U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
JAMES J. DAVIS, Secretary
CHILDREN'S BUREAU
GRACE ABBOTT, Chief

WELFARE OF PRISONERS' FAMILIES IN KENTUCKY

By

RUTH S. BLOODGOOD

Bureau Publication No. 182

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON
1928

CONTENTS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, January 10, 1928.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a report of a study of the welfare of prisoners' families in Kentucky undertaken at the request of a commission appointed by the Governor of Kentucky to study prison labor. The report deals with conditions in the families of men serving sentences in the State Reformatory and the State Penitentiary of Kentucky. The investigation was made under the direction of, and the report written by, Ruth S. Bloodgood, of the social-service division of the Children's Bureau. The bureau is indebted to officials of the two institutions and to the members of the commission, especially Prof. John F. Smith, chairman, for their helpful cooperation.

GRACE ABBOTT, *Chief.*

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor.

WELFARE OF PRISONERS' FAMILIES IN KENTUCKY

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF STUDY

This study relating to the welfare of families of prisoners in Kentucky was made by the United States Children's Bureau upon the request of a commission appointed in 1925 by the Governor of Kentucky to study the labor system in the two State penal institutions. An important phase of the general inquiry into the labor problem was a consideration of the adequacy of the compensation paid to the prisoners for their labor as related to the needs and morale of the prisoners themselves and to the welfare of their dependent families. The Children's Bureau undertook to gather data upon this latter problem, the welfare of the families.

The purpose of this study by the Children's Bureau, therefore, was to obtain, through case studies of a selected group of families, facts that would show the social and economic effects of the fathers' imprisonment upon the welfare of the mothers and children, particularly of the children young enough to present problems of child dependency. The welfare of these families should be the concern of the State or community not only during the actual absence of the father; their welfare should be safeguarded for the future by more adequate funds from the prisoners' earnings and by a program of preventive social service. It is hoped that this study, by showing what is happening in these families, will suggest the best means of preventing the social and economic breakdowns that occur in many families deprived of the father's earnings and assistance through his imprisonment.

The field work extended from March 15 to July 15, 1926. Two distinct types of investigation were made: A study of the individual records of all the prisoners in the two State penal institutions to obtain data that would show the extent of the family dependency problem with which the State must concern itself; and case studies of selected families to discover the actual situation in families deprived of the father's support. The intensive family study was made by means of visits to the homes of the families, interviews with the mother or relatives responsible for the welfare of the children, and consultations with social workers or county officials knowing the families.

The members of the commission on prison labor and of the State board of charities and corrections, the officials of the institutions, the local authorities interviewed, and the families themselves cooperated with the bureau to the fullest extent.

THE STATE PENAL INSTITUTIONS

Two penal institutions in Kentucky receive adults charged with criminal offenses—the penitentiary at Eddyville in the southwestern part of the State and the reformatory at Frankfort in the north central part. These two institutions are under the management of the State board of charities and corrections. Determination of administrative policies, appointment of superintendents, and supervision of the parole system are all functions of the board. The commissioner of public institutions is the agent of the board and has general charge of the State penal, correctional, and charitable institutions.

Although one of the institutions is designated a reformatory and the other a penitentiary, commitments of male prisoners are usually made to them on a geographical basis, those from the northwestern and southwestern portions of the State being committed to the penitentiary and those from the central, northeastern, and southeastern sections to the reformatory. Both institutions receive prisoners from Jefferson County—which contains Louisville, the largest city of the State—the commitments being apportioned on a percentage basis. All women are committed to the reformatory. Sometimes prisoners are committed to the institutions outside their district, and all persons receiving death sentences are confined at the penitentiary.

Although separate institutions called houses of reform have been provided for all juvenile offenders under 18 years of age [1] persons under that age have been received in the two penal institutions.

The labor system in operation at these institutions is the "contract system"; that is, the prisoners are employed in manufacturing industries that are operated under contracts with certain firms. When the State board of charities and corrections was organized in 1920 the able-bodied men were employed under contracts which returned to the State 50 to 95 cents a day, the State furnishing the light and power required by the contractors. After carefully considering other labor systems the State board decided to continue this contract system. New contracts were made to replace those which still had some time to run, providing that in addition to the amounts paid for the labor of prisoners the contractors should pay for the power and light used in the shops.[2] At the time of the 1925 report of the State board four contracts were in effect at the reformatory and three at the penitentiary, all functioning under the foregoing stipulations. Shirts, shoes, chairs, brooms, and harness (collars) were being manufactured.[3]

A law passed in 1920 provided that prisoners should be paid for their labor. Authority to make rules and regulations regarding such compensation was given to the State board of charities and corrections.[4] The legal provision for this compensation is as follows:

> *Compensation may be paid prisoners.*—The State board of control [now the State board of charities and corrections] shall provide rules and regulations whereby each prisoner engaged in any kind of work shall receive a certain sum each day from his earnings, which sum shall be not less than five cents (5c.) nor

[1] Ky., act of Mar. 21, 1896, ch. 33, Acts of 1896, p. 55; act of Mar. 15, 1898, ch. 35, Acts of 1898, p. 92; act of Mar. 9, 1920, ch. 7, Acts of 1920, p. 9; Constitution adopted Sept. 28, 1891, sec. 252; Carroll's Stat. 1922, sec. 2095b–13, pp. 991, 992, sec. 2095b–19, p. 993.

[2] Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the Biennial Period Ending June 30, 1923, pp. 19–23.

[3] Ibid., June 30, 1925, p. 20.

[4] Ky., Carroll's Stat. 1922, sec. 3828a–5, p. 1834.

more than fifteen cents (15c.) per day, the amount thereof to be determined as may be provided by the State board of control: *Provided*, The funds thus accruing to the credit of any prisoner shall be paid to him or to dependent members of his family at such times and in such manner as the State board of control may deem best, but at least twenty-five per cent (25%) of such credit shall be left for and paid to the prisoner at the time of his parole or final discharge by the State board of control: *And provided*, That the warden may, with the approval of the State board of control, by way of punishment for violation of rules and of propriety, or any other misconduct, cancel or distribute to the family of the prisoner such portion or such credit as he may deem best. At the end of each month the State board of control shall certify to the auditor of public accounts the amount due each prisoner for that month, and he shall draw warrant on the State treasurer for the amount so certified.

The State board of charities and corrections has fixed the maximum amount to be paid at 15 cents per day, a plan which went into effect on January 3, 1921.[5] Extra amounts are paid to some prisoners for special services, higher productivity, or overtime work. The "trusties" who are given clerical positions, those employed as orderlies in the hospital, and those performing other administrative duties are paid on the same basis as the men working in the shops.

No rules have been made regarding the assignment of earnings to dependents, although the law states that funds from a prisoner's earnings shall be paid either to the prisoner or to his dependent family, as the State may deem best. At least 25 per cent of his earnings must be put in reserve to be paid to the prisoner at the time of either parole or discharge.

Kentucky has a centralized parole system for all prisoners paroled from correctional institutions. The State board of charities and corrections, through its parole committee, decides what persons can be placed on parole from each institution. It formulates the rules governing parole and appoints and supervises parole officers.

The State is divided into three districts, and a man parole officer is assigned to each district to supervise men and boys who have been paroled. A woman officer supervises all women and girls, usually about 100, throughout the State. About 1,000 prisoners are on parole every month, and three or four visits a year, on an average, are made to each prisoner. Persons on parole are required to submit written reports monthly to the parole office.

Practically no preparole work is done for adults except in special cases at the request of parole committees of the State board. Information as to the man's or woman's reputation in the community and his standing with the officers of the law is obtained by correspondence or from a visit of the parole officer, but no special attempt is made to obtain the significant facts regarding the home or family conditions of the prisoners.

[5] An act of 1926 provides that not less than $2 a day shall be paid to the State board of charities and corrections for each prisoner employed on road work at the request of the State highway commission. Regulations of the State board govern payment of a certain percentage of the earnings—not less than 25 per cent nor more than 50 per cent—to each prisoner engaged in any kind of work. Preference in assignment to road work may be given to those prisoners with families of greatest dependency. (Act of Mar. 17, 1926, ch. 150, Acts of 1926, p. 706.)

84430°—28——2

EXTENT OF FAMILY-WELFARE PROBLEM

PRISONERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Information was obtained from the records at the penitentiary and the reformatory as to the marital status, race, and sex of all prisoners in the institutions on March 15, 1926. For male prisoners in whose families there were reported to be dependent children under 16 years of age at the time of their imprisonment, still further facts were obtained, such as date of birth of the prisoner, date on which he was received at the institution, court sentencing, charge for which sentenced, term of sentence, date on which the sentence would terminate, and date on which the prisoner would become eligible for parole.

RACE, SEX, AND MARITAL STATUS OF ALL PRISONERS

Of the 2,243 male prisoners in the two institutions, 1,554 were in the reformatory and 689 in the penitentiary.[1] Of the reformatory population, 1,030 were white and 524 negro; of the penitentiary population, 341 were white and 348 negro. As no different problems were presented by the separate institutions, the combined figures for the two institutions have been used in most of the tables.

The prisoners were rather evenly divided between single and married men, 1,040 being reported as single and 1,203 as married.[2] The 1,203 reported as married included those who were widowed, divorced, deserting, or separated from their wives. Table 1 shows the marital status by race.

TABLE 1.—*Marital status of male prisoners in the Kentucky penal institutions on March 15, 1926, by race*

Marital status	Male prisoners		
	Total	Race	
		White	Negro
Total	2,243	1,371	872
Single	1,040	597	443
Married	1,203	774	429
Living with wife prior to imprisonment	[a] 958	622	[a] 336
Widowed	105	57	48
Divorced	74	58	16
Deserting	5	5	
Separated	61	32	29

[a] Includes 1 common-law marriage.

[1] Forty-two women prisoners were in the reformatory, 19 white and 23 negro. Seventeen of these had children under 16 years of age at the time of imprisonment. Since the number was not large enough to afford a basis for any conclusions the women prisoners have been excluded from discussion.

[2] A comparison of the marital status of the male prisoners in the two Kentucky institutions and of all men committed to prisons and reformatories throughout the United States between Jan. 1 and June 30, 1923, shows that the white group in Kentucky had a somewhat smaller percentage of single men (44 as compared with 55 per cent) and a correspondingly larger percentage of married men (56 and 45). In the negro group the percentages for single and married were about equally divided, both in Kentucky and in the United States as a whole. (See Prisoners, 1923, Crime Conditions in the United States as Reflected in Census Statistics of Imprisoned Offenders, U. S. Bureau of the Census, p. 84, Washington, 1926.)

FAMILIES OF PRISONERS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Of the 1,203 married prisoners, 714 had children under 16 years of age at the date of their imprisonment, including stepchildren or children of illegitimate birth of either parent. In 600 of these families all the children were under 16. Of the other 489 married men, 426 had no children, and the remaining 63 had children all of whom were over 16 years of age.

All the married prisoners' families that included children under 16 years of age may be considered potentially dependent families, as they have been deprived of their main source of support. Many of them already may have become dependent upon their communities or may present social problems that need special service and care. Some of these families, because of the instability of the father or mother or their neglect of the children, were community problems prior to the parent's imprisonment. On the other hand, a few families of exceptional ability stood out as maintaining a high standard of living before the father's imprisonment and as able to keep up an adequate standard during his absence.

The welfare of the children who were young enough to present problems of child dependency was the primary concern of this study. The 714 families in which there were children under 16 years of age when the father was imprisoned comprised the group included in the detailed record study and those from which the families for the intensive case study were selected. One hundred and fourteen of the families in which there were children under 16 included also children over 16. Some of these older children who were self-supporting or married were not factors in the welfare of the families; others were providing for themselves and were contributing to the support of the mother and younger children. Occasionally children who had reached working age or older married children had been or still were dependent on their parents, and their dependency may have affected the welfare of the younger children.

The number of children under 16 years of age in the 714 families studied varied from 1 to 10 or more. The average number of children in these families was 2.2. More than three-fifths (437) had only 1 or 2 children, but 5 children or more were reported for 113 families. A total of 1,572 children under 16 years of age was reported for the 714 families.[3] Of this total, 1,272 were in the 600 families which had no older children, and 300 were in the 114 families which had older children.

The prisoners had come from every section of the State. Of the 547 whose families were reported as living in the State only 94 resided in the two counties (Jefferson and Fayette) having the largest cities. In only 19 of the 120 counties in the State were there no dependent families of prisoners.[4] The place of residence of 71 of the 714 families was not reported.

Ninety-six families resided outside the State. Most of these were living just over the border in adjoining States, but a few were living in more distant localities.

---

[3] This represents the number for whom ages were reported. In 21 of the families having both children under and children over 16 the ages were not reported; hence it was impossible to get the complete total of children under that age.

[4] For the purpose of the study a "dependent family" means a family with 1 or more children under 16 years of age.

OFFENSE AND TERM OF IMPRISONMENT OF FATHERS

The following list shows the charges against the married prisoners having children under 16 years of age at date of imprisonment:

	Number of prisoners
Total	714
Offenses against the person	338
Murder	190
Manslaughter	124
Malicious injury to persons	24
Offenses against property	273
Robbery	42
Burglary, breaking and entering	87
Larceny	83
Receiving stolen goods	6
Embezzlement	5
Fraud	11
Forgery	35
Arson	4
Offenses against the administration of government	28
Offenses against chastity	50
Rape	15
Carnal knowledge	14
Other	21
Desertion or failure to provide	21
Other	4

The terms for which the prisoners with dependent children had been sentenced upon the foregoing charges were as follows:

	Number of prisoners		Number of prisoners
Total	714	10 years, under 15	69
		15 years, under 20	32
1 year	88	20 years and over	75
2 years	135	Life	125
3 years	53	Death sentence	4
4 years	22	Indeterminate	3
5 years, under 10	108		

Only 12 per cent were sentenced for less than two years, and 57 per cent were sentenced for five years or longer. The small number of indeterminate sentences in Kentucky is in great contrast to the practice in most States, as throughout the United States more than half of the persons in prisons and reformatories on January 1, 1923, had been given indeterminate sentences.[5]

Every prisoner became eligible for parole at the end of half of his term in cases in which the term was for less than 16 years. The men sentenced for 16 years or more and the life-sentence men became eligible for parole after serving 8 years.[6] The State board of chari-

[5] Prisoners, 1923, p. 124.

