 | 94 | 84 | 107 |
| 16 | 170 | 162 | 145 | 189 | 95 | 85 | 110 |
| 17 | 170 | 165 | 162 | 163 | 97 | 95 | 95 |
| 18 | 171 | 175 | 165 | 194 | 102 | 96 | 113 |
| 19 | 175 | 172 | 169 | 177 | 98 | 96 | 101 |
| 20 | 180 | 150 | 151 | 146 | 83 | 84 | 81 |
| 21 | 186 | 186 | 179 | 200 | 100 | 96 | 116 |
| 22 | 184 | 203 | 200 | 205 | 110 | 108 | 111 |
| 23 | 187 | 139 | 136 | 143 | 74 | 73 | 76 |
| 24 | 192 | 159 | 160 | 157 | 83 | 83 | 82 |
| 25 | 192 | 177 | 177 | 177 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| 26 | 192 | 162 | 149 | 181 | 84 | 78 | 94 |
| 27 | 192 | 181 | 175 | 194 | 94 | 91 | 101 |
| 28 | 192 | 177 | 171 | 185 | 92 | 89 | 96 |
| 29 | 192 | 168 | 165 | 173 | 87 | 86 | 90 |
| 30 | 192 | 216 | 224 | 208 | 112 | 117 | 108 |
| 31 | 192 | 150 | 142 | 159 | 78 | 74 | 83 |
| 32 | 192 | 181 | 169 | 175 | 94 | 88 | 91 |
| 33 | 192 | 186 | 200 | 167 | 97 | 104 | 87 |
| 34 | 192 | 186 | 187 | 181 | 96 | 97 | 94 |
| 35 | 192 | 187 | 185 | 194 | 97 | 96 | 101 |
| 36 | 192 | 172 | 167 | 181 | 90 | 87 | 94 |
| 37 | 192 | 154 | 142 | 169 | 80 | 71 | 87 |
| Average | --- | --- | --- | --- | 96.4 | 93.5 | 99.8 |

(Continued on the next page)

TABLE VI (continued)

A COMPARISON OF THE I.Q.'S FOR GROUP I AND GROUP II
(December Scores - Group II)

| Boy No. | C.A. | Mental Age | | | I.Q. | | |
|-------------|------|------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------|--------|
| | | Total M. | Lang. | Non Lang. | Total M. | Lang. | Non L. |
| 1 | 96 | 73 | 76 | 70 | 76 | 78 | 72 |
| 2 | 99 | 99 | 93 | 105 | 100 | 94 | 106 |
| 3 | 103 | 99 | 93 | 103 | 96 | 90 | 100 |
| 4 | 110 | 125 | 125 | 127 | 113 | 113 | 115 |
| 5 | 117 | 95 | 87 | 105 | 81 | 74 | 89 |
| 6 | 118 | 114 | 123 | 103 | 96 | 104 | 87 |
| 7 | 126 | 119 | 108 | 115 | 90 | 85 | 91 |
| 8 | 129 | 152 | 164 | 124 | 117 | 127 | 96 |
| 9 | 129 | 118 | 115 | 123 | 91 | 87 | 94 |
| 10 | 132 | 145 | 142 | 154 | 110 | 109 | 116 |
| 11 | 138 | 119 | 115 | 124 | 86 | 83 | 90 |
| 12 | 144 | 175 | 170 | 181 | 121 | 118 | 125 |
| 13 | 161 | 143 | 137 | 160 | 88 | 85 | 99 |
| 14 | 167 | 153 | 153 | 150 | 91 | 91 | 89 |
| 15 | 168 | 147 | 145 | 150 | 87 | 86 | 89 |
| 16 | 170 | 162 | 149 | 181 | 95 | 87 | 106 |
| 17 | 170 | 165 | 130 | 185 | 97 | 76 | 108 |
| 18 | 171 | 159 | 155 | 163 | 94 | 91 | 95 |
| 19 | 175 | 166 | 153 | 185 | 94 | 87 | 105 |
| 20 | 180 | 143 | 136 | 153 | 79 | 75 | 85 |
| 21 | 186 | 177 | 165 | 197 | 95 | 88 | 105 |
| 22 | 184 | 197 | 185 | 181 | 107 | 100 | 98 |
| 23 | 187 | 136 | 138 | 130 | 72 | 74 | 70 |
| 24 | 192 | 154 | 147 | 163 | 80 | 77 | 84 |
| 25 | 192 | 162 | 158 | 167 | 84 | 82 | 86 |
| 26 | 192 | 157 | 151 | 163 | 82 | 79 | 85 |
| 27 | 192 | 169 | 160 | 185 | 88 | 83 | 96 |
| 28 | 192 | 166 | 158 | 177 | 86 | 82 | 92 |
| 29 | 192 | 167 | 155 | 185 | 85 | 80 | 96 |
| 30 | 192 | 197 | 197 | 197 | 102 | 102 | 102 |
| 31 | 192 | 145 | 134 | 159 | 76 | 70 | 83 |
| 32 | 192 | 172 | 162 | 189 | 90 | 84 | 98 |
| 33 | 192 | 172 | 173 | 169 | 90 | 91 | 88 |
| 34 | 192 | 180 | 173 | 194 | 93 | 91 | 101 |
| 35 | 192 | 180 | 158 | 183 | 94 | 82 | 95 |
| 36 | 192 | 171 | 165 | 185 | 89 | 85 | 96 |
| 37 | 192 | 157 | 147 | 173 | 81 | 75 | 91 |
| Average --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 91.7 | 88.2 | 95.2 |

