

PATERNAL AND MATERNAL ROLES AND DELINQUENCY

R. G. ANDRY *

The purpose of this chapter is twofold: to examine critically the concept of "maternal deprivation" and to establish a case for recognizing several additional and perhaps more important concepts, including that of the pathogenic paternal factor in delinquency.

First the general background of the problem including the maternal-deprivation concept will be discussed. The sequence will deal with a selection of findings in a research project conducted by the author and recorded elsewhere in much greater detail.¹

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE CONCEPT OF "MATERNAL DEPRIVATION"

The concept of "maternal deprivation", as brought out clearly by Dr John Bowlby,⁴ seems to imply that one of the most dangerous pathogenic factors in child development is the harm that may be done if a child has been deprived of his natural mother's love through separation. This concept, while undoubtedly valid in specific cases, as demonstrated by Bowlby, causes dissatisfaction in several directions, if one wishes to consider the vast and complex development of personality as a whole.

For instance, the concept seems to imply that, other things being equal, a single factor — namely, maternal deprivation — is often the main pathogenic factor in personality development. But is this necessarily so? For instance, can one ever assume that other things are equal? Might it not be that child development is so complex (even during the first years when mother-child relationships seem to be more important than father-child and child-sibling relationships) that the relatively crude condition of maternal deprivation may be only one among several other perhaps more important aspects of mother-child relationships? For instance, what of the child who does not become a delinquent or neurotic — even though he may have suffered maternal deprivation — but who

* Psychology Department, University of London Institute of Education, London, England.

was cared for by a warm-hearted mother-substitute such as a relative or a nurse? Or what of the child who has become a delinquent or neurotic, despite the fact that he was never maternally deprived during the critical periods in his life? What of stimulating institutions such as the *Kibbutzim*, where maternally deprived children do not seem to become delinquents? The delinquency of such children in other institutions may well be due to the questionable quality of the institution.

Often the distinction between physical and psychological separation seems to be overlooked. The concept of maternal deprivation appears to imply that physical separation between mother and child is usually very damaging to the child's proper development. But what of the case where physical separation has not occurred, but where psychological separation seems to have acted as a major pathogenic factor in the subtle way called by the Gluecks¹⁵ "broken-under-the-roof relationships"? Bowlby³ himself found that only about one-quarter of his delinquents had suffered separation from their mothers to the extent that it appeared to have given rise to the maternal-deprivation syndrome. Similarly, the Gluecks¹⁵ report that of their sample, closely resembling the delinquency population as a whole, again only about one-quarter of the delinquents came from broken homes — i.e., homes where a "mother-child" separation factor had occurred. This point was also taken up by the writer¹ when, in the sample selection of cases for his project, he found that about 25% came from broken homes. The remainder scrutinized for study were also examined to determine whether more subtle "under-the-roof" relationships had occurred which could be traced back to forms of physical separation rather than to breakdowns in psychological communication between the child and his parents. This point will be taken up again further on.

So far, then, the maternal-deprivation concept appears to be vulnerable in several directions as a central pathogenic agent. Briefly, the concept is vulnerable on the following grounds:

(1) Is it valid or expedient to isolate a single factor, such as maternal deprivation, from the complex matrix of human personality development to account for pathological behaviour?

(2) Is it valid to take such a single concept and to regard it as a central pathogenic agent giving rise to such diverse behaviour patterns as psychosis, psychoneurosis, and delinquency? (Most forensic psychologists — for example, Bennett² and Glover¹⁴ — do not regard the majority of delinquents as neurotics.)

(3) To what extent is it profitable to regard such a concept as being of sufficient significance to account for the major part of deviant behaviour?

(4) How far is it useful to explain, through such a concept, a behaviourally deviant pattern in terms of a theory (Kleinian psycho-analytic) which is heavily committed to certain viewpoints, one being that child-mother relationships during the early crucial years of a child's development are usually more basic than other, later, child-object relationships — between the child and his father, other siblings, social environmental challenges — and original genetic endowment backed by biochemically responding conditions?

(5) How far are designs of experiments satisfactory and valid in establishing the importance of the maternal-deprivation syndrome?

It is not intended, here, to discuss each of these five points exhaustively, but to examine their general validity, the usefulness of the concept of maternal deprivation, and the value of this concept within the framework of current psychological theories.