[6] Ky., Carroll's Stat. 1922, sec. 3828–2 p. 1928. A law passed in 1926 provides for parole at the end of half the term in cases in which the sentence is for 10 years or less, or sentences aggregating 10 years or less; parole at the end of 6 years' imprisonment on a sentence or sentences aggregating more than 10 years and not more than 21 years; and parole at the end of 8 years for persons convicted for life or sentenced for more than 21 years. (Act of Mar. 22, 1926, ch. 152, Acts of 1926, p. 712.)

ties and corrections restricted this by ruling that all life men sentenced since January 1, 1922, should be required to serve 12 years before they were eligible for parole recommendation.[7] On March 15, 1926, 92 of the 710 men not under death sentence had already become eligible but had not been paroled, 337 might be released within a period of less than 2 years, and for 35 men the period of further imprisonment would be 8 years or more. The report of the State board shows that only about one-fifth of the 2,024 men becoming eligible for parole, on the basis of time served, during the two-year period, July 1, 1923, to June 30, 1925, were recommended by the board as having met all requirements.[8]

Another consideration in connection with the length of imprisonment is the commutation for "good time." This is dependent entirely on the prisoner's conduct in the institution and is credited on the following basis: Seven days to be allowed for each month of the first year, 8 days for each month of the second year, and 10 days for each month of the third and subsequent years.[9]

At the time of the study, 383 of the 714 men had been in the institution for one year or more and 71 had been there for five years or more. The duration of the men's imprisonment up to March 15, 1926, was as follows:

	Number of prisoners		Number of prisoners
Total	714	4 years	38
		5 years	26
Under 6 months	213	6 years	13
6 months, under 1 year	118	7 years	17
1 year	137	8 years	4
2 years	78	9 years	6
3 years	59	10 years and over	5

FINANCIAL AND SOCIAL AID TO FAMILIES

In both institutions prisoners might make assignments to their families from their earnings and from other available funds. Only a few men were not employed because of physical inability or because of detention under death penalty. In addition to the prisoners' contributions, the families of men in the reformatory might receive aid from the Mutual Welfare League. Assistance from the league is limited to the families of its members, but at the time of the study most of the prisoners were members.

ASSIGNMENTS FROM EARNINGS AND OTHER INCOME OF PRISONERS

Assignments of earnings were made voluntarily by the prisoners, except in the case of members whose families were receiving grants from the Mutual Welfare League. (See p. 11.) The State board of charities and corrections apparently made no definite effort to encourage men to send their earnings to their families.

[7] Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the Biennial Period Ending June 30, 1925, p. 25.
[8] Ibid., p. 26.
[9] Rules Governing the Consideration and Granting of Paroles and Commutations for Good Time at Kentucky State Reformatory, Frankfort, Ky., and Kentucky State Penitentiary, Eddyville, Ky., p. 6. Issued by the State board of charities and corrections, Frankfort, Ky.

The financial accounts of the 714 married men having children under 16 years of age showed the amounts of money sent to the families or relatives and the dates on which the money was sent. The amounts which had been sent either to the family or to other relatives up to March 15, 1926, are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2.—*Amount of money sent to family or relatives by married men having children under 16 years of age at date of imprisonment, by time in institution up to March 15, 1926*

Amount of money sent to family or relatives	Married men having children under 16 years of age at date of imprisonment							
	Total	Time in institution up to Mar. 15, 1926						
		Under 1 year		1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 years and over
		Under 6 months	6 months, under 1 year					
Total	714	213	118	137	78	59	38	71
No money sent	548	195	97	95	57	41	22	41
Amount reported	164	18	21	42	21	18	16	28
Under $10	56	12	11	20	4	2	2	5
$10, under $20	32	1	6	12	5	3	3	2
$20, under $30	23	----	2	3	5	7	3	3
$30, under $40	15	3	----	1	4	2	4	1
$40, under $50	6	----	1	1	----	----	1	3
$50, under $100	16	2	----	3	3	2	2	4
$100 and over	16	----	1	2	----	2	1	10
Amount not reported	2	----	----	----	----	----	----	2

Only 166 men (nearly one-fourth of the 714 prisoners having dependent children under 16 years of age) had sent money to their families or relatives. These contributions had been very irregular in the majority of cases; no prisoner had sent money from earnings or other sources throughout the entire period of his imprisonment. As the men's earnings were so small it was necessary for them to wait several months to accumulate a little cash in addition to the reserve fund before they could send even a few dollars to their families.

Only 32 families had received $50 or more; 76 had received from $10 to $50, and 56 had received less than $10. When the length of the father's imprisonment is taken into consideration the inadequacy of his contribution to his family's support is evident. The largest contributions had been from five men imprisoned six months to seven years, whose assignments had averaged about $100 a year. At the other extreme were 10 men who had been imprisoned from six months to seven years whose contributions to their families had averaged less than $1 a year.

The institutions handle all the funds belonging to the prisoners, and money which they may have brought with them at commitment or which is sent to them from outside sources is credited to their account at the institution. Almost three-fourths of the men sending money home for whom information was obtained had no income

except their earnings. However, several men were receiving regularly Government allowances for military service and transferring this to their families; some had received rather large sums from outside sources such as returns on investments or compensation for injury. Relatives frequently sent money to the prisoners, and sometimes it was the wife who had sent money to her husband rather than his having provided anything for his family.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM MUTUAL WELFARE LEAGUE

Aid to dependent families is a part of the work carried on by the Mutual Welfare League at the State reformatory. This organization, its membership comprising nearly 90 per cent of the population in the institution, was started in 1920 and has for its object "the promotion in every way of the true interests and welfare of the men confined in prison."

Any prisoner may become a member of the league, the membership being divided into three classes: (1) Active members, those who pay monthly dues; (2) inactive members, those who through unfortunate conditions for which they are not to blame are not able to pay dues; and (3) honorary members, who merit the membership by charitable deeds. Dues, payable monthly, are based on the amount of compensation the prisoner receives. Men who receive as much as 10 cents a day pay 25 cents a month, whereas those receiving less than 10 cents a day are required to pay 12 cents a month.

The league is managed by a board of directors consisting of nine prisoners selected for a period of one year. The chief clerk of the reformatory is the custodian of the league's funds. All undertakings of the league are subject to the approval of the superintendent of the institution. The league's income is derived from the profits from several enterprises which it carries on—a mercantile store, a printing shop, and various recreational activities not financed by the State. The charitable work of the league includes aid to dependent families; burial of deceased members, if no other funds are available; payment of traveling expenses for the prisoner and an accompanying guard for the trip home in the event of critical illness or death of a member of his immediate family; and the furnishing of such extras as fruit or milk for members who may be ill in the hospital.

It was impossible to ascertain from the records the exact date on which the league started giving aid to the dependent families of its members. The earliest reports found were dated December 3 and 24, 1921. The December 3 report stated that the disbursements for November were five checks of $10 each, mailed on November 3, and checks of $5 to $12.50, amounting to $66.50, mailed on November 21. The report of December 24 summarized the total expenditures to date and showed that a total of $428 had been sent to dependents of 22 prisoners. The largest sum which had been sent to any one family was $46. From these reports and a statement of the president of the league at the time of this study, it may be concluded that aid to dependent families was started late in 1921.

The relief work done by the league has increased rapidly and has been extended as available funds permitted. The policy has been to grant aid to all families whose applications are accepted by the

board, even if this necessitates curtailment in the amounts sent to each family. The number of families receiving aid varies from month to month, owing to the release of prisoners and the withdrawal of aid in unfit cases.

This branch of the league's work is known as the "department of dependent welfare," and any member may apply for aid to his dependents, including wife, children, parents, brothers, or sisters. The application blank calls for information concerning the following items: Offense, term. date of admission, name and number of prisoner; names and addresses of wife and parents; ages and sex of children; dependency of relatives other than wife and children; employment and earnings of wife and children; earnings of prisoner; assignment of earnings to dependents; and money received from other sources. The names and addresses of four references personally acquainted with the prisoner's dependents are required on the application.

The constitution and by-laws of the league state that in investigating these cases the secretary shall send out questionnaires to the following persons: The county judge, the parole agent, the justice of the peace of the magisterial district in which the dependents reside, and a reputable citizen of the immediate neighborhood. Although this provision includes the parole officer as one of the informants in the investigation of the family, it was reported that parole officers were seldom called upon to make investigations for the league. The questionnaire sent out by the secretary was as follows:

How long have you known this family? _____
Has this woman a good reputation? _____
Is she making an effort to support herself? _____
What is her probable income? _____
Was the man named above supporting her when sent here? _____
Number of boys under 16? _____ Give ages _____
Number of girls under 16? _____ Give ages _____
Number of boys over 16? _____ Do they contribute to the family's support? _____
Number of girls over 16?_____ Do they contribute to the family's support?_____
Has the family any relatives that should help them? _____
Does the family receive aid from any other source? _____
Are these people property owners? _____
If so, to what extent?_____
Do you recommend that this family be given help by the league? _____
If help is given, whom do you recommend to handle the money? _____
Name_____ Address_____
Remarks _____
Signed_____ Address_____

In some instances a local merchant, a minister, some relative, or perhaps a local official was designated to receive the allowances and assist the wife in her expenditure of the money. Most frequently, if the wife was not the direct recipient a local merchant received the checks and placed the amount of the grant to the wife's credit at his store.

When aid is first granted, the wife or the person handling her allowance is required to send in, on blanks furnished by the league, an itemized list of her expenditures, signed by the merchant. A note appears at the foot of this blank that "the purchase of luxurious articles will not be approved." These reports are not required after the league is satisfied that the money is being expended wisely. The

limitations of carrying on this relief work without personal contact with the family in the investigation and in the supervision after aid is granted, were recognized by the league officials who were interviewed by the agents of the Children's Bureau. Careful consideration is given to the questionnaires by the board of directors, who determine the grants, and if the replies received do not satisfy them as to the merits of the case they frequently send out further questionnaires. Welfare organizations are consulted whenever the families live in communities which have such organizations. Some organizations have helped greatly by assuming the supervision of a family and making regular reports to the league. Any unfavorable reports concerning families receiving aid are investigated, but unless such reports come in no further supervision is undertaken.

Brief individual records are kept, consisting of application, investigation questionaires, expense accounts sent in, and correspondence concerning the case. Many of the records are incomplete, as little clerical assistance has been available to the person responsible for the records. Such significant data as date of application, date of granting aid and amount sent, and date of disallowance in cases in which aid had been revoked or discontinued were lacking. The amount of the grant was available from the treasurer's lists, but it was often impossible to find out the exact length of time the families had received aid.

The amount granted each family was $5 a month for the wife or mother and 50 cents for each child under 16 years of age until December, 1925, when the allowance was increased to $1 a month for each child under 16. Although no general rule was followed in assigning money to their families from the earnings of the prisoners as a whole, those desiring aid for their families from the league were required to send 50 per cent of their earnings to their families after the 25 per cent reserve required by the law was taken out. The small amounts sent from the prisoners' earnings were included in the checks which the league sent.

From February to July, 1926, the monthly expenditures of the department of dependent welfare varied from $606.51 to $850.57, including assignments from prisoners' earnings, the exact amount of which was available only for March. On March 24, 1926, a total of $756.72 was sent to the dependents of 80 prisoners in amounts varying from $5 to $13 a month. Of this, $655.05 was sent by the league from its funds, and $101.67 by the prisoners from their earnings. Seventy-three of these eighty prisoners were reported as having children under 16 years of age, the dependents of the other 7 being their mothers or wives.

The majority of the families receiving aid were included in the intensive family case study, and further details as to the needs of the families and the aid given are discussed elsewhere. (See p. 21.)

SOCIAL AID TO FAMILIES

The information obtained through the questionnaire of the Mutual Welfare League was used in apportioning the grants to families and in enlisting the help of local individuals or agencies if this

seemed necessary. In a few instances welfare organizations had supervised the family for the league, and individuals in the community were assisting a number of the mothers by handling the aid and guiding her in her expenditures. These individuals might be considered volunteer representatives of the league; and although the service rendered was meager it was a helpful contact with the families.

This work of the department of dependent welfare reached comparatively few families, yet it is a very interesting and important undertaking. It is the only definite effort being made to furnish aid and service to the families of prisoners, since the State board of charities and corrections had assumed no responsibility in this regard. Even bearing in mind its limitations, it is worthy of high praise and might well be studied intensively with a view to its becoming the nucleus of a more extensive service.

FAMILY CASE STUDY

BASIS OF SELECTION OF FAMILIES

To ascertain the effect of the imprisonment of the father upon the welfare of the family, detailed information was sought regarding the family's living conditions both before and during the father's absence. Special attention was given to the ways in which the families adapted themselves to their change of circumstances and to the effects of the adjustment upon the individual members. The information was obtained by interviewing the mother or the relatives responsible for the children, local officials, or other responsible citizens who knew the families.

Because of the limited time available for the study it was impossible to visit the families of all the 714 prisoners with dependent children. It was decided, therefore, to include only those families that met the following conditions:

1. One or more children under 16 years of age on March 15, 1926.
2. Residence within the State or within reasonable distance of the border, if in an adjoining State.
3. Confinement of the father in prison for at least nine months.
4. Residence of the father with the family within the year preceding the date of his imprisonment or of the jail detention prior to his imprisonment. (Families in which the parents had been separated by divorce, desertion, or separation were excluded unless the records showed that the date of the separation had been within the year preceding the father's imprisonment.)
5. Existence of a family unit consisting of one or both parents and most of the children prior to the father's imprisonment. (Families were included that had one or more children away from home, but no family was included in which all the children had been scattered before the father's imprisonment.)

Some of the families that fulfilled these conditions could not be located and the homes of others were in localities too remote or inaccessible to be visited in the time available. Fairly complete data were obtained from 210 families—29 per cent of the total with children under the age of 16 years at the time of imprisonment of the father.

According to the 1920 census nearly three-fourths of the population of Kentucky was rural, and only about one-fourth was living in towns or cities of 2,500 or more.[1] The 210 families included

[1] Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920, vol. 3, Population, p. 364. Washington, 1922.

in this study were distributed in about the same proportions—73 per cent in rural communities and 27 per cent in towns of 2,500 or more.