(Continued on the next page)

TABLE VI (continued)

A COMPARISON OF THE I.Q.'S FOR GROUP I AND GROUP II
(June Scores - Group I)

| Boy No. | C.A. | Mental Age | | | I.Q. | | |
|-------------|------|------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------|-----------|
| | | Total | M. Lang. | Non Lang. | Total | M. Lang. | Non Lang. |
| 1 | 102 | 93 | 91 | 94 | 91 | 90 | 92 |
| 2 | 105 | 129 | 123 | 137 | 122 | 117 | 130 |
| 3 | 109 | 127 | 119 | 137 | 116 | 109 | 125 |
| 4 | 116 | 153 | 142 | 184 | 131 | 122 | 158 |
| 5 | 123 | 115 | 113 | 118 | 93 | 91 | 95 |
| 6 | 124 | 138 | 135 | 144 | 111 | 108 | 116 |
| 7 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 8 | 135 | 187 | 185 | 195 | 138 | 137 | 144 |
| 9 | 135 | 129 | 117 | 150 | 95 | 86 | 111 |
| 10 | 138 | 168 | 170 | 160 | 121 | 123 | 115 |
| 11 | 144 | 151 | 135 | 195 | 104 | 93 | 135 |
| 12 | 150 | 221 | 215 | 227 | 147 | 143 | 151 |
| 13 | 167 | 145 | 135 | 176 | 86 | 80 | 105 |
| 14 | 173 | 181 | 165 | 208 | 104 | 95 | 120 |
| 15 | 174 | 172 | 158 | 197 | 98 | 90 | 113 |
| 16 | 176 | 184 | 165 | 183 | 104 | 93 | 103 |
| 17 | 176 | 189 | 185 | 197 | 107 | 105 | 112 |
| 18 | 177 | 195 | 175 | 224 | 110 | 98 | 126 |
| 19 | 181 | 185 | 177 | 200 | 102 | 98 | 110 |
| 20 | 186 | 171 | 162 | 185 | 92 | 87 | 99 |
| 21 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 22 | 190 | 223 | 209 | 236 | 117 | 110 | 124 |
| 23 | 192 | 153 | 138 | 173 | 79 | 71 | 89 |
| 24 | 192 | 176 | 175 | 177 | 91 | 90 | 92 |
| 25 | 192 | 191 | 187 | 197 | 99 | 97 | 102 |
| 26 | 192 | 176 | 169 | 189 | 91 | 88 | 98 |
| 27 | 192 | 192 | 185 | 203 | 100 | 96 | 105 |
| 28 | 192 | 181 | 175 | 194 | 94 | 90 | 101 |
| 29 | 192 | 183 | 175 | 197 | 95 | 90 | 102 |
| 30 | 192 | 233 | 242 | 224 | 121 | 126 | 116 |
| 31 | 192 | 183 | 175 | 197 | 95 | 91 | 102 |
| 32 | 192 | 212 | 200 | 224 | 110 | 104 | 116 |
| 33 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 34 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 35 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 36 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 37 | 192 | 163 | 149 | 185 | 85 | 78 | 96 |
| Average --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 104.8 | 99.8 | 113 |