Regarding the general question of validity and the design of experiments, it seems desirable to consider whether Bowlby and the maternal-deprivation theorists have established the case that the concept is both veritable and useful, and that it was isolated through rigorously controlled experiments.

Generally speaking, a necessary condition for the validity of any major concept is not only that experiments must show the concept (for instance, maternal deprivation) to be primarily responsible for a set of behaviour, but also that this can be demonstrated repeatedly and consistently on later occasions. It must also be shown that other variables have not been mainly responsible for the same set of behaviour (e.g., delinquency). Only thus could a single concept stand revealed as a major etiological variable. Usually, in this kind of work (as Vernon³⁰ and Mannheim & Wilkins³¹ show) a "factor-analysis" should reveal quickly how much of the total "variance" is accounted for by major factors. The maternal-deprivation factor should thus have a high factor loading (and account for most of the variance) in relation to other variables, if the factor is to be accepted as being of primary importance. Unfortunately maternal-deprivation theorists have not presented their evidence in factor-analysis terms.

The onus of proof is on the maternal-deprivation theorist to demonstrate that a set of behaviour (such as delinquency, or an "affectionless character" or neuroticism) is *primarily* due to separation having occurred between a mother and her child during a particular span of his age. Have the maternal-deprivation theorists succeeded in this demonstration? Bowlby⁴ bases much of his thesis on his own work with forty-four juvenile thieves, and on the works of Theis, Beres, Obers, Bender, Goldfarb, Spitz, and others.

His own study suggests that maternal deprivation is a useful concept and capable of being isolated in about one-quarter of his cases; however, it seems to have a particularly pernicious influence in those described as "affectionless characters". It should not be overlooked that Bowlby³ himself, in his own study, never went beyond the reasonable position that delinquency is not primarily based on a maternal-deprivation factor, but that a specialized sub-group among delinquents (the psychopathic affectionless character) has largely suffered from the maternal-deprivation factor. This agrees with other views, from Burt⁹ to the Gluecks,¹⁵ who find that delinquency is the result of more than one factor. Would Dr Bowlby agree that, apart from its limited aspect, maternal deprivation plays no great part in the majority of delinquent cases, nor in the majority of cases of neuroticism (a condition not specifically investigated in Bowlby's forty-four juvenile thieves from the point of view of maternal deprivation)?

Bowlby, in his monograph,⁴ accepts the finding in the well-controlled studies of Theis and Beres & Obers that hereditary factors can in all probability be ruled out as the major responsible pathological factor, thus exposing the maternal-deprivation factor as vitally important. In recent years, however, experimental evidence suggests that the whole question of genetic inheritance needs examining once more. This can no longer be quickly dismissed as being of minor importance vis-à-vis such environmental factors as maternal deprivation. Tinbergen,²⁹ Lorenz,²⁰ Harlow,¹⁶ Bowlby⁵ himself, and especially W. Kessen,* in the child development field, have re-opened this issue. For instance, Kessen at Yale, in filming the sucking and other responses of babies from birth through the first week of their lives, found that, often irrespective of the mother's feeding attitude towards her child, the infants displayed characteristic motivational patterns of their own, some being very responsive towards the mother, others considerably less so. It goes without saying that the practical implications of this finding are important and may help to explain the statements of mothers who point out the differences in "responsiveness pattern" since earliest childhood between a delinquent (or neurotic) child of theirs and a non-delinquent (or non-neurotic) sibling.

Since the publication of his monograph, Bowlby⁵ himself seems to have developed a growing interest in the field of inheritance, as shown in his more recent papers on the inherited clinging response of monkeys. From this, however, it is not clear whether he would accept the position that much of what in the past might have been attributed to an environmentally induced maternal-deprivation pathology factor might be due to

* Research currently being conducted at Yale University (as yet unpublished).

the more fundamental inherited cortical and genetic structure of certain individuals. Here one wonders to what extent he shares Eysenck's¹² view that differences in personality patterns are relatable to a theory of cortical inhibition and disinhibition. This implies, for instance, that the major origin of delinquency need not be sought in factors such as maternal deprivation, but in factors such as, for example, how relatively unconditionable a delinquent is, as revealed by his limited extent of being conditionable under certain Pavlovian testing situations. It is interesting to note that Bowlby,⁶ in a recent publication on the etiology of mourning and the depressive position, departs somewhat from the orthodox basis of Freud,¹³ Melanie Klein¹⁸ and Burlingham & Freud⁸ and comes nearer to positions held by academic psychologists such as Miller & Dollard,²² Mowrer²³ and Shoben.²⁷ In their view, not a single, but several, measurable interacting variables of different habit strengths account for a given set of behaviour. Also of interest are Wilkins' findings,³¹ which suggest the delinquency proneness of a child during his fifth year under traumatic conditions. By that time and at that age the single maternal-deprivation factor is not likely to have operated.