Practically every type of community was represented by the 210 families selected for special study—large cities (including Louisville, Lexington, Newport, and Paducah), small cities, towns, villages, mining camps, and isolated mountain districts. The 210 families were scattered over 84 of the 120 counties of the State, and for this reason the localities visited may be considered representative of the State as a whole. Although the families that lived in the towns or cities had advantages denied to those in the rural sections, the living conditions reported for many of them were quite detrimental to the welfare of the children. Poor neighborhoods, with bad housing conditions and insanitary conditions, although not general, were quite common with the families living in urban communities. Some of these families were living on the outskirts of the town under conditions which in many respects differ but little from those in rural sections.

FAMILY CONDITIONS BEFORE FATHER'S IMPRISONMENT

RACE, NATIONALITY, AND AGE OF FATHERS

The men whose families were selected for study (165 men at the reformatory and 45 at the penitentiary) composed one-third of the men with dependent children in the reformatory and one-fourth of those in the penitentiary. The distribution of white and negro men was about equally representative; 165 (79 per cent) were white and 45 (21 per cent) were negro as compared with 73 per cent white and 27 per cent negro in the entire prison group. Only 5 of the 714 prisoners with dependent families were reported to be foreign born, and no foreign-born prisoners were included among the 210 whose families were studied.

The ages of the fathers are significant as an indication of their potential wage-earning capacity at the time of their separation from their families. Three-fourths (155) of the 205 men whose ages on March 15, 1926, were reported, were under 40 years; 42 were between 40 and 50 years; only 8 were 50 or over. Thus the majority of the fathers of these families were in prison during what might be considered their most active wage-earning years.

MARITAL STATUS AND WHEREABOUTS OF FATHERS

The basis of selection of the families resulted in the inclusion of a large number of apparently normal family groups and eliminated most of those in which the parents were divorced or living apart. The parents in nine-tenths of the families (186) were reported as married and living together at the time of the father's imprisonment. Fourteen fathers were widowed, 4 had deserted, 2 had been deserted by their wives, and 4 were separated.

In 150 families the parents were living together in their own homes, and in 19 they were both in relatives' homes before the father's imprisonment or jail detention. (Table 3.) Nine of the 19 families in which the parents were living with relatives were not dependent

upon these relatives for support, but were sharing the household expenses and the work in the house or on the farm. Two families were paying board to relatives. In a number of cases the father and mother had continued after their marriage to live with one or the other's parents or with relatives who had raised them from childhood. Partnership in farming was a factor which had caused some of these families to continue to live with relatives. In 8 of the 14 families in which the mother was dead the father was reported as maintaining a home, and in 4 he was living with relatives.

TABLE 3.—*Whereabouts of father and mother prior to father's imprisonment or jail detention*

Whereabouts of father	Families investigated					
	Total	Whereabouts of mother				
		Own home	With relatives	Inapplicable (mother dead)	At place of employment	Not reported
Total	210	165	29	14	1	
Own home	159	150	1	8		
With relatives	24	1	19	4		
Working away from home	9	7	2			
Other	[1] 8	5	3			
Not reported	10	2	4	2	1	1

[1] Includes 4 in hiding to avoid arrest following commitment of crime.

OCCUPATION AND INCOME OF FATHERS

The varying lengths of time the fathers had been away, the dependence of many of the families upon what they were able to raise on the farms, and the different economic standards of the neighborhoods in which they lived made it impossible to reach conclusions as to the adequacy of the family income and the standards of living of the families before the father's imprisonment. The occupations in which the fathers were engaged immediately before their imprisonment or detention in jail are somewhat indicative of the social and economic status of the families. The largest numbers of the men were engaged in farm work or in mining, 84 and 44, respectively. Twenty-four were employed as unskilled laborers, other than farm and mine laborers; only 11 were employed as carpenters, mechanics, or other skilled laborers. The 28 men engaged in other occupations included 6 proprietors of businesses, 3 county officials, and 19 in various jobs in transportation or domestic and personal service. Twelve of the fathers were unemployed at the time of their detention or imprisonment. Only a few of these men were unemployed because they were shiftless or too lazy to work; the others had lost their jobs through no particular fault of their own or had left their work and their families immediately following the commitment of the crime for which they were imprisoned and had gone into hiding to escape arrest. No information was obtained as to the occupations of 7 men.

Sixty-eight of the 84 men engaged in farm work were working for themselves and 16 were farm laborers. Among the 68 farmers the number of tenants (37) was slightly larger than the number of owners (31). Although the size of the holdings reported by the farm owners varied from 10 to 200 acres, farms of less than 100 acres were more usual than those of more than 100 acres. In several instances only a very small part of the total acreage of the farm was under cultivation.

It was impossible to obtain from many of the families definite information concerning the value of the farms or the incomes from the crops raised. The largest farms owned by any of these men were two of about 200 acres each. One of these consisted of good bottom land and yielded good crops. The other was divided, the owner cultivating about 100 acres and renting out the rest. He was reported as making a "good living." Before this study a number of families had been compelled to sell their farms, frequently at a sacrifice, in order to pay the expenses of the father's trial or to have ready money for their necessary living expenses. For this reason the amounts realized from the sale of the farms may not be an accurate estimate of the value of the land. In several cases the mother received as little as $15 an acre. A house and 55 acres of a 100-acre farm were sold for $2,500 to pay off a mortgage; this farm brought the largest amount per acre of any whose sale was reported.

The tenant system most used in Kentucky was that of a crop-share division in which the owner received either one-third or one-half of the crops. Other arrangements were sometimes made when use of the owner's farm implements was included in the bargain. Frequently the tenant was cultivating land owned by relatives, and if he was not paying a cash rental an informal division of crops was made, the tenant getting enough for his own use. The size of the farms "tended," like those owned, varied from little plots of 3 or 4 acres to large farms of more than 100 acres. The tenant who worked a farm of 200 acres, raising corn and tobacco, received the use of the house and half the crop. Another tenanted 8 acres in return for two-thirds of the crop. He also hired out as a laborer, and according to his wife's statement "made a good living."

The wages paid for farm labor were from $1 to $2 a day. Only 1 of the 14 men who had no occupation except farm labor exceeded the $2 rate, and he made $14 a week.

Although many of the farm owners and tenants were said to be making a "good living" from their land, they were known to have supplemented this income from time to time by working in the mines, at logging, at carpenter work, or at any other labor obtainable. Sixteen men engaged in farm work were known to have been engaged in other work just before their imprisonment. The seasonal nature of the farm work made it feasible for the men to engage in other work, but, on the other hand, some of the fathers only helped to plant the crops and left much of the harvesting to the mothers and children.

The wage scale for men employed in the mines varied considerably. The lowest wage reported was from $8 to $10 a week, and the highest was from $60 to $75. From $30 to $40 a week was the wage rate reported most frequently. Although the wages in the mines

appear to have been comparatively high, the work was irregular and the standard of living maintained by the miners' families varied with the general standards in the particular camps in which they lived.

In spite of the apparent inadequacy of the earnings of many of the fathers and the irregularity of their employment, 125 of the 210 families had been dependent entirely upon the father's earnings and other income at the time of his imprisonment. In 64 families the father's earnings had been supplemented by the earnings of the mother or children, or both, or by some outside assistance. In 5 families the mother and children had been the main support and in 4 the partial support. Two families had been entirely dependent upon children's earnings or upon assistance from outside sources, and for 10 families the source of support was not reported.

EMPLOYMENT OF MOTHERS [2]

The group of 46 mothers who were employed immediately preceding the father's imprisonment or detention in jail awaiting trial does not represent the entire number who had been employed at any time previously. In more than half these families the mother had found it necessary to become a wage earner because of some social problem—separation from or desertion of the father, unemployment of the father, or general instability of the father, and the consequent inadequate provision for his family. The other mothers had been supplementing the income of their husbands either because it was inadequate or because they preferred to work outside the home. Only about one-fifth (45) of the families visited were negro families, but more than half the women (24) who had been employed before the father's arrest were negroes. This was not surprising, as it is not unusual in many of the communities visited for the negro women to work, even though the husband is making sufficient to provide necessaries for the family. Thirty-two of the 46 mothers previously employed were reported as working regularly, but such regularity in many cases consisted of a certain number of weekly "washes" or several days of cleaning each week.

In the farming districts the majority of the mothers living on farms had assisted the men in the fields; but this was not reported as a gainful occupation unless the mother specifically stated that she considered it as such. In all but one of the seven families in which the mothers reported as gainfully employed had been working on their own or tenant farms, the fathers were following some other occupation, probably leaving the management of the farm and a large share of the farm work to the mothers. The father of one of these families had been a county superintendent of schools, three had been laborers, one had been a miner, and one had peddled groceries before their commitment.

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN

It is usual in rural sections in Kentucky, as elsewhere, for the children who are big enough to assist in the fields, especially during the busy seasons, and even under normal home conditions many chil-

[2] Only those mothers have been considered employed who had some gainful employment for which they were receiving a cash wage or a share in crops or other salable products.

dren are kept from school to help. No doubt most of the children in the rural families who were big enough had worked in the garden or on the farm, helping their fathers or the relatives with whom they were living. Because of the time that had elapsed it was difficult to obtain complete information in regard to the employment of children prior to the father's imprisonment. It was learned, however, that at least 21 children under 16 years of age (in 17 families) had been depended upon for more than casual assistance—4 of these were 15, 5 were 14, and 12 were under 14 years of age. Fifteen of these children were working as farm laborers (3 away from home for hire and 12 on their fathers' farms), 3 were employed at domestic service, 1 was working in a restaurant, 1 at logging, and 1 at mining.

Seven of the 9 employed children 14 or 15 years of age had left school and 2 were working only when school was not in session. Six of the 12 working children under 14 had left school, and 6 had been working during vacations and after school. Nine of these had been doing farm labor, 1 had been working at logging, 1 was a nursemaid, and 1 did washing. Six of the 12 had been working away from home, and 6 (in two families) had been helping their fathers who were farm tenants.

WHEREABOUTS OF CHILDREN

The following list shows the whereabouts of children under 16 years of age before the father's imprisonment or jail detention:

	Families investigated
Total	210
Families having only 1 child under 16 years of age	52
With one or both parents—	
In parental home	38
In home of relatives	14
Families having more than 1 child under 16 years of age	158
Living together	143
With one or both parents	140
In parental home	126
In home of relatives	14
With neither parent, in home of relatives	3
Separated	14
Some with parents and some with relatives	6
Other conditions	8
Whereabouts not reported	1

In few of the families visited had the children been separated from their parents before the father's imprisonment. The majority of the children who had not been living at home were 16 years of age and over. Fifty-two families had only one child under 16 before the father's imprisonment. In only 14 of the 158 families having more than one child under 16 was it found that the children had been separated. Provision for some of the children by relatives was responsible for the separation of the children in six families. The

other families had been broken by the commitment of several children to a child-placing agency.

FATHER'S OFFENSE AND LENGTH OF SENTENCE

The following list shows the charges against the fathers in the families investigated:

	Families investigated
Total	210
Offenses against the person	145
Murder	87
Manslaughter	53
Malicious injury to persons	5
Offenses against property	47
Robbery	4
Burglary, breaking and entering	22
Larceny	9
Forgery	9
Other	3
Offenses against the administration of government	2
Offenses against chastity	13
Rape	4
Carnal knowledge	3
Other	6
Desertion or failure to provide	3

Sixty-nine per cent had been sentenced for offenses against the person, 22 per cent for offenses against property, 6 per cent for offenses against chastity, and 2 per cent for other offenses. This distribution of offenses is markedly different from that of the offenses committed by all men in prisons and reformatories on January 1, 1923. The distribution for this larger group was 24 per cent for offenses against the person, 59 per cent for offenses against property, 10 per cent for offenses against morals, and 7 per cent for other offenses.[8]

In considering the number of cases of offense against the person (including murder and manslaughter), which at first glace seems to be extremely large in contrast to the proportion of such cases among all male inmates of prisons and reformatories, one must bear in mind the traditions of this section of the country, especially in the mountain districts, where for generations the way to settle a fight or to avenge an insult has been to resort to killing.

In all probability the majority of the 210 men, including those committed on a life sentence, will not be required to serve the entire term for which they were committed, as most of them were committed under determinate sentences, and in such cases prisoners are eligible for parole after expiration of half their term, or a smaller proportion if sentenced for more than 16 years. (See p. 6.)

An analysis of the terms for which the men were sentenced shows, however, that in the majority of cases the probable length of absence

[8] See Prisoners, 1923, pp. 198–199.

of the fathers from their homes was sufficient to create a serious problem of dependency for the families. Life sentences had been imposed upon 52 men, but it was possible that they might be paroled after a period of 8 to 12 years. All prisoners sentenced for less than life terms and for more than 16 years are considered for parole after they have served 8 years, except that prisoners sentenced subsequent to January 1, 1922, to life imprisonment are not considered for parole until after they have served 12 full years.[4]

For only one of the men who had received determinate sentences was the possibility of confinement less than one year, and for only 37 was it less than two years. On the other hand, the maximum term of imprisonment would be from 2 to 5 years for 42 men, from 5 to 8 years for 41 men, and more than 10 years for 37 men.

It will be remembered that only families in which the father had served at least nine months were selected for special study, because a shorter period would not afford a basis for significant observations as to the effect of the father's imprisonment. All but 18 of the men whose families were included, however, had been in prison for a year or more, and 21 had been confined for five years or more at the time this study was made. The following list shows the length of time the father had been imprisoned at the date of the study:

	Number of fathers		Number of fathers
Total	210	4 years	24
		5 years	11
9 months, under 1 year	18	6 years	3
1 year	83	7 years	3
2 years	39	8 years	3
3 years	25	9 years	1

The duration of imprisonment, however, does not represent for most of the fathers the entire length of absence from home up to the time of the study, as jail detention immediately before imprisonment was reported for all but 23 of the men and some had been in hiding before arrest. Many families became dependent or in need of special care before the father was sent to the State institution and the family situation had become acute by the time of the father's commitment.

The facts regarding jail detention were not obtained for all the men, because the jail records in some communities were inadequate and because the county seat, where the records were kept, was not always visited. The statement of the wife or of the relative interviewed was accepted, with verification whenever records were available.