* Boys who left the Home to join a parent or the armed forces

(Continued on the next page)

TABLE VI (continued)

A COMPARISON OF THE I.Q'S FOR GROUP I AND GROUP II
(June Scores - Group II)

| Boy No. | C.A. | Mental Age | | | I.Q. | | |
|---------|------|------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------|-----------|
| | | Total | M. Lang. | Non Lang. | Total | M. Lang. | Non Lang. |
| 1 | 102 | 84 | 91 | 74 | 83 | 89 | 73 |
| 2 | 105 | 105 | 108 | 101 | 100 | 102 | 96 |
| 3 | 109 | 113 | 102 | 129 | 108 | 92 | 118 |
| 4 | 116 | 128 | 121 | 137 | 110 | 103 | 118 |
| 5 | 123 | 121 | 104 | 150 | 98 | 84 | 121 |
| 6 | 124 | 117 | 123 | 107 | 94 | 99 | 86 |
| 7 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 8 | 135 | 153 | 157 | 141 | 113 | 116 | 106 |
| 9 | 135 | 129 | 125 | 135 | 96 | 92 | 100 |
| 10 | 138 | 151 | 147 | 160 | 111 | 106 | 115 |
| 11 | 144 | 112 | 115 | 107 | 77 | 80 | 74 |
| 12 | 150 | 168 | 163 | 184 | 112 | 108 | 122 |
| 13 | 167 | 152 | 142 | 181 | 91 | 85 | 108 |
| 14 | 173 | 171 | 153 | 200 | 98 | 88 | 115 |
| 15 | 174 | 163 | 160 | 167 | 93 | 91 | 95 |
| 16 | 176 | 172 | 165 | 185 | 97 | 93 | 105 |
| 17 | 176 | 176 | 136 | 200 | 100 | 71 | 113 |
| 18 | 177 | 176 | 173 | 181 | 99 | 97 | 102 |
| 19 | 181 | 176 | 162 | 200 | 97 | 89 | 110 |
| 20 | 186 | 159 | 147 | 177 | 85 | 79 | 95 |
| 21 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 22 | 190 | 213 | 209 | 218 | 112 | 110 | 114 |
| 23 | 192 | 150 | 149 | 143 | 77 | 76 | 74 |
| 24 | 192 | 177 | 169 | 194 | 92 | 88 | 101 |
| 25 | 192 | 171 | 165 | 181 | 89 | 86 | 94 |
| 26 | 192 | 167 | 162 | 173 | 87 | 84 | 89 |
| 27 | 192 | 179 | 169 | 197 | 93 | 88 | 102 |
| 28 | 192 | 171 | 160 | 189 | 89 | 83 | 98 |
| 29 | 192 | 171 | 162 | 203 | 89 | 84 | 105 |
| 30 | 192 | 203 | 200 | 205 | 105 | 104 | 106 |
| 31 | 192 | 158 | 142 | 181 | 85 | 76 | 94 |
| 32 | 192 | 183 | 173 | 200 | 95 | 90 | 104 |
| 33 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 34 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 35 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 36 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 37 | 192 | 161 | 147 | 181 | 84 | 76 | 93 |
| Average | --- | --- | --- | --- | 95.4 | 90.6 | 101.4 |

*Boys who left the Home to join a parent or the armed forces

APPENDIX C - CASE HISTORIES

CASE HISTORY OF NUMBER 8

Fred was a thin, sensitive boy of seven when his parents separated, and his mother took him to live with her sister. He had no serious illnesses when young. He was very obedient. He always made good marks in school with little effort. Fred likes baseball, football, to play marbles and to read books. He is able to sustain an interesting conversation. He is very polite and behaves as a much older boy.

Fred's father was born in 1884 at New Orleans. He was the only child of a father who was in the diplomatic service. His father served at Paris, Spain and London. His mother was born in America and believed to be a countess in her own right. Fred's father received a degree in chemical engineering at Paris and his doctorate degree in Heidelberg, Germany. He is able to speak seven languages, besides English, fluently. His wife, Fred's mother, considers him too intelligent to live with. She complained that he was nervous and lost his temper easily.