Bowlby⁴ accepted in his original monograph the point made by Obers, Bender, Goldfarb and Spitz about the seeming irreversibility of the maternal-deprivation concept, once this factor had been demonstrated. The question, as Lady Wootton rightly points out elsewhere in this volume (see page 68), is whether these cases were sufficiently followed up, and whether life-correcting factors, such as successfully contracted marriages, may not have demonstrated the reversibility potential of maternally deprived cases.

Returning to the central theme of the existence and relative importance of the maternal-deprivation factor, Bowlby⁴ made his own interest clear in his monograph by regarding the concept as being of considerable importance in the understanding of deviant behaviour such as delinquency and neuroticism. However, the results of more recent investigations tend to show, if anything, the reverse — namely, the relative unimportance of the maternal-deprivation factor in the majority of cases of deviant behaviour. Naess,²⁴ who matched delinquent with non-delinquent brothers (holding the age factor as a constant), found that separation had occurred more among non-delinquents than delinquents. Dr Hilda Lewis,¹⁹ in her study of 500 children at a reception centre, was unable to demonstrate a clear connexion between a child's separation from his mother and a particular pattern of disturbed child behaviour. Neither was O'Connor²⁵ able to demonstrate any permanently disturbing effects of mother-child separation. Similarly, Stott²⁸ and especially A. D. B. & A. M. Clarke¹⁰ bring out the reversibility of the effects, in cases where a separation effect seems to have been active, by demon-

strating that, under proper institutional care, damaging effects can be relieved, and also that, under improper institutional care, the behavioural disturbances manifesting themselves are due less to a maternal-deprivation effect than to poor institutional care. Moreover, the Clarkes¹⁰ observed the damaging effects over a period of time of bad institutionalization on the intellectual functioning of children.

It should, however, be noted that, since the appearance of his monograph, Bowlby has modified some of his views regarding the perniciousness and influence of the maternal-deprivation effect. (This can be seen in the follow-up of the findings of Bowlby, Ainsworth, Boston & Rosenbluth.⁷) Also, since his association with Dr Heinecke¹⁷ in 1952, he has demonstrated the advantage of longitudinal over cross-sectional studies in this field.

The works of Douglas & Blomfield¹¹ and Rowntree²⁶ concerning the alleged existence and usefulness of the maternal-deprivation concept must also be mentioned here. Rowntree investigated *post hoc* 277 children up to four years of age who by then had suffered the absence of a parent, and matched them with children from stable homes. She concluded that most of the deprived children were not exceptionally prone to the grosser forms of emotional disturbance. Rowntree,²⁶ who also matched 4668 infants who were separated with non-separated ones in the same neighbourhood, had, up to the time of publication of her study, been unable to find many significant correlations in favour of the maternal deprivation theory. Similarly, Andry¹ was unable to isolate clearly any pathogenic maternal-deprivation factor. By matching 80 delinquents with 80 non-delinquents (boys between the ages of 11 and 15 and a subsample of both parents) he devised an interview questionnaire in order to find out which child had been deprived — that is, separated specifically either from his mother (as distinct from his father) or from both parents (as measured by whether the child was evacuated with or without his mother or his father, etc.). Again, he was unable to establish clearly among his delinquent sample that they had suffered, by comparison with his matched non-delinquents, any unusual degree of separation from their mothers. A more detailed discussion of the author's findings will be given later.