Forty-one of the prisoners were known to have been detained in jail awaiting trial for six months or more; 13 for a year or more. One hundred and two were detained for less than three months, and 44 for three to six months.

Previous imprisonment was also an important factor in the welfare of the families during the father's present confinement. If the father had already served a term in jail or prison the family would have been deprived of his support previously and by the time of this

[4] Rules Governing the Consideration and Granting of Paroles and Commutations for Good Time at the Kentucky State Reformatory, Frankfort, Ky., and the Kentucky State Penitentiary, Eddyville, Ky., pp. 4–5. Issued by State Board of charities and corrections, Frankfort, Ky.

study might have made adjustments to meet the situation or might have become a community problem. Seventy-six of the 210 fathers had been imprisoned previously either in a jail or in a State penal institution; 15 had previous court records but no record of imprisonment; 112 had neither court nor institutional records; and for 7 men this information was not obtained.

FAMILY CONDITIONS DURING FATHER'S IMPRISONMENT

STANDARDS OF LIVING OF FAMILIES WHEN VISITED

Practically all the families included in the study had suffered some hardship during the father's absence. This was true even of the few families that had succeeded in maintaining fairly high standards of living. The absence of the father may not have been directly responsible for the unfavorable conditions in all cases, but it had at least an indirect effect. Some of the conditions that may have been caused, directly or indirectly, by the father's imprisonment, were as follows: The dependence upon relatives or social agencies for assistance; the separation of children from their mothers or from brothers and sisters; the employment of the mother, frequently necessitating prolonged absence from the home; the employment of children as soon as they were old enough to go to work; the interruption of the children's schooling, not only because of the necessity of going to work but because of insufficient clothing or transportation facilities; the loss of property through forced sale or inability to continue payments; and the assumption by the mother of illegal relationships.

An important consideration in connection with the economic and social status of the rural families was the inaccessibility of schools and of centers where the mother or older children might obtain work. The poor roads found in many of the counties tended to cut off the families from the social, economic, and educational advantages of near-by centers. Some of the families that were visited lived in such isolated regions that the only way to reach them was on horseback "up the holler." In winter the children in these families were unable to attend school, and even under the most favorable circumstances the opportunities for contact with neighbors, schools, churches, and other organizations were limited.

In addition to the families that had farms or worked as tenant farmers, a number had gardens upon which they were more or less dependent for their food. Most of the farms were small, and many of them consisted of rocky, hilly soil upon which meager crops were raised only with great effort.

Types of home.

Although the homes of the families visited represented a variety of types, from the two-room mountain cabin in a little clearing to the six or eight room house in a city or town, the majority were poor. A few of the mothers were living with their children in a single rented room, and a number of families were living with relatives in rather crowded quarters. A few families both in the towns and in the rural localities were living in comfortable homes or apartments, but the houses that were in good condition, well furnished, and adequate in every way for the needs of the families were exceptional.

The usual type of home was the three-room house. The agents' descriptions of the homes covered a wide range—"clean, well-built cabin," "typical mountain cabin," "rough little shack," "dilapidated cabin," "mere shack," "just a shed, agent couldn't believe anybody lived in the building." Some of the homes were neat, clean, in good repair, and comfortably furnished; others were filthy, unplastered, with leaking roofs. The furnishings in most were in keeping with the general condition of the houses; in some only the barest necessities were found, and a few lacked even these. Some families had been forced to sell a part of their furniture to raise cash, others had sold everything and had gone to live with relatives. The furniture and household equipment of two families had been destroyed by fire after the father's imprisonment, and they had been unable to replace them.

It is significant that three-fourths of the families had moved between the time of the father's imprisonment and the agent's visit, the majority in order to reduce their living expenses. Many had gone to live with relatives. Most of the families had remained in the same type of neighborhood and had not greatly altered their standards of living because of their change of location. A few families had moved into different communities where the mother could get work, and others had been forced to move from tenant farms because the mother and children had not been able to cultivate so large an acreage and produce so big a crop as they had when the father was managing the farm.

The majority of the families were living in overcrowded quarters, according to the generally accepted housing standards. This overcrowding was more general at the time of the interview than at the father's imprisonment, owing in many instances to the family's going to live with relatives. The usual plan in a two-room cabin was to use one room for sleeping purposes and the other for cooking, eating, and other activities, though some families had a bed in the kitchen. Many families were living in such crowded quarters that the sleeping conditions were not conducive to either the physical or the moral well-being of the children.

The poor construction of the houses made heating them in the winter a difficult problem. The small cabins or cottages had, as a rule, provision for only one fire, which was used for both cooking and heating. Many of the rural families were at no expense for fuel, as they used wood almost entirely and could obtain all they needed either from their own property or in near-by woods. This meant, however, much hard work. One mother, in recounting the hardships they had suffered, said that they had sawed all their own wood, frequently working in snow up to their shoe tops.

Food.

No detailed information was obtained in regard to the diets of the families visited, but some reported that after the father went away they frequently did not have enough to eat. The majority raised their own food, but the yield was limited both in variety and in quantity. Corn (for meal), potatoes, and beans were raised in larger quantities than anything else. Several mothers stated that they had not been able to plant any potatoes during the season the study was made as they had not had sufficient cash to buy seed potatoes. The

amounts of other vegetables raised were very small. The families produced only enough for immediate use and did not have anything to sell or to dry or can for winter use. A few of the families visited had small orchards, but fruit raising was not an important item in providing for the family. Peaches, apples, and wild blackberries were the most common fruits, and during the summer some of the mothers and children sold their fruit or earned a little money picking blackberries.

Keeping cows, hogs, or chickens was not general among the families visited, except that most of the mothers in isolated communities who had small children considered it an absolute necessity to keep a cow in order to get milk, even though it meant a sacrifice in other directions. As many of the families had only a limited garden space or had been able to plant only a few acres, their need of the produce for their own food permitted the use of only a small part for stock and poultry. Other families had been forced to sell their stock to obtain cash. The children in these families were deprived of essential elements in their diet. A few of the families had kept several cows prior to the fathers' imprisonment, selling the milk and butter. In the mining camps and in other sections where little pasture was available the milk supply was so small that the mothers found the prices prohibitive.

Education of children.

The majority of the children in the families included in the study lived in districts in which only a six or seven months' school term was provided, usually extending from July to January. This arrangement was made to avoid the bad weather of the winter months and to fit in more conveniently with the farming season. In some of the mining camps nine-month schools had been made possible through financial assistance from the company and an additional tax levy upon the employees.

As many of the communities in which these families lived were visited during the school vacation the children's school records were not checked with the official registers, except in some of the cities. The mothers' statements as to the regularity of attendance and the completion of schooling were accepted. School principals were interviewed in some communities, and general statements in regard to school attendance of children in certain families were obtained from them.

Nonattendance during the entire school term was reported for a number of children of compulsory school age.[5] Some of these children had never attended school, others had been out only the preceding term, and others had not attended since the time the father left, perhaps two or three years previously. At the time of the interview 14 of the 48 children 14 or 15 years of age were not enrolled in school. Except for a 14-year-old girl who was married and a 14-year-old boy who was feeble-minded, the majority of these chil-

[5] The law requires that children between 7 and 16 years of age in cities of the first, second, third, and fourth classes shall attend school with the exception of those between 14 and 16 who are regularly employed on employment certificates. The law applying to county school districts requires attendance of children between 7 and 16 years of age unless they have completed the full course of instruction offered by the public schools of the district where they reside. Both laws exempt children physically or mentally incapacitated. Ky., Carroll's Stat. 1922, secs. 4526c–2, 4526c–3, pp. 2161, 2162, and ruling of the State board of education.

dren had stayed away from school because their assistance was needed at home. Few of these children had entered regular employment; only 4 were regularly employed at the time of the study.

The nonattendance of children under 14 years of age is more significant than that of the older children. Forty-seven (18 per cent) of the 264 children between 7 and 14 years of age in the families visited were not enrolled in school at date of interview. Eleven of these had just attained school age, and 4 were unable to attend school because of mental or physical handicap. The father's imprisonment was directly responsible for the nonattendance of many of the other children. Fourteen had stopped school because their help was needed at home. Lack of money to buy clothing and schoolbooks, illness, and distance from school were other reasons given by the mothers or relatives for their failure to send children to school. In several cases friends had bought books for the children, and the county board had also supplied books for a few children.

Similar reasons were given for irregularity of attendance. Seventy-two families having 120 children of school age reported that the children's attendance had been irregular. Some children missed from two to four days a week regularly; others had lost as much as two or three months at a time. A little girl who seemed very eager to go to school said, "I don't get to go to school half the time since pap went away." Her case was no doubt typical of many children in the 72 families. In some families in which regular attendance was the rule it was made possible by great sacrifices on the part of the mothers.

A rather large number of the children were below the grades usually considered normal for their ages. Of the 117 children reported as between 12 and 16 years of age, 33 were in the fourth grade or lower. More than two-thirds of the children who had left school after the father's imprisonment had not advanced beyond the fourth grade.

Case stories.

The following case stories illustrate the standards of living of the families visited and the extent to which some of the mothers succeeded in making adequate provision for their children:

Mrs. A. lived in a neat three-room house on a farm of 65 acres which she had inherited from her first husband. About half the land was in timber. Two years before the agent's visit Mr. A. was found guilty of manslaughter and sentenced to the reformatory for 21 years. For five months before his commitment he had been detained in jail. After his marriage to the mother he had made only one crop, on which he cleared about $200. Mrs. A. had rented part of the land to tenants on shares, and since the stepfather's imprisonment the two boys, aged 13 and 14, had helped on the farm. They had also done some farm work for neighbors at 75 cents a day. Before her second marriage Mrs. A. had had a prolonged illness and had mortgaged her place for $500. She was not equal to the task of running the farm as she had never entirely regained her health. A second mortgage ($550) was taken soon after the father's imprisonment. About $100 was paid to the lawyer who defended the father. One year the mother sold enough potatoes to pay the interest. She kept a cow and a number of chickens and sold about 20 dozen eggs a week. She felt that the most serious effect of the stepfather's imprisonment upon the children was the interruption of their schooling. They had been kept out for six or seven weeks during the preceding term. She was trying to plan the work so that that would not be necessary another season. A neighbor

said that the boys were the brightest children in the school in their district. The family had never received any outside assistance from relatives or organizations.

Mr. F., who was serving a life sentence for murder, had been in the reformatory more than six years at the time of the agent's visit and had been detained in jail for more than a year before his conviction. Mrs. F. and the three children (all boys, 13, 16, and 19 years of age at the date of the interview) were living in a two-room shack on the outskirts of a small city. The family came to the town only a few months before the father's arrest and had taken the only house available at a low rent at that time. As they had not been compelled to pay any rent for four years they had stayed on. The shack was little more than a shed, and the agent could scarcely believe that it was occupied by human beings.

The mother worked a small garden plot on shares and did washing and cleaning, earning on an average $5 or $6 a week. The oldest boy left school and went to work before he was 13. He had had a number of jobs and had worked very irregularly. At the time of the study he was earning $3 a day. The second boy left school when he was 10 and worked for a few months as a water boy with a street-construction gang. Within a few months he received a severe injury to his leg which had never healed. As he was unable to work he returned to school but had not progressed beyond the fifth grade.

The mother had received $26 from the father's earnings and $137 from the Mutual Welfare League prior to July, 1923, when the father escaped from prison. He was gone about one year and eight months, and the mother had received no assistance since his return. They were $36 in debt for groceries. A church and neighbors gave the family some help when the mother was sick, and the doctors gave their services free of charge. In addition to having their schooling interrupted, the boys have lived under most unsatisfactory conditions and have not had enough to eat. The mother's estimate was that they had not had more than half what they should have had to live on.

The N.'s, a negro family in Louisville, had not always managed on the father's earnings prior to his imprisonment without other assistance. Mrs. N. was having a particularly difficult time at the time of the interview caring for her children, five of whom were under 16 years of age. They "just scufiles along" according to her statement. The mother was earning $4 or $5 a week at laundry work, and one of the two children over 16 was living at home and had been employed but was out of work at the time of the interview. The second child, who was married and in her own home, helped the family with occasional gifts. A number of social agencies had given some little assistance at different times. The mother had tried to keep the children in school, but their attendance had been very irregular because of illness. The mother attributed much of their illness to the lack of necessary food, clothing, and fuel. She told the agent that the week she paid the rent "we don't hardly eat at all." The children never had any milk to drink and used evaporated milk on their cereal. They never had butter unless some one gave it to them. The rent, which had been $15 a month while the father was at home, had been raised to $20, toward which a friend contributed $2 or $3 a month. Mr. N. had sent only a few dollars home during the 17 months of his imprisonment.

The father was serving a five-year sentence in the penitentiary for manslaughter, and the mother and the children had all brooded over his imprisonment. It was said that the oldest daughter had been ill in bed soon after his imprisonment as a result of worry. About a year before the study a legal-aid society had undertaken to help the family to the extent of writing a letter asking for the father's release.

At the time of the interview Mr. O. was serving a 10-year sentence in the reformatory for manslaughter. He had owned his farm and had worked regularly as a laborer for a coal company. After the crops were planted Mrs. O. and the children did most of the work on the 10 acres they cultivated. They had a small orchard and kept one or two cows and some hogs. The oldest of the eight children was 15 and the youngest about 18 months at the time of the

interview. The oldest child, a girl, had left school in order to help the mother and was earning $1.50 a day irregularly doing washing and farm labor. All the children who were old enough to go to school helped when school was not in session, and occasionally they were kept out of school to help the mother peddle fruit. The mother also earned a little money working out by the day, but this too was very irregular. The first season the father was away the mother managed to put in a full crop, but at the time of the interview she had planted only about half the usual acreage. She had no hogs or chickens but kept two cows. Only $20 had been received from the father's compensation and $26 from the Mutual Welfare League during the 18 months the father had been in prison. Relatives and friends had helped with occasional gifts. They raised money for the mother to go to Frankfort to try to get her husband pardoned. During the month she was there she earned her board by working at the Salvation Army headquarters. The farm had been mortgaged for $800 in order to pay the expenses of the father's trial, but the mother had not been able to pay the interest on the mortgage. The family lived in a three-room house which was badly in need of repair; the roof leaked, and there was no money to have it fixed. The family was getting along on a minimum of clothing and household equipment; they had not been able to replace the dishes and utensils which had broken or worn out.