Fred's mother (Mrs. Brown) was born in 1910. She is of medium build and has an attractive disposition. She is the older of two girls in her family and an interesting conversationalist. She claimed to be her father's "pet" and said her younger sister was her mother's favorite. Mrs.

Brown obtained a B.S. degree in education at a teacher's college when she was eighteen years old. She taught school for one year in West Virginia. Since she was unable to handle the discipline in her classroom, she left to take a job as a clerk in a department store. She worked her way up to the stock control department. She left this job over a personality clash with the new manager in the department. Then she obtained a job with the government and worked her way up to statistical editor. It was at this time that she met her husband, who was a speculator in gold and rare minerals. Her family was making plans with him to investigate the possibilities of gold in a tract of land in North Carolina.

Mrs. Brown said that she married for her parent's sake. She felt that her husband would be able to help her family, who had apparently invested a good part of their savings, and there was no prospect of immediate returns. Mrs. Brown was twenty-six and her husband fifty-two at the time of their marriage. She did not consider her husband very attractive and avoided him whenever possible.

Shortly after their marriage she became pregnant. Not wishing to have a child at this time, she made several attempts to get rid of the child by abortion but failed. However, by

accident, she fell down a flight of stairs and shortly after the child was born dead. She then was possessed with a strong desire to have a baby and planned for her next child which was Fred.

Mrs. Brown said that her husband was not fond of children. He was abusive of the boys and also of her. Her second child, a boy, had been born two years after Fred's birth. Mrs. Brown felt that her husband was old fashioned in his attitude toward her, treating her as a servant.

In 1947 the home conditions became unbearable, and she left with her children to live with a sister who was sick with cancer. Late in 1947 her sister died. Then Mrs. Brown moved to Richmond and placed the two boys in the Boys' Home.

Fred is fond of his mother and capable of understanding the reasons for placement. He likes his brother but considers him a problem. He did not like his father and the only remembrance he had of him was being kicked two feet off the floor when refusing to study in the library.

Fred was given an examination on September 28 by Mrs. Giblette of the Memorial Guidance Clinic. The report added:

The boy does have excellent thinking capacity, but he is extremely variable in his productions thus reflecting his emotional tenseness, his undevelopment in some phases of his capacity, and his tendency to be bored with routine. His reasoning in abstract situations is outstanding. Tests pointing to sociability have very

superior scores. His word knowledge and fund of information about practical and social matters are excellent. School achievements, although average for his age is much below his capacity level.

Fred was given a Rorschach test which indicated considerable anxiety and conflict, around the relationship of his parents. His mental superiority makes it difficult for him to adjust to children of average intelligence, as his vocabulary and interests are not within their comprehension. He is responsive to interest shown him, and he may eventually relax and develop an emotional security through parent substitutes. Fred should have an enriched school program so that he will retain an eager desire for learning.

CASE HISTORY OF NUMBER 11

James is a pale, thin boy of twelve years, with large, serious brown eyes. He seems very shy and reserved, self-possessed and quieter than the average child for his age. He is neat, clean, cooperative and conducts himself well. He shows unusual mechanical ability.

James' parents are divorced. James' mother (Mrs. Smith) was granted legal custody of her four children in final divorce proceedings in March 1949. There was included an injunction that Mr. Smith remain away from his wife and children.

Mrs. Smith and her four children lived in a tiny, two-room apartment. She had a position here in one of the department stores at \$37.50 a week. Her income was supplemented by the Family Service Society. Mr. Smith was under court order to pay his family \$15.00 a week, but this was never paid.

In January, 1949 Mrs. Smith had a very serious operation, and the doctor advised a period of rest from the continued responsibility of the children. Then James and his older brother came to the Richmond Home for Boys. The other two children, being girls, went to live with relatives.

Mr. Smith is near the middle of a family of fifteen. When his father became paralyzed, he left school in order to

go to work. He was fourteen and was in his second year of high school. His father died when he was eighteen, and shortly after his mother remarried. Mr. Smith remained dependent upon his mother for all planning. His mother and his siblings are known to social agencies where their financial incompetence is recognized. His mother never leaves her home.

Mr. Smith is reported to be epileptic. He seems able to produce a seizure at will. His alcoholism contributes to this problem. During an alcoholic episode, he is reported to be violent. He is on parole to the Federal Parole Officer, having had some arrests for forgery. Because of Mr. Smith's actions during an alcoholic episode, the children have a very real fear, since they have seen their mother mistreated by him. They used to keep themselves locked in and lived under considerable pressure and with extreme physical limitations.