In summing up the first part of this chapter, all that need be said is that Bowlby's maternal-deprivation concept, though useful in certain cases, is probably not to be found as universally as was suspected by many shortly after the appearance of his stimulating monograph. Since then, he and others have had second thoughts on the matter, in varying degree, without repudiating the essentials where appropriate. The author of this chapter makes a special plea for the recognition of the role played by the father, in addition to that of the mother, as far as child development is

concerned. Also he hereby appeals to analytically orientated psychologists for a greater recognition and appreciation of the usefulness of the complex "learning-theory models", which have helped greatly in this field with the understanding of child-parent relationships. It is suggested here that the two kinds of models (the psychoanalytic and the learning-theory ones) need not be antagonistic to each other; on the contrary, with patience and tolerance, they can prove to be complementary.

RESEARCH ON THE PATHOGENIC ROLE OF FATHERS IN DELINQUENCY

Andry,¹ in an endeavour to investigate aspects of child-parent relationships, approached the topic essentially from two angles. He set out to examine the boys' relationship, in his study of 80 delinquent and 80 non-delinquent boys, not only their mothers but also with their fathers. Also, he examined aspects of child-parent separations in order to study the relative importance of mother-and-child and of father-and-child separations. This seemed desirable, since the maternal-deprivation theorists seem to have grossly neglected the concomitant role of the father.

Concerning the topic of separations, the author found it necessary to distinguish (contrary to the practice of most maternal-deprivation theorists) three possible aspects of parent-child separation:

- (1) psychological separation as a concomitant of physical separation (it is this aspect which is primarily considered by maternal-deprivation theorists; however, it appears essential to consider also the following two aspects);
- (2) psychological separation without physical separation;
- (3) physical separation without concomitant psychological separation.

It should be noted that the maternal-deprivation theorists concentrate on the hypothesis of mother-child psychological separation as a consequence of mother-child physical separation. It was felt that this was too restrictive and therefore to study this hypothesis further one should also link it with a father-child separation factor. Consequently, it was found necessary to distinguish three possible forms of parent-child separation:

- (1) separation of the child from its mother only (or maternal separation);
- (2) separation of the child from its father only (or paternal separation);

(3) separation of the child from both of its parents (or dual-parental separation).

Maternal-deprivation theorists seem to ignore the possible importance of paternal and dual-parental separations.

Owing to the fact that the author's study was not longitudinal but cross-sectional, it was not possible to trace in detail all Bowlby's valuable criteria for the maternal-deprivation factor, which tends to depend on: (1) the child's age when separation occurred; (2) the length of the separation; (3) the degree of the separation; (4) the frequency of the separation; (5) the quality of the parent-child relationships before separation occurred; (6) the experience of the child with its parent-substitute; (7) the child's reception by its parents when reunited with them. However, the author decided to determine what sorts of physical separation characterized the three basic forms of parent-child physical separation (i.e., maternal, paternal and dual-parental). The oft-quoted adverse effect of child institutionalization had to be expanded on logical grounds. For instance, wartime evacuations involved the separation of the child not only from his mother but also from his father. The author therefore selected for study various kinds of separation of the child in relation not only to his mother but also to his father or to both parents.

In order to get "pure" maternal-separation items the samples were checked for differences between delinquents and non-delinquents in relation to: (a) whether mothers were working, and (b) whether mothers had been hospitalized. In order to get "pure" paternal-separation items the samples were similarly checked for: (a) those fathers who had been away on war service and who had delinquent children, and those fathers who, although they had been away on war service, had non-delinquent children; (b) whether a child had been evacuated with the mother (thus having been paternally deprived); (c) whether fathers had been away a great deal on shift work during the boys' childhood; (d) whether fathers had been hospitalized during the boy's childhood. Lastly, in order to get "pure" dual-parental-separation items, it was decided to inquire into differences between the samples from the point of view of: (a) whether the child had been evacuated by himself; (b) whether the child had been hospitalized; (c) whether both parents had been hospitalized (thus possibly producing a dual-parental deprivation effect). All these questions were, of course, correlated with the age of the child during which ill-effects might have developed. Thus attempts were made to cover Bowlby's criteria (1), (2) and (4) (see above). Regarding the other criteria (concerning the quality of child-parent relationships before and after separation), the problem had to be approached differently (as will be shown later) — namely, in a more general way,

based on the fundamental affective relationship between a child and his parents. The results proved of interest.