The R. family, consisting of the mother and four children under 12 years of age, were in destitute circumstances. A year before the agent's visit the father had been sentenced to the reformatory for two years for forgery. The family had received aid for extended periods from public and private relief agencies and the county doctor, but no constructive program for them had been worked out. The father had previously served a penitentiary sentence for forgery and a jail sentence for the unlawful possession of whisky. When not in prison he had earned good wages as a factory laborer, and the mother had not worked. At the time of the agent's visit the family owed nearly $45 for doctor's visits, gas, and rent. They had not moved but had rented the only airy room of their three-room house. The mother and four children slept in one double bed. The monthly income, including the mother's earnings, rent for one room, and county aid, amounted to $26, of which $14 a month went for house rent. Relatives were either unable or unwilling to help. The 9-year-old girl was kept out of school on an average of once a week to care for the younger children while the mother was at work.

The father's imprisonment was not entirely responsible for the hardship which the B. family was suffering. It was stated that the family was no good—"the sorriest family in the community"—and members of the father's family were continually in trouble. Mr. B. had been in the reformatory for more than two years at the time of the study, serving a sentence of 21 years for manslaughter. For a year before his conviction he had been detained in jail. Several years before this he had served a sentence of nine months for stealing. He worked as a farm tenant on shares and occasionally hired out by the day but had never earned an adequate living for his family. At the time of the study there were four children—1, 5, 6, and 8 years of age. Until about a month before the agent's visit the family had lived with Mrs. B.'s parents; a family of nine occupied a two-room house. Mrs. B. decided that this was too crowded and rented a near-by cabin, consisting of one room and a lean-to, for $1 a month. The cabin had no windows and not even a space cut for a window. The only furniture in the room was a bed, a small table, and two chairs; the lean-to had only a table—no stove, the fireplace being used for cooking. The family did not even have enough dishes for all to eat at once.

Mrs. B. had an acre of ground and raised vegetables. The year of the study she had not raised any potatoes as she could not afford to buy seed. She had no stock. A neighbor gave them milk sometimes, but they seldom had any butter. She made a little money hoeing corn and doing washing but worked very irregularly, so that it was impossible to estimate her earnings. Her only other cash income was $8 a month from the Mutual Welfare League.

The mother had had two children since the father's commitment. The first was born two months after the father's imprisonment and had died at the age of 3 months. The second child was of illegitimate birth. Mr. B. did not

know about this child. The storekeeper who handled the mother's Mutual Welfare League check said that he had talked to Mrs. B. and advised her to "do right." His opinion was that she was "living straight" at the time of the interview.

Mr. D. was 60 years old at the time of his imprisonment, nine years prior to the study, on a life sentence for murder; his wife was 20 years younger. He owned a farm and in the fall had made considerable money logging. Mrs. D. reported that her husband never told her how much he made; she only knew that he "made plenty." It was stated on good authority that he had about $3,000 at the time of his arrest. After his imprisonment he received a check for $7,000 from the sale of timber on his farm, which he deposited in the bank. He had not sent his wife and 12-year-old girl any money during his imprisonment. The mother and child were in destitute circumstances, living in a dilapidated one-room hut. Relatives said that the father was too mean and stingy to send them a penny. On the other hand, the son, who was 23 years old at the time of the interview, had sent the father $125.

Mr. D. had served several jail sentences previously and had been cleared in the court of appeals on a murder charge. Because of his previous record he was not granted a parole when he was eligible, and it was thought that he would not seek it as he was contented where he was.

The mother had received $300 from a railroad for the right of way through their property. The only other income since the father's imprisonment had been $3.50 a week which the mother earned doing laundry work. She had also raised small crops.

Mrs. D. had serious trouble with her eyes, which necessitated frequent trips to the city for treatment. The son was married, and he and his wife and two children were living in a two-room cabin on the mother's farm. For four years he had had tuberculosis, and his work was interrupted by frequent trips to the city for treatments. The family apparently did not consider schooling important, as the son had left school when he was 14 and in the fourth grade, and the 12-year-old girl was not attending regularly, though the school was only about a quarter of a mile away.

A negro family consisting of Mrs. E. and her four children—7, 8, 11, and 15 years of age at the time of the interview—lived in a very attractive and modern four-room cottage in one of the larger cities of the State. The father had been imprisoned nearly seven years on a life sentence for murder. Mrs. E. had earned something at sewing before the father's imprisonment, but at the date of the interview was earning $12 a week at domestic service. Her sister, who was attending high school, lived with her and took care of the children after school. The oldest child, a boy, had been working during summer vacations from the time he was 12 years old, and the summer before the agent's visit earned $9 a week. Mrs. E.'s employer bought the house in which she was living, and Mrs. E. was paying for it in monthly installments. She and the 15-year-old boy had papered and painted it themselves. The paternal grandparents had been providing for the three younger children during summer vacations, but they had recently lost all their possessions through fire.

The Mutual Welfare League had sent the family $35 during 1922, but this assistance was discontinued because the father had refused to send any of his earnings. The family was said to be of an unusually high type, and the mother had worked hard to keep up their standards. The children's school attendance was excellent, and the mother showed considerable interest in their progress.

MARITAL STATUS AND WHEREABOUTS OF MOTHERS

Although a prison sentence provides ground for divorce in Kentucky, little change had occurred in the marital status of the parents during the father's imprisonment. Table 4 shows that 13 of the 186 mothers who had been living with their husbands at the time of imprisonment died before the date of interview. One hundred and

fifty-eight (91 per cent) of the other 173 had not changed their marital status at the time of the interview. Fourteen mothers had obtained divorces, and the status of 1 was unknown. Eight of the 14 mothers who had divorced their husbands had remarried. One mother who had deserted before the time of the father's imprisonment had obtained a divorce. Nine mothers (3 white and 6 negro) whose marital status had remained unchanged were living with other men. A few of them had contracted second marriages in ignorance of the law, believing their husbands' imprisonment automatically released them; some of the more ignorant of these mothers seemed to have no idea of the necessity for any legal relationships to the men with whom they were living.

TABLE 4.—*Marital status of father at date of interview, by status prior to imprisonment or jail detention*

Marital status of father at date of interview	Families investigated					
	Marital status of father prior to imprisonment or jail detention					
	Total	Married and living with mother	Widower	Deserting	Deserted	Separated from mother
Total	210	186	14	4	2	4
Unchanged	180	158	14	4	----	4
Widower	13	13	----	----	----	----
Divorced	15	14	----	----	1	----
Not reported	2	1	----	----	1	----

Prior to the father's imprisonment most of the mothers were living in their own homes or with their husbands and children in the homes of relatives.[6] At the time of the study changes had occurred in the living arrangements of many of the mothers; a few were living at their places of employment, and many had given up their homes and had gone with their children to relatives. The most significant change was the shift from their own homes to the homes of relatives; 45 mothers who had been living in their own homes before the father's commitment made this change. Although the need for financial assistance was not the only cause for a change in living conditions, it was the most important factor in many cases. In addition to these 45 mothers, 16 who had been living with relatives before the father's imprisonment continued this arrangement, making a total of 61 mothers who were living with relatives at the time of the interview. Four mothers who had been with relatives before the father's imprisonment had established independent homes; 1 had gone to live with another man, and 3, for various reasons, had started housekeeping with their children. One of these mothers rented a house in the county seat at the time the father was placed in jail, so that she might be near him; later she obtained a place at domestic service

[6] In the 210 families investigated, 165 mothers had had their own homes before the father's imprisonment, 29 were living with relatives, 1 was living at her place of employment, 14 were dead, and the whereabouts of 1 was not reported. At the time of the study 101 were in their own homes, 61 were in the homes of relatives, 8 were in their places of employment, 27 were dead, and 13 were elsewhere or their whereabouts were not reported.

where she was furnished with a house on the employer's grounds. Another who had left her husband shortly before he committed the crime had returned and taken charge of the home upon the father's jail detention. The third mother, with her four children, had moved from a relative's home into a neighboring cabin, as the two-room house was inadequate for nine persons.

RACE, AGE, AND WHEREABOUTS OF CHILDREN

In some of the homes visited the children did not have a common parentage. The decision was made, however, to include in the enumeration all the children of the prisoner and his wife. This means that in addition to the children of the prisoner through marriage with the mother, children of either parent by previous marriages, children of illegitimate birth of either parent, and children born to the mother by remarriage during the father's absence were included. Even though the seven children born to five mothers as a result of their remarriage during the prisoners' absence were not the prisoners' responsibility, they were included because their presence in the family affected the welfare of the prisoners' children. The 15 children of illegitimate birth, most of whom were born after the father's imprisonment, were included for a similar reason, since they were an integral part of the family in most cases.

At the time of the study the 210 families contained 749 children—389 boys, 353 girls, and 7 whose sex was not reported. Divided on the basis of school and working-age groups, 284 children were under 7 years of age; 264 were 7 but under 14 years; 48 were 14 but under 16 years of age; and 142 were 16 years of age or over. The ages of 11 children were not reported. Sixty-five families had children 16 years of age or over, and 145 were made up entirely of children under 16. The white families had a slight preponderance of boys and the negro families of girls. On an average the negro families were smaller than the white families. The 45 negro families reported 79 children under 16, or less than 2 children per family, and the 165 white families reported 518 children under 16, or 3 children per family.

As more than half the fathers had been in prison for periods ranging from two to nine years and more, it is natural to expect that some of the children in a number of the families would have passed the age of dependency (16 years) by the time of the agent's visit. Some of the older children had married, others had gone away to find work, and others remained with the family and contributed to its support.

All the children in 168 families were under 16 years of age on the date of the father's imprisonment, whereas at the time of the study this was true in 145 families only. In spite of this decrease the number of families in which the children under 16 were separated had increased from 14 on the date of the father's imprisonment to 42 at the time of the study. The separation of the children in 4 of the 42 families was due primarily to the death of the mother and in others to the inability of the mother to provide for her children or to her inability to care for them while working.

Forty-eight families had only one child under 16 years of age at the time of the agent's visit. The mothers of 38 of these families had succeeded in keeping the children with them in their own homes, in relatives' homes, or in their places of employment. All of the chil-

dren of 120 of the 162 families having more than one child under 16 were living together—98 with their mothers and 22 away from their mothers. The children of 42 families were separated, 22 of the 42 mothers keeping one or more of the children with them. The following list shows the whereabouts of the children under 16 years of age at the date of interview:

	Families investigated
Total	210
Families having only 1 child under 16 years	48
With mother	38
In parental home	18
In home of relatives	18
Elsewhere	2
Without mother	10
In home of relatives	9
Elsewhere	1
Families having more than 1 child under 16 years	162
Living together	120
With mother	98
In parental home	64
In home of relatives	34
Without mother	22
In parental home	3
In home of relatives	17
Elsewhere	2
Separated	42
Part with mother and part with relatives or friends	15
Part with mother and part with other than relatives	7
Part with relatives and part with other than mother	4
Other combinations	7
With relatives or friends	7
Whereabouts of some children not reported	2

Only 11 children under 16 were in foster homes, including 5 who had been placed in the homes of friends by their mothers or by relatives who had been responsible for their care. Two children had been legally adopted. Foster-home care under the supervision of an agency doing child-placing work was reported for only 3 children (in two families). In neither of these families was the removal of the children due directly to the present imprisonment of the father. In one family the children had been removed by the juvenile court five years previously because of dependency and neglect. The father had served a prison term prior to the children's removal, and the present imprisonment was the second since that time. The 4 children in another family had been separated; 2 were with the mother and 2 had been placed through the humane society following the father's imprisonment, which had extended to the time of the study. The dependency problem in the family had actually been

of longer duration, as only three months had elapsed between this commitment and the father's release from a previous imprisonment. The mother explained that this provision for the children's care was only temporary. A number of children were living in the homes of relatives, apart from their mothers. In many of these cases the mother had died, was living in her place of employment, or had several children and was unable to provide for all of them. Seven children were in institutions for dependents, 2 were in an almshouse with their mother, and 2 in institutions for delinquents.

LOSSES AND DEBTS RESULTING FROM FATHER'S IMPRISONMENT

Although some of the families had invested their savings in homes or farms and the necessary stock and equipment, and a few had savings or investments, the resources of most of the families at the time of the father's imprisonment were limited. Even with the assistance of the mothers and the older children many of the fathers had succeeded in making little more than was actually needed to keep out of debt. The farmers (owners and tenants) raised enough food to last them through the year, with little left over to sell. In the country it was customary to exchange labor and produce with neighboring farmers, and in many families the fathers or older children worked out by the day when they could be spared. The irregularity of the fathers' employment, either because of the seasonal nature of their occupations or because of their instability, kept many of the families on the border line of economic independence and made it impossible for them to save enough to be of any substantial assistance in an emergency. As a rule all the savings of the families had been invested in stock, farm equipment, or household furnishings.

The loss of property (such as real estate, stock, equipment, household furnishings, and insurance) because of the father's imprisonment was one of the factors which contributed to the dependency of some of the families visited. A number of families sold their property in order to raise money to pay the expenses of the father's trial; others found it necessary to part with their possessions from time to time to pay their taxes or meet other necessary expenses. A forced sale of the farm generally entailed a financial loss incident to selling below the market value.

Only 47 families owned their homes at the time of the father's imprisonment, and 18 of these sold them during the father's absence. Some of the 28 who succeeded in keeping their homes had been handicapped through the sale of a part of their farms, stock, or equipment.

A total of 69 families[7] (about one-third of the number investigated) reported the loss of property of some kind during the time the father had been in prison. This group included 21 families who had been forced to sell in order to defray the expenses of the father's trial, 26 who had sold for cash to meet their living expenses or who had failed to make the regular payments on property they were buying, 18 who had lost insurance policies because they could not pay the premiums, and 4 who had lost both property and insurance.

[7] The 2 families who lost their property by fire during the father's absence are not included, as the present discussion is confined to the group whose losses were more or less an outcome of the father's imprisonment.