Mrs. Smith is one of eight children. She completed third year high school and then took a business course. For five years prior to her marriage, she worked. Partly because her husband did not support her adequately and also because she preferred work outside of the home, she continued to work after her marriage. Since her operation she has had periods of coma which are very frightening to the children.

The family used to attend a Baptist church. Aside from

visiting maternal relatives, this was their only social activity.

The mother remembers nothing of James' early training, but she feels that it must have been average or normal or it would have been noted at that time. He was a bottle fed baby and was very thin at the time that this marriage made its first physical break. James and his brother are inseparable companions.

James had a psychological examination at the Memorial Guidance Clinic indicating:

He lacks self-confidence. He does not dare to erase an error without permission. His test pattern shows superior potentialities, but he needs remedial reading. He is left-handed and his directional confusion apparently is a factor of this. He is functioning at average, although he has superior native intelligence. The psychiatrist feels that the environment of the Richmond Home for Boys will be beneficial for this child. He is interested in the exact routine laid out for him at the Home.

CASE HISTORY OF NUMBER 13

Jim, a well-built, nice-looking boy of thirteen exhibits a withdrawn and sensitive attitude about his home condition. He was so devoted to his own parents that the authorities felt that he would not accept a substitute foster home and recommended institutional care for him.

The case worker described him as a clean child physically and mentally, forgiving and showing respect for elders, but having a tendency to pick on younger children, even his own two younger brothers.

The father was born in Virginia in 1906 and married in 1926. He was a patient in Western State Hospital because of drunkenness (1942) and paroled in the spring of 1945. At the present his whereabouts are not known. There seems always to have been marital discord, but the children are devoted to their father.

The mother, an untidy housekeeper, drinks and has a history of immorality. At present, she is at the State Farm for Women charged with immorality and of neglecting the children. The children appear to adore her.

Jim has two younger brothers and an older sister. Having received no discipline in his home, he has been at times, difficult to control. He seems somewhat emotional and

cries easily. He has no feeling of security and hates to go from the known to the unknown, even if the known is unpleasant and the unknown more promising.

CASE HISTORY OF JOHN

John is the illegitimate son of Lucy. He was born in the Salvation Army Home and Hospital, on September 3, 1925. He remained there with his mother for thirteen months, and then he was placed in the City Home where he remained until he came to the Richmond Home for Boys on June 2, 1936. His mother was transferred to the Colony of Lynchburg. John's father is unknown.

Mr. Morton, Superintendent of the City Home said:

John is affectionate, kind-hearted and gets along well with other boys. He does not appear to be good material for taking higher education, but if he gets any chance at all, in my opinion, he will make a useful citizen.

John had difficulty seeing a piece of work through. Often he would lose his tools. He was put in an ungraded class at school. He learned to read and spell a little and to count change. His health was good. He loved pets. He was always anxious to please. He was never mean, seemed to love everybody. He enjoyed the Home, as he liked the country atmosphere. He was perfectly contented and did not realize that he was any different from the other boys. At eight years of age he had scored 5 years and 2 months (I.Q. 65) on an intelligence test.

After years of understanding and kindness shown him

by the staff at the Home, John has gone out and gotten a job as a mechanic. He has married and has a child and maintains a home here in Richmond, and he is a good citizen. While he will probably never make an outstanding citizen he is a self-sustaining one.

VITA

Mabel McLain was born at St. Stephens Church, Virginia on December 19, 1917. She was educated in King and Queen County, receiving her diploma from Marriott High School in June, 1935. She was graduated from Longwood College in August, 1940 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Education, and she accepted a Junior Primary Teaching position in Cumberland County.

During World War II she worked for two years as a typist at the Bellwood Quartermaster Depot near Richmond, Virginia. She married William Nanouski of the United States Navy in December, 1944. While her husband was stationed at Norfolk, Virginia, she taught English and History in the high school, for one year, in the Norfolk County Schools.

After the war, she and her husband returned to Richmond, Virginia to make their home. She taught one year in Chesterfield County before coming into the Richmond Public Schools.

The work on the program leading to a Master of Science Degree in Education was begun at the University of Richmond in the summer of 1947.