It was found that no statistically significant differences between the two samples emerged in connexion with the hypothesis that there is a greater tendency for delinquents to have suffered maternal separation than for non-delinquents. Thus, the hypothesis that delinquents suffered more from maternal separation than non-delinquents had to be rejected, at least on the basis of the items under investigation. Somewhat similar results emerged in connexion with the hypothesis that there is a greater tendency for delinquents to have suffered paternal separation than for non-delinquents. No significant differences emerged in respect of either (a) the father's absence from home due to war service, or (b) the boys having been evacuated with their mothers. Delinquents, on the basis of these items in this research, cannot therefore be said to have suffered more than non-delinquents, during the first few years of their lives, from paternal separation. (It was later demonstrated by the author, however, that although no adverse paternal-separation factor in early childhood was demonstrable, it was in fact possible to demonstrate the existence of disturbed child-father relationships irrespective of whether early paternal-separation factors had occurred.) Further, in keeping with these results, the hypothesis that there is a greater tendency for delinquents to have suffered from dual-parental separation than for non-delinquents proved negative. This finding was based on such questions as: "Was the child evacuated by himself?" "How old was he then?" "What illnesses necessitated his hospitalization for more than one week during the first three years of his life?" "When and for how long were the parents hospitalized and thus separated from the child?" Generally speaking then, it was found that although the technique used was blunt and of necessity inferior to a more reliable direct observation study, the results failed to support the maternal-deprivation theory. It must be kept in mind that the findings can neither validate nor invalidate the maternal-deprivation theory. However, they do call the general usefulness of this theory into question, because:

(1) to be of heuristic value, a theory must incorporate clearly defined empirical referents and must be susceptible to empirical testing by a practical research method operating on these referents;

(2) apart from the fact that the maternal-deprivation theory does not satisfactorily provide clearly enough defined empirical referents, it is not, in certain crucial respects, susceptible to empirical testing by a *practical* research method (as the findings presented briefly above testify).

In order to prove the pathogenicity of the paternal-deprivation factor, several things would be necessary. Techniques would have to

be evolved for an on-the-spot observation and a long-term study covering the child during, say, the first twenty years of his life. The sample would have to be large, in order to ensure that a statistically adequate sample of delinquents would emerge, and the study would have to consider the roles of both parents — not merely that of the mother.

So far then, it is recalled that the author approaches his conceptionalization in a twofold way, with regard to child-parent attitudes and to character formation. However, it was felt that an investigation of child-parent separation, though going beyond the maternal-deprivation concept by taking paternal deprivation into consideration, was still not going far enough. Consequently, the other approach was conceptionalized in wider terms. It was reasoned that, in order to do full justice to the study of child behaviour (or misbehaviour), it would be necessary to relate findings to aspects of the study of the personality formation of an individual as a whole and, if possible, to relate this to already existing personality theory in psychology and not necessarily within the more specific confines of psychoanalysis. Consequently, the nearest model at hand seemed that of role perception. The task seemed to be to try to find out something about a child's perception of the relative importance of the roles played in his life by his mother and his father (and to check with both parents the extent to which this seemed to approximate to the true state of affairs as seen from the parent's point of view). With this in mind, the execution of the task became relatively easy.

As mentioned earlier, a sample of delinquent and non-delinquent boys were interviewed by means of a specially designed interview questionnaire covering a series of areas which presumably seemed important in their lives from the point of view of their character formation and overt behaviour. The major areas selected, in addition to the early childhood developmental ones already mentioned above (which presumably equally merited investigation though they affected the boys not before but during the so-called "latency period" and thereafter), were these: (1) emotional atmosphere, and (2) training. Under each of these headings several sub-areas seemed in need of investigation. The basic theme of the inquiry was centred on the area of parent-child affection. Which parent did the child feel more loved by — the mother or the father? Or did he feel that both loved him equally or that neither loved him? One of the tasks was to establish whether among the delinquent boys a greater proportion felt more loved by their mothers or by their fathers. This seemed important to find out. The research had already shown that, as far as one could tell, no deprivation effects (either maternal, paternal, or dual-parental) due to separation had occurred. Therefore, what other faulty child-parent relationships were at work possibly to account in part for the delinquent behaviour? Did the delin-

quent feel in some subtle way rejected by the mother? — as one might suspect if one kept in mind the implications of the maternal-deprivation concept. Interestingly enough, research findings tended to suggest the contrary. Among the delinquents there was a preponderance of those who implied that they felt rejected by their fathers (indicating that they felt loved more by their mothers, whereas the non-delinquents indicated with much greater constancy that they felt loved equally by both parents).