Two factors should be kept in mind in considering the loss of insurance—the loss of money already paid in and the effect of the permanent loss of the endowments on the future welfare of the families even after the father's release from prison. It is not known what proportion of the insured families is represented by the group of 22 whose policies lapsed because of their inability to keep up their payments. It was reported in several instances that the companies refused to permit the mother or relatives to revive policies which had lapsed because the family had been unable to pay the premiums, even though they had been paying on them for several years before the father's imprisonment.

A few examples may be cited as illustrative of the losses sustained by these families:

The A. farm was sold for $2,800, and the money was used to pay the expenses of the father's trial. The cost of Mr. A.'s defense was unusually large because the death of a juryman at one trial and a hung jury at another made it necessary to have three trials. The stock and farm equipment were sold at a sacrifice for $1,000, and the money was used to pay the family's debts. The mother and older child lived with relatives for a few months, but the mother died soon after the birth of the younger child. Her relatives thought that the worry and added strain of the father's trial and imprisonment had been responsible for her death. The grandparents were very poor and barely able to "keep their heads above water," but had been providing for the two children, 4 and 5 years of age, since the mother's death.

In order to buy clothing for her three children, 1, 3, and 5 years of age, Mrs. T. had been been compelled to sell her furniture for about half its value, receiving only $25 from the sale. Her 150-acre farm and house had also been lost and the family had become dependent upon relatives.

Mrs. P. had four children under 9 years of age. She was forced to sell her cow, hogs, and chickens, for which she received $55. Although she sold them for less than they were worth, the greatest loss was probably the physical loss to the children, as they had been unable to have milk since the sale of the cow.

Closely related to the losses sustained by the families is the matter of debts incurred during the father's absence. Only 79 (30 per cent) of the families from whom information was obtained were in debt at the time of the agent's visit. The amount of the indebtedness of most of these families was small. No doubt more families would have been in debt and the amounts would have been larger if credit had been easily obtained. The largest amounts owed had been borrowed to pay the expenses of the father's trial. Nine families were in arrears with their rent, 10 owed doctor's or hospital bills, and 17 had other debts, including expenses of divorce suits or fathers' trials, and payments on furniture, farm implements, or livestock. Eight of the 28 families who had succeeded in keeping their own homes had mortgaged them or had been unable to pay the taxes.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT OF FAMILIES

Many of the families had no resources other than their earnings, and others had only limited savings. In a large number of families the standards of living were comparatively low. Although many families had been living on the border line between independence

and dependence upon outside assistance, only a small proportion were receiving aid immediately before the father's imprisonment.

The number of families who were self-sustaining at the time of the interview, as compared with the number in this group at the time of the father's imprisonment, is shown in Table 5. In nearly two-thirds of the families the fathers were providing the entire support immediately before their imprisonment, and in one-fifth the mothers and children were supplementing the father's earnings. In all, 87 per cent of the families whose sources of income before the father's imprisonment were known had been self-sustaining. Practically all the outside assistance came from relatives.

In contrast, less than one-fifth of the families were self-sustaining after the father's support was withdrawn. The majority of the families were receiving assistance from relatives or social agencies.

TABLE 5.—*Source of income of mother and dependent children under 16 years of age at date of interview, by source of income of parents and dependent children under 16 years of age prior to father's imprisonment or jail detention*

Source of income of mother and dependent children under 16 years of age at date of interview [1]	Total	Source of income of parents and dependent children under 16 years of age prior to father's imprisonment or jail detention					
		Family self-supporting				Family partly or wholly dependent	Not reported
		Total	Father wholly supporting	Father partly supporting	No support from father		
Total	210	168	125	38	5	32	10
Family self-supporting	33	28	11	15	2	2	3
Mother only earning	19	17	7	9	1	2	----
Mother and children earning	14	11	4	6	1	----	3
Family partly dependent	100	82	65	15	2	15	3
Relatives only assisting	41	33	24	9	----	6	2
Relatives assisting—							
With aid from Mutual Welfare League	12	9	8	1	----	3	----
With aid from other sources	7	4	4	----	----	2	1
Mutual Welfare League only assisting	9	8	6	2	----	1	----
Mutual Welfare League assisting with aid from other sources except relatives	15	15	14	1	----	----	----
Other sources	16	13	9	2	2	3	----
Family entirely dependent	69	54	45	8	1	13	2
Relatives only assisting	31	21	19	1	1	10	----
Relatives assisting—							
With aid from Mutual Welfare League only	14	11	8	3	----	2	1
With aid from other sources [2]	16	14	12	2	----	1	1
Other sources [3]	8	8	6	2	----	----	----
Not reported [4]	8	4	4	----	----	2	2

[1] Does not include prisoner's compensation.
[2] Includes 5 families with aid from Mutual Welfare League.
[3] Includes 2 families with aid from Mutual Welfare League.
[4] Includes 1 family with aid from Mutual Welfare League.

Contributions of fathers.

Information in regard to the money sent to the families from the fathers' earnings was obtained from the institutional records; the amounts reported included all remittances sent before March 15,

1926. The lack of a law requiring an assignment of earnings may have been responsible for the small number of prisoners (only 82 of the 210) who had sent their families part of their earnings. The Mutual Welfare League required that all men whose families received a league allowance should assign a part of their wages to their families. (See p. 11.) Fifty-eight of the families were receiving assistance from the Mutual Welfare League and 24 families only the small contributions the fathers were able to make.

Irregularity of assignment of earnings was another factor for which the voluntary system was probably responsible. None of the fathers had sent money home regularly during the entire period of their imprisonment, and some men had sent money only once or twice and others at very irregular intervals. The assignments of earnings in the families aided by the Mutual Welfare League were more regular than the others, but they had not extended over the entire time the father was in prison.

The actual amount of money sent to the families was pitifully small as compared with their needs. At the rate of compensation in effect at the time of the study the amount the family might receive from men regularly employed during an entire year would be $23.40, if all the father's earnings aside from the reserve were assigned to the family. Not even this amount was actually available, as it was necessary for the prisoners to retain some money for such personal expenditures as are essential for maintaining their morale. Twenty-six families had received less than $10, although all but seven of the fathers had been in prison more than a year, and several had been confined from two to six years. Of the 82 families only 7 had received the equivalent of $20 a year or more during the period of the father's imprisonment; most of the fathers in these families had received extra earnings which enabled them to make larger assignments. One man had sent his family $136 from his earnings as a barber during his imprisonment of a little more than one year.

Assistance from relatives.

More families received assistance from relatives than from any other source. Many of the families had become entirely dependent upon relatives, and others were practically so, having in addition only a small income from mothers' earnings or from outside aid. In some cases one family of relatives had assumed the support of the prisoner's whole family; in others the burden was divided among several families.

The splendid spirit shown by the relatives in sharing their homes, and in many cases in practically supporting the families of the prisoners, should receive due recognition. Their willingness to help may no doubt be attributed largely to the strong ties of kinship which exist among the people of the rural sections of the so-called Mountain States. Some of the relatives had assumed the family's debts or the cost of the father's trial or were sharing their limited incomes with their grandchildren or nieces and nephews. Many of the relatives stated that as long as they had anything to eat and a place to sleep the children should share it. Frequently the relatives were financially unable to maintain an average standard of living while caring for the prisoner's family.

The families which were assisted by relatives fall into three main groups: First, families entirely dependent upon relatives for support; second, those able to maintain themselves with the assistance of relatives; and third, those receiving some assistance from relatives but needing outside help as well.

The mother's death, the mother's unemployment due to illness, or the mother's desertion following the father's imprisonment were responsible for the entire dependency of some families upon relatives.

The tendency of relatives to keep the families together was recognized as a particularly favorable feature so far as the social welfare of the children was concerned. From the economic standpoint, however, especially in some of the larger families, the burden upon the relatives may have been so great as to affect unfavorably the welfare of the children.

Employment of mothers.

The mothers' difficulty in obtaining work, their willingness to do any kind of work available, and the very small wages they received were noted especially in connection with the employment of the mothers during the imprisonment of the fathers. Many of the families lived in more or less isolated communities, with little or no opportunity for regular employment. The only opportunity they had to earn a few dollars was to take in washing or to get a day's work now and then at general housework Even such work was hard to get because standards of living were much the same throughout these communities and few families could afford to have their work done. During the busy seasons it was sometimes easier to obtain work as farm helpers; this, too, was most irregular and amounted usually to only a few weeks of hoeing corn. Little need be said about the difficulties the majority of the mothers encountered in trying to support a family on the money they were able to earn under these circumstances. A few mothers in rural districts who owned their farms or were tenant farmers were more nearly able to maintain their families on their labor. More regular and more lucrative work was usually available for mothers living in the towns and cities. But on the whole the mothers had had little training or experience, and their value in the industrial world was consequently low.

Many of the mothers were unable to work because of physical disability. The birth of a child within a few months after the father's imprisonment or jail detention was one of the factors which hindered 34 of the mothers in obtaining employment. Two other mothers had been confined less than a week before the father's imprisonment.

The extent of the employment of the mothers after the father's imprisonment as compared with their employment before the father's imprisonment is shown in Table 6. In addition to the 16 that had not been employed at any time after the father's imprisonment 42 others were not working at the date of the interview, although most of them were really contributing to the support of their families through work in the homes, on the farms of relatives, or in the care of boarders and lodgers. More than two-thirds of the mothers who were working on the date of the interview had not been gainfully employed immediately before the father's imprisonment. Most of

those who had been employed before the father left were still working at the time of the study, although some had died, others had worked irregularly, and one was physically unable to work.

TABLE 6.—*Employment of mother subsequent to father's imprisonment, by her employment prior to his imprisonment*

Employment of mother subsequent to father's imprisonment	Families investigated				
	Total	Employment of mother prior to father's imprisonment			
		Employed [1]	Not employed	Inapplicable (mother dead)	Not reported
Total	210	46	149	14	1
Employed [1]	159	41	117	----------	1
Not employed	16	1	15	----------	----------
Inapplicable (mother dead)	27	2	11	14	----------
Not reported	8	2	6	----------	----------

[1] Excludes mothers who were keeping boarders or lodgers; of the 159 only 117 were working at the date of interview.

Occupations.—Of the 117 mothers who were working at the time of the interview, 60 were engaged in domestic service or at laundry work, 40 were doing farm work, 7 were employed in factories, and the others were engaged in various occupations, including working in café, waiting on the table, sewing, cooking in a hotel, and doing clerical work.

The mothers doing farm work included those working their own farms, those raising crops on rented land for which they were usually paid a crop share, and those hiring out as laborers. Many of these mothers had always assisted in the fields when their help was needed during the busy seasons, but few had ever "worked out for hire" or carried the entire burden of management of the farm as they were called upon to do after the father's imprisonment. Owing to the seasonal nature of the work and the limited demand for paid workers, the mothers who hired out as a rule did only a few weeks' work during the year—during the busy seasons at planting and harvesting time. Eleven mothers did some other work in addition to their farm work—generally washings or daywork; one taught school and worked on the farm between terms.

The regularity of the mothers' employment and the places of their employment (whether at home or away from home) affected the amount of care that they could give to the children. For the purpose of this study full-time work has been interpreted as being employment six full days a week and part-time work either less than six full days each week or less than a regular working day for six days. Although women who were working on their farms either as owners or tenants have been classified as full-time workers the seasonal nature of the farm work and the irregularity of hours should be borne in mind. Sixty-six of the 117 mothers who were employed at the date of interview were working full time and 47 part time; for 4 this item was not reported.

Table 7 shows the type of the mother's employment. At the time of the interview 45 mothers were working at home, 53 were working away from home, and 19 were working part of the time at home and part of the time away. A few of the mothers were living at their places of employment, but the majority of them were living at home and going out to work.

TABLE 7.—*Mother's occupation at date of interview, by place of her employment at date of interview*

Mother's occupation	Families investigated					
	Total	Place of mother's employment				
		At home	Away from home	Both at home and away	Inapplicable [1]	Not reported
Total	210	45	53	19	85	8
Employed [2]	117	45	53	19	----	----
Farm owner or tenant [3]	29	20	----	9	----	----
Farm laborer [4]	11	4	4	3	----	----
Laundress [5]	40	17	16	7	----	----
Domestic	20	2	18	----	----	----
Factory worker	7	----	7	----	----	----
Other	10	2	8	----	----	----
Inapplicable [1]	85	----	----	----	85	----
Not reported	8	----	----	----	----	8

[1] Includes 58 mothers unemployed and 27 dead.
[2] Excludes mothers who were keeping boarders or lodgers.
[3] Includes 4 mothers who also did laundry work, 6 mothers who were also farm laborers, and 1 who was also a domestic.
[4] Includes 2 mothers who also did laundry work, 2 who did laundry and housework, 1 who was also a domestic, and 1 who was a teacher.
[5] Includes 6 mothers who also did cleaning and housework and 1 who was also a chicken picker.

The most important group to consider in connection with their inability to give proper supervision to the children are the 66 mothers who were engaged in full-time work, especially those who were working away from home full or part time. Twenty-six mothers were employed full time at home, many of them doing farm work. Ten mothers who were working full time were at home part of the time and away part of the time.

The relatives with whom the families were living often cared for the younger children while the mother was at work. It was necessary, however, for a number of the mothers who were working away from home to leave the children alone during the time they were out of school or to keep older children out of school to care for the younger ones. The lack of supervision of an older person was only one of the ways in which the children were affected by the mother's absence. The mothers who were away all day probably had little time to prepare their food or to look after the general physical and moral welfare of the children. The gainful employment of the mothers at home, especially full-time employment, had its attendant hardships for the children also. The necessary household duties were performed with a minimum expenditure of time and energy, and the children were kept out of school either to help with the work

or to do some of the things the mothers otherwise would have been able to do themselves.

Earnings.—It was impossible to make a cash estimate of the earnings of the mothers who were paid in crops, or their maintenance in return for their labor, but the amounts, either actual or approximate, of their weekly cash earnings were reported for 69 of the mothers who were employed at the time of the study. Forty-five earned less than $6 a week, 16 earned from $6 to $12 a week, and only 8 earned $12 or more. The highest wage was $29 a week, which one mother received as clerk in a confectionery store, but it was necessary for her to live in one town and to maintain a home for the children in another. One mother earned $17, one $14, two $12.50, and two $12.

The earnings of the 11 negro and 8 white working mothers who were supporting their families with no outside assistance at the time of the agent's visit seemed inadequate to maintain even the standard of living to which they had been accustomed; 4 of these families had received some outside assistance during the father's absence. All but 1 of the 11 negro mothers were doing domestic work and were receiving some maintenance for themselves and their children in addition to small sums in cash. Four of the 8 white mothers were farm owners and managed as best they could from the crops, though 2 of them found it necessary to do day's work for neighbors whenever they could get it to do. One of the mothers did sewing, 1 was a farm tenant, 1 did laundry work, and the eighth did housework.

Case stories.—The following stories illustrate the difficulties some of the mothers had to cope with in providing for themselves and their children during the husband's absence:

Before Mr. A.'s arrest the family lived on a farm which they were working on shares, but soon after he left home all their furniture and stock had been destroyed by fire. At the time of the agent's visit Mrs. A. and her six children, ranging from 4 to 16 years of age, were living on a 75-acre farm which the older children (by her first marriage) had inherited from their father. Only about 12 acres had been cleared and the rest was in timber, but the mother was not allowed to sell the property or even the timber. She had been able to cultivate only 4 or 5 acres and the year previous to the study had not put in any crops, as she could not get any plowing done. At the time of the study she was working in the cornfields of neighboring farmers at $1 a day whenever there was an opportunity. During one winter she lived at a near-by mining camp in order that she might get a few washings to do. One summer she had earned from $1.25 to $1.50 a day three days a week doing washing for summer guests at a hotel 5 miles from her home. As the journey was made on foot during the entire season—from June to October—it was necessary for her to start very early, and often she did not reach home until dark or even later. The 16-year-old girl worked regularly at the same hotel during the season, and the younger children were left with the 13-year-old girl. The guests at the hotel had provided the children with clothes, and the proprietor paid for their schoolbooks, so that they were able to attend school regularly.

Mrs. M.'s youngest child was born five months after her husband's imprisonment, and for some months she was unable to work. During this time the oldest girl, 13 years of age, did most of the housework and cared for the younger children. At the time of the study, Mrs. M. was working her own garden, doing her housework, and "hiring out" to do house cleaning and washing four days a week. Her wages amounted to $3 or $4 a week and "crops." Soon after her husband's imprisonment she had sold her furniture in order to raise sufficient money to pay the railroad fare of her children

and herself to another section of the State, where a relative gave her the use of a house and garden, rent free. The inaccessibility of the home from the school, the lack of sufficient clothing, and the necessity of having a caretaker for the younger children during the mother's absence prevented the two older girls from attending school regularly.

With the help of two of the older children, a boy of 14 and a girl of 10, Mrs. B. cultivated not only her own 5-acre farm but 6 acres in addition which she rented. For the three seasons prior to the study she had also hired out to hoe corn. As her husband had peddled groceries for a living she was accustomed to doing a great deal of the farm work. The neighbors helped her put in the crop when the work was too much for her. The oldest of the six children, a girl of 17, had been attending a settlement school but was compelled to leave to help her mother. She had secured irregular work at domestic service.

For about a month during the tomato season Mrs. P. walked 2 miles every morning to the cannery where she was employed in peeling tomatoes at 7 cents a bucket. Her earnings during the month amounted to $9.65. This was the only outside work that she had been able to secure except a washing now and then. Four boys, 8 to 14 years of age, who were living at home, attended school regularly while the mother was at work. Every evening they drove the "old nag" to the cannery to "carry her home." For two seasons the mother had done all the plowing, but the year of the study the 14-year-old boy was able to do it. No work seemed to be too hard for the mother and the children to undertake. They even sawed all their own wood, sometimes working in snow up to their shoetops. The mother had managed to provide for the family and keep the four children in school. The crops they raised and the mother's meager earnings had been supplemented by the father's soldier's pension of $12 a month and by occasional help from the older children who were away from home.

Mrs. T. summed up the family's condition by saying, "We manage to keep alive." "We" refers to herself and four children, three girls, 14, 12, and 9 years old, and a boy, 8 years old. Although the farm of the children's grandparents, which the father had "tended" rent free before his imprisonment, consisted of 100 acres, only a few acres were under cultivation. After the father left, the mother took over the entire responsibility. Her relatives did the plowing for her, but she hoed, harrowed, planted, and gathered the crops. Besides what she was able to make from the crops, she had received $27.94 from her husband's earnings during a period of eight months, and two months prior to the date of the study the Mutual Welfare League made her a grant of $7 a month.

Since her husband's imprisonment Mrs. L.'s health had grown steadily worse, owing to overwork and worry in trying to make a living for herself and six children, who ranged from 4 to 17 years of age. With the aid of four of the children (7, 10, 13, and 15 years of age), she tried to cultivate about 10 acres on a tenant farm. She usually did four washings and one ironing a week, for which she generally received only $2.50 in cash plus milk and butter. The oldest boy, 17 years of age, left school to go to work immediately after his father's imprisonment and was earning $7.50 a week as a farm laborer. The schooling of all the other children had been interrupted in order to help their mother. The mother had debts amounting to $57, incurred since the father went away.

Employment of children.

Although a large proportion of the families were living in rural communities and the study was made in the midst of the farming season, the amount of employment reported for the children was small. The employment of the children was influenced by the same

farming and living conditions that made inability to find employment one of the main problems of the mothers who were attempting to support their families. Of the 596 children 7 years of age but under 16 years, 64 were employed at the date of interview; 40 were under 14 and 24 were 14 or 15 years of age. Forty-nine of these 64 children were working as farm laborers, the others in domestic service or in various activities in the towns.

All children who were working in the production of crops or other salable products, whether for their mothers or for someone else, have been included in the group of the gainfully employed; but those who helped at home with the housework have not been included. If the family had a farm, or even a garden, it was customary for the children—both boys and girls—to help with every part of the work. It was not unusual to find families in which the mother had done the heaviest of the farm work for several years following the father's imprisonment, until her oldest boy was big enough to help her out. Some of these boys who were "big enough" were only 12 or 13 years of age.

An effort was made in interviewing the mothers to obtain as much information as possible about the work done by the children, but there was no way to judge whether many of them were doing more than they would have done under normal conditions. Some of the mothers stated quite definitely that the children were working on the farm much more than if the father had been at home. In a number of families it was apparent to the agents that the children were working beyond their strength and that their physical as well as their educational welfare was being affected seriously.

The irregularity of the employment of those who "hired out" lessened to some extent the possibility of serious results of too early and too difficult employment. On the other hand, some of these children were only 11 or 12 years of age, and the work even for short periods was probably taxing.

The contribution to the family support of cash earnings of children of school age was small. Only four children under 16 were regularly employed throughout the year; most of the other children not attending school were helping at home. All the remaining working children were employed during the time that school was not in session or after school hours. Cash earnings were reported for less than one-third of the total number of working children who were under 16 years of age.

Only 40 of the 142 children 16 years of age and over in the 210 families were living at home; 29 were employed and 11 were not. Some of the latter were girls 16 or over who were the home makers for the younger children; others were married sons or daughters who were living at home temporarily. A few were children physically incapacitated for work; these of course presented an additional problem in the families. A cash wage was reported for 20 of those who were living with the family group. The cash earnings of some of the older boys and girls were a definite contribution to the family income. Seven reported a weekly wage of $12 or more, 9 a wage of $6 to $12, and 3 a wage of less than $6. The earnings of 1 were not reported.

The earnings of the older children who were living away from the family group were practically the same as those of the older children who were living at home. Few were earning sufficient to do more than support themselves, and the aid available from them for the families was almost negligible.

The types of work engaged in by the children, and the irregularity of their employment and the consequent low wages they could earn are illustrated by the following cases:

Twelve-year-old Charles T., the oldest of a family of five children, had worked during vacations as a farm helper since he was 10. He had helped his father before the latter was imprisoned, and since then he had helped relatives who had given him his board and room and a little cash. One season he earned $20 picking berries. As his work had been done during vacations and out of school hours his schooling had not been interrupted and he was in the sixth grade. The family was entirely dependent upon the county and upon relatives.

Besides helping his mother with her farm work the 12-year-old boy in the F. family worked out for neighbors two days a week during the summer vacation and received $1 a day. He attended school regularly and was in the third grade. During the fall previous to the study he earned about $5 picking chestnuts, with which he bought his clothes and schoolbooks. The family consisted of the mother, two boys, and a girl of 9. The 19-year-old boy had "fits" and was unable to work.

The present imprisonment of the father was not responsible for Mary K.'s employment at the age of 14. She had lived with her grandparents since she was 6 years of age and had completed the eighth grade when she went to work. At the time her father was sent to prison she was working in a restaurant earning $5 a week. Her sister, who began work at 12, earned $1 a week doing washings, as well as working in the home; her schooling had stopped after she had completed only the first grade. She was living at home with her mother and five younger children. The father had apparently provided inadequate care for the family before his imprisonment, as he had been in hiding for some time and was also reported as having served numerous jail sentences.

The father in the L. family had been in hiding four and one-half months before he was apprehended and sent to the reformatory on a life sentence for murder. During this time he had not sent his family any money, nor had he sent any since his imprisonment. He had been away from home nearly five years at the time of the agent's visit. The two L. boys, one at 14 and the other at 15, had obtained employment in the mines, apparently by making false statements in regard to their ages, as the law specifies 16 as the minimum age for such employment. Both these boys had been compelled to stop work because of complete physical breakdowns, due to their too early employment, and at the date of the interview the older (then 18) was an incurable invalid.

The family barely succeeded in eking out an existence, though the mother and older children had worked hard at anything they could get to do, had moved several times in order to reduce expenses, had sold their furniture at a sacrifice, and had gone into debt for groceries. In addition to the lack of schooling and serious physical hardship which the two boys had suffered, the schooling of three other children had been interfered with seriously. They had attended school irregularly, and two years before the study they had stopped school altogether—the 10 and 12 year old girls because their help was needed at home and the 7-year-old girl because of the distance. The youngest child was only 3 years of age. At the date of the interview the invalid boy had gone to live with a widowed aunt and was acting as caretaker for her four children while she was at work. The mother was employed as a cook in a hotel 3 miles away and had been walking home every night after work so as to have a few

minutes with the children. The 12-year-old girl began to take the mother's place when she was 8 years old and was acting as housekeeper as well as helping to care for her sick brother.

Aid from public and private agencies.

The fact that many of the communities in which the families lived were not served by any social agency accounts to some extent for the comparatively small amount of outside assistance received by these families. Slightly more than one-fourth (57) of the families were reported as having been known to social agencies after the father's imprisonment. Twelve families had had some agency contacts before the father's imprisonment, and six of them continued to have agency assistance after his imprisonment.

Forty-five of the 57 families had received material relief from public or private agencies. In a number of cases this relief had been very irregular or had amounted to only one or two grants of a few dollars each. A few families had received some regular allowance over at least part of the time the father had been in prison. Such service as care at health clinics, day-nursery care for children, the securing of employment, and the placement of children in foster homes had been extended to nine families not receiving material relief. The contact with three families had been investigational or advisory only.

The county poor relief system was inadequate. Because of the small amounts granted at a time and the irregularity of these grants this type of assistance can not be considered an important factor in the support of the prisoners' families. County aid was granted through the fiscal court, a branch of the county court, and in the majority of counties aid was granted only every six months, when this court convened. Investigations were seldom made, and no supervision was given the families aided. The applicants were required to appear in person and present a petition for aid properly signed by references. The amounts granted seldom exceeded $10 at any one time and frequently were as small as $5.

In some counties it was possible to obtain aid more frequently or between court sessions, but this depended largely upon the policy of the individual judge. Not only was the amount of aid granted inadequate, but in several of the counties it was difficult to obtain any aid. Only 25 of the families visited reported that they had received either city or county outdoor relief during the father's absence. Many other mothers stated that they had asked for county aid but had been refused because of a policy of retrenchment in granting county relief. Several mothers who had been granted aid only once or twice said that the lack of funds had been given as a reason for discontinuance.

Twelve families were receiving county aid at the time of the study. One mother and her two children were being cared for in the county almshouse. Only three families had received city relief. This aid likewise was irregular and inadequate, consisting in most cases of a few supplies or occasional gifts of coal.

The private organizations serving families included one institution for dependent children, the Kentucky Children's Home Society, humane societies, local family-welfare organizations, and the Salvation Army. In many communities churches and lodges were the only

organizations from which any charitable assistance could be obtained, but only eight families had received aid from such organizations. For none of the families aided did the care given by private agencies extend over prolonged periods of time, nor did any of the families benefit by a constructive social program as the service and aid given had been irregular.

The small number of children in institutions for dependent children or in foster homes (other than those of relatives) may be accounted for both by the tendency of these people to recognize the ties of kinship and to assume responsibility for their care and by the lack of local institutions for dependent children. Only nine children (from four families) were in institutions for dependents at the date of the study. Two were being cared for with their mother in a county almshouse, and the other seven were in a church orphanage in Louisville.

As about four-fifths of the 210 men whose families were visited were in the reformatory, and all men in this institution were eligible for assistance from the Mutual Welfare League under certain conditions, it was not surprising to find that the league was providing aid to families more regularly and more adequately than any other agency. Fifty-eight families were receiving assistance from this source.

It was not the purpose of the league to assume the entire responsibility for support, and the amount of aid granted was not in any case sufficient to furnish adequate support for the family. On the other hand, the league allowance (plus the father's small contribution) was the only cash income reported for nearly half the families who were receiving it. Two families (one with five children and the other with two) had no other source of support except irregular gifts of food from relatives. A number of these families receiving aid from the league were living with relatives who were furnishing shelter and food, and the money from the league was all they had for clothing and other necessary expenses. Although some of the families were also receiving assistance from agencies, the Mutual Welfare League grant was the only aid from outside agencies reported by 45 families.

Beginning in December, 1925, the league increased its monthly allowance from 50 cents to $1 for each child under 16 years of age; the wives received $5 a month. It was sometimes necessary to reduce the allowance of some families temporarily, as the amount available for this service and the number of families varied each month, and aid was not refused any family if upon investigation they met the requirements of the league. The amounts granted to 33 of the 58 families receiving assistance corresponded with the standards set up by the league. Thirteen families were receiving less than standard amounts, 10 families were receiving more, and for 2 families this information was not obtained.