This pattern of the father-rejected delinquent tended to appear in a number of areas and sub-areas which were investigated. It emerged also in the child-parent communication area. Here attempts were made to assess both environmental and psychological communication between a child and his parents. Was the mother or the father more often away on shift work? And had such absences occurred more among the delinquents, having perhaps contributed to delinquency? Or, which parent did the boy feel more understood by—the mother or the father? To whom did he first turn when in trouble, and which parent did he prefer to deal with if under stress? Results showed that the bulk of the delinquents tended, by comparison with the non-delinquents, to stay away from both parents and not to seek their advice when in trouble. Further, it was found that both groups tended, if anything, to seek out their mothers before their fathers. However, thereafter, quantitative differences emerged again in the two groups. The delinquents in response to the question “Which parent do you prefer ultimately and finally to deal with your case if you have done something wrong?” opted for their mothers, whereas the non-delinquents opted for their fathers, in the hope of thereby getting the matter finally disposed of. Presumably the communication channels were worse between the delinquents and their fathers than in the case of the non-delinquents, and the proportion of delinquents who were more afraid of their fathers than their mothers was greater than that of the non-delinquents. Similarly, when aspects of the home climate were investigated the relative paternal glumness as opposed to maternal cheerfulness was commented upon more by the delinquents than by the non-delinquents.

Fathers were very similarly incriminated when the investigation applied to the field of “training” and punishments. Linked with the earlier area of an inquiry into child-parent affection two assumptions were made: (a) that adequate rapport must exist between parents and child so that the child feels sufficiently loved by his parents to make him feel the need for (to find meaning in) socialization training and learning; and (b) that a consistent mode of training must be adopted which is based more on the positive approach of praise and reward than on the negative one of punishment. Consequently, a series of hypotheses were set up in order to see whether a clear source of authority

existed in the family and, if so, from which parent this emanated; how each of the parents reacted in the case of delinquents and non-delinquents to "trouble"; how "reasonably" a child interpreted a parent's reaction to trouble caused by the child; how strict parents were and whether they praised positive behaviour rather than punished negative behaviour. Among the many findings only a few are mentioned here. For instance, with regard to clear sources of authority in the home, it was found that non-delinquents had a very strong tendency to recognize their fathers as the head of the family and obeyed them most. Delinquents, however, though recognizing their fathers as heads of households, tended to obey them least. This points to a greater degree of defective paternal leadership among delinquents than among non-delinquents.

It should be mentioned that attempts were made, with reference to the major areas under investigation, to compile an agreement code by asking both parents to answer the same questions as their sons. All too often in child-guidance investigations one finds that, if control groups are used at all, parents are not often enough asked to supply answers to the same questions which have been asked of the child, and that if this is done it is the mothers who are questioned rather than the fathers. In this instance both the father and the mother were examined, separately from each other and from their sons. The aim was to discover whether a delinquent's opinion as to his parents' feelings towards him — for example, that he felt loved more by his mother than by his father — would be confirmed by either parent. Originally it was hypothesized that there would be great discrepancies between answers, and that many parents, especially those who felt guilty about their defective relationships with their children, would tend to give answers diametrically opposed to those of their sons. It was interesting to find that the unexpected happened. On the whole there was a remarkable amount of agreement between the answers of the parents and those of their children, in both groups, even if a child had by implication exposed the father, say, as the one who was the less loving of the two parents. This tends to indicate the pathetic fact that parents, and especially the oft-mentioned inadequate father, were aware of deficiencies and yet were powerless to do much about ameliorating the situation. This would lead one to recommend that, in future child-guidance work, not only the mothers, but also more and more of the fathers should be involved in the whole treatment programme, especially in the case of delinquents. In keeping with this, the author already had the occasion, some years ago in Australia, to conduct an experimental clinic for the fathers of delinquent boys, with exceptionally good results.