The assistance from the league was primarily financial, and many of the families were in great need of the constructive supervision which should be given by any agency giving material relief. Nevertheless, the money given saved many homes from even greater hardships than they were suffering. A few families accepted the money

rather as a matter of course, but most of the mothers or relatives expressed their appreciation of the help it had been to them.

The following stories show the meager resources of many of the families and the losing fight that they were making against a complete break-up of the family. They illustrate also the lack of adequate public provision for dependent families and the limited social resources of many rural communities:

The largest county grant being made to a prisoner's family at the time of the study was a quarterly allowance of $25 to the R. family. This was the only source of support Mrs. R. had for herself and her two children except the little crop she was able to raise on about 4 acres of land. Even with this grant of $100 a year the family had suffered great hardship, and it had been necessary for them to go to live with the grandmother. The grandfather was in the reformatory and all he had left the family was corn, meal stuff, a horse, and a cow. They ate the corn but could not feed the cow and had to kill it. Later they sold the stove and a bedstead and traded the horse for another cow but had to sell this cow for $10. All this had been done "to keep the children from starving to death."

A mother with seven children from 2 to 16 years of age received a monthly allowance from the fiscal court of $5. She was trying to manage on her earnings of $8 a week, about $9 a month from the 14-year-old boy who was employed in a restaurant, and the county aid of $5 a month. The 16-year-old boy had been employed irregularly, usually at farm work, earning 75 cents a day, but he was not employed at the time of study. The mother kept a cow and some chickens.

Mrs. K. had been receiving a small monthly allowance from the county for about a year and a half. She and her four children had no other income, but received free rent and some clothing from relatives. A fifth child, a 12-year-old boy, was living with relatives and earning about $3 a week, besides his board and room.

Mrs. S. and her six children lived in a two-room log cabin and tended about 10 acres of land. They received $10 a month from the Mutual Welfare League. In addition to helping his mother an 18-year-old son hired out, and at the time of study he was earning $3 a week. The mother earned a few extra dollars occasionally hoeing corn. The county had given the family a total of $93 over a period of three and one-half years.

A family that was entirely dependent upon the Mutual Welfare League lived in an isolated mountain section. The mother would gladly have worked if it had been possible to get work. The two children (4 and 5 years of age) appeared to be undernourished. The mother said that she had not had enough money to get the proper food for them. Most of the time the children had no milk, as the cow died shortly after the father went away, and the family had had no money to buy another. For two years the county had given aid—$10 every six months. This aid had not been granted at the last session of the court, partly because the mother was being aided by the Mutual Welfare League and partly because of a lack of funds. The home had been mortgaged for $125 to pay the expenses of the father's trial. The mother had spent a small sum she had inherited and was in debt for groceries.

At the time of the study Mrs. T. and her five children from 1 to 9 years of age were dependent upon the $11 a month they received from the Mutual Welfare League, semiannual relief from the county, assistance from the county health department, and irregular contributions and gifts of clothing from relatives. The mother had been ill for a month previous to the agent's visit. Before her illness she had worked irregularly at whatever she could get to

do—washing, cleaning, or cooking—and had averaged about $4 a week. She had received $7.81 from the father over a period of eight months. The mother's necessary absence from home had interfered with the school attendance of the oldest child, a girl of 9 years, who had been absent about half the time. This girl's scholarship record had been unusually good until the year preceding the study, but she was probably not going to make her grade in the session in which the interview occurred.

Mrs. A., who was 31 years of age, had five children from 1 to 14 years of age. She had had tuberculosis for two years, but owing to her limited income she could not follow the doctor's suggestions as to special diet and rest. She was an excellent housekeeper and would not sacrifice her standards in order to save herself. She also refused to send any of her children to an institution. The father had sent $6.50 home during the 16 months he had been in the reformatory. At the time of the interview the mother earned $6 a week doing washing. This and the $10 a month from the Mutual Welfare League were her only cash income. Free rent was furnished, and the doctor had given her some medicine free of charge. Work, worry, and poverty were making her condition worse, and the health of the children was in danger, as no precaution against their being infected was being taken. The family was living in a mining camp in which the milk supply was inadequate and the cost prohibitive.

The G. family presented a health problem needing special attention. The father had been detained in jail for eight months immediately before his commitment to prison. Soon after he was put in jail it became necessary for the mother and the three children (2, 4, and 8 years of age) to move to her "folks," where the mother started taking in washing. She averaged four days' work a week, at about $1.75 a day. This was the only income the family had, as the grandparents had no savings and the grandfather was confined in bed. They owned their house, however, and the grandmother earned enough as a midwife to pay the taxes. The mother was pregnant at the time of the father's imprisonment but worked until within a few days of her confinement, because of the urgent need for her earnings. She was unable to work for two months following confinement, and after that had been working only two days a week. A church had given some coal and groceries and had helped pay the rent before the mother went to live with the grandmother. The Mutual Welfare League sent her $9 a month for six months preceding the agent's visit—the maximum amount for herself and four children. The health of the mother had been impaired by overwork, and, so far as was reported, she had received no medical care nor aid in preventing further breakdown. The mother said that they managed to live from week to week with the money sent by the league and with her earnings.

A mother with four children ranging from 1 to 9 years in age had gone to live with her parents. The mother's six brothers and sisters were in the home. The house was overcrowded, as 12 people were living in two rooms. One of the mother's sisters, a girl of 17, was in the last stages of tuberculosis and was not expected to live. The mother herself was not strong, and the agent suspected that she also had tuberculosis, although no physician's report was obtained. The mother and her children were entirely dependent upon these relatives except for the $9 a month which they received from the league. Over a period of 15 months the league had sent $103, and the father's compensation sent with the league check had amounted to $13.88.

At the time the father committed the murder for which he, was sentenced to the reformatory for life, the M. children were 1 year, 3 years, and 6 years of age. For about a year before his commitment the father was in hiding and made no contribution to the support of his family. The mother and children went to live with her parents, and as soon as she was strong enough she went to work as a domestic. The grandparents cared for the children during the

mother's absence. Two years later the mother became insane and died in the State hospital for the insane. The grandparents, who were old and ignorant as well as poor, had had full responsibility for the care and support of the children since the father had left home, as the mother had earned little more than enough for her clothes and board. The Mutual Welfare League had been assisting the children for a little more than three years, the estimated amount of aid being $212. The grandfather and an uncle worked a 75-acre farm on rocky, mountainous land, and barely made a living. Intelligent supervision and assistance in securing the proper educational and physical guidance were needed to safeguard the future welfare of these children.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PROBLEM OF THE PRISONER'S FAMILY IN KENTUCKY

To the convicted defendant, sentence to a penal institution means deprivation of liberty and, theoretically at least, opportunity for reformation; to society, protection from the criminal tendencies of the prisoner and possibly a deterrent effect on others with similar tendencies; to the wife and children, deprivation of a father's support and all the economic and social readjustment which such a loss involves. Kentucky has provided police, prosecuting officers, courts, and penal institutions for the discipline and reformation of the prisoner and protection of society. It has ignored almost entirely its obligation to the wives and children. Yet at the time of this study almost one-third of the inmates of its two penal institutions had dependent children under 16 years of age when they were sentenced. These families represented every section of the State. Only 17 per cent of those reported as living in the State resided in the two counties (Jefferson and Fayette) having the largest cities. For the most part the problem of provision for prisoners' families in Kentucky is a rural one. Almost two-thirds of the fathers with dependent children would have to serve, it is estimated, a minimum period of two years or more, and almost one-third would have to serve eight years or more. The problem, in the main, is one of long-time adjustment rather than of temporary relief.

Although in some instances the father had been separated from his family before his imprisonment, more than three-fourths of the married prisoners had been living with their families. Practically all the fathers in the 210 families intensively studied had been supporting their families in whole or in part. Neither the families, the localities in which they lived, nor the State was prepared to meet the problems which the sudden loss of the father's support involved.

Only a few families had had any savings other than investments in their homes or farms. The mortgaging or forced sale of their property in order to pay the expenses of the father's trial or to tide the family over the first few months of his absence not only caused immediate hardship but in many instances jeopardized the future welfare of the mother and children. Opportunities for the employment of mothers and older children were limited in the mountain counties in which many of them lived; in many neighborhoods nearly all the families were eking out a bare living from the soil, and except for a few washings or an occasional day's hoeing no employment was available to the most needy of the community. On the other hand, the small farms or gardens which a number of the families owned or rented enabled them to survive on an extremely small cash income. Relatives were the most important source of assistance during the father's absence, both in the number of families aided and in

the amount of help given. To many families no other source of assistance was available, and both the mother's and the father's relatives generously shared what they had, though in many cases this necessitated considerable self-denial.

Outside two or three of the more populous counties, Kentucky was entirely without organized social-service agencies which could assist in dealing with the problems of dependent, neglected, and delinquent children. It had no provision for public aid to dependent children in their own homes, which in 23 States was available to the children of prisoners. Only a few communities had organized juvenile courts and probation service. There were few trained social workers administering family relief, public or private, or doing children's aid and protective work, except in urban areas. Fraternal organizations and churches were the only private agencies available in many rural and semirural communities.

The existence of public or private agencies from which families of prisoners could obtain material relief or other forms of service not only would have prevented much hardship to the mothers and children but would have relieved relatives of the added responsibility which many of them, in justice to their own families, should not have assumed. Of the 210 families studied only 3 received city aid and only 14 county aid during the year. County aid was granted by the fiscal court when it convened; in some counties the court met monthly or quarterly but in most counties semiannually. The amounts granted were small, the maximum grant being $100 a year and the minimum $20 a year. Few families received the maximum amount, especially as grants were seldom continuous, the irregularity being due partly to a lack of funds available for this purpose.

Only about one-fifth of the 210 families visited had been aided by a private agency (not including the Mutual Welfare League of the reformatory) during the father's absence. Some of the families reported as having agency help were not granted material relief, and in practically all cases in which grants were made they were so small and irregular that agency assistance could not be considered an important source of support during the father's absence. Several children were being provided for by child-placing agencies or institutions for dependents. Family-relief agencies and in a few instances fraternal organizations and churches had contributed grocery orders, coal, or clothing in emergencies, and legal-aid societies had given some service to several families.

What was Kentucky doing to meet the problems occasioned by the imprisonment of the family breadwinner? It had no State board which included in its activities the prevention of child dependency and neglect or the organization and guidance of local agencies to deal with these problems. Its State board of charities and corrections was limited to the administration of State institutions. The small compensation paid working prisoners in the penitentiary and the reformatory made it impossible for the men to send their families more than a few dollars a month. Since the men were not required to send any of their earnings, their contributions were not only limited but very irregular and uncertain.

Much larger sums are paid working prisoners in most of the States that specify the amounts to be paid. In fact, only one State speci-

fied a smaller compensation than the 5 to 15 cents a day granted in Kentucky. A minimum of 50 cents a day is usual, with the maximum varying from $1 to $2.50. Provision had been made by a number of States for the payment of prisoners' earnings (or a certain proportion of them) directly to their wives or other dependents. In these States the prisoners had no choice as to whether the money should be sent, nor as to the amount.

The parole officers serving the two Kentucky institutions were not trained social workers, and no attempt was made to investigate the family situation or to assist the family before the prisoner's release.

Only one of the institutions, the reformatory, had a Mutual Welfare League. At the time of the study the league was assisting one-third of the 165 families of reformatory prisoners included in the inquiry. It was not the purpose of the league to assume the entire responsibility for the support of the families of prisoners, but about half of the families receiving aid had no other cash income. The league was staffed entirely by prisoners and had no field agents who could make investigations, assist the family in making plans, or give constructive supervision when needed.

Among the results of the lack of provision for meeting the financial and other needs of prisoners' families were: Broken homes, loss of property, accumulation of debts, lowering of physical endurance through overwork, insufficient food and improper living conditions, absence of a mother's care due to her employment outside the home, and interruption of schooling. No doubt these and the numerous other lesser privations which many of the families suffered left a permanent impression on the lives of the children.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to deal adequately with the problem of the prisoner's family in Kentucky, measures concerned directly with the administration of the penal institutions and general social-welfare measures looking toward the development of local resources for dealing with problems of child dependency and neglect are needed.

ADMINISTRATION OF PENAL INSTITUTIONS

Necessary measures concerned directly with the administration of institutions are:

(1) Development of a labor system that will permit the employment of all able-bodied prisoners at a reasonable wage.

(2) Compulsory regular contributions to their families of a portion of the earnings of prisoners with dependents. Rules governing the circumstances under which contributions shall be required, and time and method of payment, should be drawn up by the State board of charities and corrections.

(3) Continued encouragement of the excellent work done by the Mutual Welfare League of the reformatory and establishment of a similar organization in the penitentiary.

(4) Employment by the State board of charities and corrections of a sufficient number of trained family case workers to investigate all families of newly committed prisoners in order to assist them in the readjustments made necessary by the imprisonment of the father, and to give such friendly supervision as may be necessary. This work should be coordinated with the parole work, for which it will be an excellent foundation, preparing the family and the community for the prisoner's return. The case workers should also render assistance to the Mutual Welfare League in the investigation and supervision of cases.

GENERAL SOCIAL-WELFARE MEASURES [1]

In order that the local community may deal adequately with the problem of child dependency and neglect, the following measures are needed:

Organization of county child-welfare work. One of the outstanding needs of Kentucky, especially in rural districts, is a system of county boards of child welfare or public welfare working in cooperation with a State board and equipped to do case work with families and children. Only through such a system, which is now in existence in a number of States, can problems of child dependency and neglect in rural communities be dealt with effectively.[2]

Public provision for aid to dependent children in their own homes (mothers' pensions), including children of prisoners whose contributions to family support from their own earnings are insufficient. Forty-two States have passed laws providing for regular grants to families with dependent children, varying in amount with the number of children and the family's income from other sources, and administered by trained social workers.

---

[1] In March, 1928, a bill passed by the Kentucky House of Representatives was awaiting action of the senate. It provides for the creation of a State children's bureau and county children's bureaus, and authorizes the counties to provide aid for mothers with dependent children. This assistance would be available to the dependent children of prisoners.

[2] See The County as a Unit for an Organized Program of Child-Caring and Protective Work, by Emma O. Lundberg (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 169, Washington, 1926), and Public Child-Caring Work in Certain Counties of Minnesota, North Carolina, and New York, by H. Ida Curry (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 173, Washington, 1927).