In summing up the second part of this chapter a few general comments should be made. First, the many obvious limitations which stem from

a pilot study of this kind are recognized and the author would be the last to let his thesis rest here. In fact, further projects, especially those including delinquent girls, are being planned. Secondly, it is intended to help to redress the balance a little by pointing out, with the findings of this research, the defective role frequently played by the father and not only that of the all-too-often mentioned mother. Thirdly, it is not intended thus to overemphasize the often defective role of the father to the exclusion of that of the mother. Finally, the purpose is to emphasize the subtle and basic triangularity which exists (from a child's point of view) between a child and both his parents, a relationship which is subjected to constant frustrations among all concerned, be it through the arrival of other siblings or through each member of the triad failing to respond appropriately to the others' needs and failing to learn and to become conditioned to a multitude of situations throughout a lifetime within a cultural and subcultural setting.

REFERENCES

1. Andry, R. G. (1960) *Delinquency and parental pathology*, London, Methuen
2. Bennett, I. (1960) *Delinquent and neurotic children*, London, Tavistock Publications
3. Bowlby, J. (1946) *Forty-four juvenile thieves, their characters and home life*, London, Baillière, Tindall & Cox
4. Bowlby, J. (1952) *Maternal care and mental health*, 2nd ed., Geneva (*World Health Organization: Monograph Series*, No. 2)
5. Bowlby, J. (1958) The nature of the child's tie to his mother. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 39, 350
6. Bowlby, J. (1961) Processes of mourning. *Bull. Brit. Psychol. Soc.*, 43, 56
7. Bowlby, J., Ainsworth, M., Boston, M. & Rosenbluth, D. (1956) The effects of mother-child separation: a follow-up study. *Brit. J. med. Psychol.*, 29, 211
8. Burlingham, D. & Freud, A. (1943) *Infants without families*, London, Allen & Unwin
9. Burt, C. (1944) *The young delinquent*, 4th ed., London, University of London Press
10. Clarke, A. D. B. & Clarke, A. M. (1959) Recovery from the effects of deprivation *Acta psychol.*, 16, 137
11. Douglas, W. B. & Blomfield, J. M. (1958) *Children under five*, London, Allen & Unwin
12. Eysenck, H. J., ed. (1960) *Handbook of abnormal psychology*, London, Pitman
13. Freud, S. (1933) *New introductory lectures in psycho-analysis*, New York, Norton
14. Glover, E. (1959) *The roots of crime*, New York, International Universities Press
15. Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. T. (1950) *Unraveling juvenile delinquency*, Boston, Mass., Harvard University Press
16. Harlow, H. F. (1958) The nature of love. *Amer. Psychologist*, 13, 673

17. Heinecke, C. M. (1956) Some effects of separating two-year-old children from their parents. *Hum. Relat.*, **9**, 105
18. Klein, M. (1923) The development of a child. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, **4**, 419
19. Lewis, H. (1954) *Deprived children (the Mershal experiment)*. A social and clinical study, London, Oxford University Press
20. Lorenz, K. Z. (1950) *The comparative method in studying innate behaviour patterns* In: Danielli, J. F. & Brown, R., ed., *Physiological mechanisms in animal behaviour*, London, Cambridge University Press (*Symp. Soc. exp. Biol.* No. 4), p. 221
21. Mannheim, H. & Wilkins, L. T. (1955) *Prediction methods in relation to Borstal training*, London, H.M. Stationery Office
22. Miller, J. & Dollard, J. (1950) *Personality and psychotherapy*, New York, McGraw-Hill
23. Mowrer, O. H. (1960) *Learning theory and behavior*, New York, Wiley
24. Naess, S. (1959) Mother-child separation and delinquency. *Brit. J. Delinq.*, **10**, 22
25. O'Connor, N. (1956) The evidence for the permanently disturbing effects of mother-child separation. *Acta psychol.*, **12**, 174
26. Rowntree, G. (1955) Early childhood in broken families. *Populat. Stud.*, **8**, 247
27. Shoben, E. J., jr (1949) Psychotherapy as a problem in learning theory. *Psychol. Bull.*, **46**, 366
28. Stott, D. (1956) The effects of separation from the mother in early life. *Lancet*, **1**, 624
29. Tinbergen, N. (1952) "Derived" activities. *Quart. Rev. Biol.*, **27**, 1
30. Vernon, P. E. (1960) *The structure of human abilities*, London, Methuen
31. Wilkins, L. T. (1960) *Delinquent generations*, London, H.M. Stationery Office