

THE HOMELESS MAN ON SKID ROW: VOLUME II

Continuation Studies

Should be 65-II

from

National Opinion Research Center

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

5711 S. Woodlawn Ave.

Chicago 37, Illinois

LIBRARY
NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

FILE COPY

THE HOMELESS MAN ON SKID ROW: VOLUME II
Continuation Studies

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

Report No. 65, II (Preliminary)

December, 1959

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

Clyde W. Hart, Director
Herbert Goldstein, Business Manager
Selma F. Monsky, Field Director

Responsible for this project:

Donald J. Bogue
Study Director

with the assistance of:

Mary C. Booth
Elizabeth J. Bogue

THE HOMELESS MAN ON SKID ROW: VOLUME II
Continuation Studies

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.	iv
CHAPTER 1. Family Background of Homeless Men on Skid Row	1
CHAPTER 2. Courtship, Marriage, and Family Life of Skid Row Men.	39
CHAPTER 3. Personality Traits of Skid Row Men.	61
CHAPTER 4. How Homeless Men Arrive on Skid Row	92
CHAPTER 5. Recreation on Skid Row.	104
CHAPTER 6. Religious, Political, and Racial Attitudes of Skid Row Men.	114
CHAPTER 7. Negroes and Indians on Skid Row	127

INTRODUCTION

This volume is called "Continuation Studies" because the findings presented in it are derived from data collected in an earlier, comprehensive study of The Homeless Man on Skid Row.¹ In the earlier study, which was performed under a contract with the City of Chicago, the goal was to describe and analyze the situation in which the homeless men on Skid Row find themselves. Their being on Skid Row was accepted as an already-accomplished fact, with the major practical problem being what to do about them -- how to improve living conditions and otherwise to change the situation until the typical Skid Row characteristics disappear.

In Chapters 1 to 4 which follow, an effort is made to discover and evaluate basic sociological and psychological forces that have had a part in bringing homeless men to Skid Row. The findings presented in these chapters will probably be of little immediate practical use to city planners and others interested in urban renewal, because they discuss factors which single persons or local organizations are powerless to modify substantially or to control. Only programs that begin to operate in the pre-Skid Row lives of people -- programs which cannot be expected to bear fruit until they have been operating for a considerable number of years -- can modify the influence of these factors. Yet for the student of sociology and psychology, the types of deeper-lying, more diffuse factors that are dealt with here are likely to be matters of prime interest and utility. While it is chiefly to such theoreticians that these chapters are addressed, they will not be without interest for practitioners. Everyone who works with homeless men and other Skid Row residents is interested in knowing "how people get that way" and "what makes these people act the way they do."

The remaining chapters, 5-7, are only partially concerned with basic sociological and psychological characteristics of Skid Row men and with the long-run factors that account for them. Chapters 5 and 6 present some significant data on the recreational activities of Skid Row men and on their religious, political, and racial attitudes. Chapter 7, "Negroes and Indians on Skid Row," is really a research note bearing on a development concerning which the data obtained in the study were not of sufficient quantity to yield reliable statistical measures of trends. Despite its somewhat conjectural character, this chapter sets forth some important suggestions.

¹The Homeless Man on Skid Row, National Opinion Research Center Report No. 65, I (Chicago, October 1959), a research report on Housing and Home Finance Agency Demonstration Project No. III.D-1; supported, also, by a grant of funds from the Wieboldt Foundation, Chicago, Illinois.

The analytical and other costs incident to these continuation studies were covered by a Ford Foundation grant to National Opinion Research Center for studies of metropolitan problems.

THE HOMELESS MAN ON SKID ROW: VOLUME II

Continuation Studies

Chapter 1

FAMILY BACKGROUND OF HOMELESS MEN ON SKID ROW

In assessing the sociological and psychological forces acting on the lives of men on Skid Row, it is essential that two variables be controlled: these are drinking behavior and marital status. Inasmuch as this premise determines the organization of the entire analysis which follows, the arguments in support of it should be stated.

(a) Drinking behavior. Certain findings of earlier chapters have made it abundantly clear that Skid Row men differ widely on one basic trait -- drinking behavior. Some of them are complete teetotalers, while others are hopeless alcoholic derelicts. The two groups of men, the uncontrolled drinkers on the one hand, and the controlled drinkers and non-drinkers on the other, dislike and avoid each other. This suggests the hypothesis that living on Skid Row may result from different causes for different groups of men. It is reasonable to assume that the forces that influence a teetotaler or light drinker to come to Skid Row may be quite different from the forces that bring a chronic alcoholic there, or that cause a person to become a chronic alcoholic after he arrives. Pooling the data for all Skid Row men and making a single analysis might lead to rather vague findings, whereas a separate analysis for men of each type of drinking behavior group may lead to more incisive findings. Incidentally, introducing this control also furnishes an unusual opportunity to study the factors in Skid Row alcoholism. All too often, studies of Skid Row alcoholism have been devoid of adequate control groups. Alcoholics from Skid Row have been compared with normal persons in the general population or even with subjective impressions of what the non-alcoholic population is like. All differences between the Skid Row drinker and the general public or general non-alcoholic public have been attributed to alcoholism. The present study compares Skid Row

alcoholics with Skid Row non-alcoholics. Thus we have a situation where the result "living on Skid Row" is separated from "being an uncontrolled drinker." Since both the control group of controlled drinkers and the experimental group of uncontrolled drinkers live on Skid Row, the inference that differences between them are attributable to alcoholism appears more warranted than in earlier studies.

(b) Marital status. The men on Skid Row are almost all without family and in this sense are very atypical of the general adult population. But they fall into three significantly different groups with respect to marital status:

- (1) Men who have never married. It is quite extraordinary for a male to attain the age of 45 or 50 without marrying. The sociological and psychological factors that are involved in this life-pattern must be very different from those involved in marriage at the usual age.
- (2) Men who marry and are then divorced or separated from their wives. Unlike the first group, these men have risked marriage but either have found it unsatisfying or else have proved to be unsatisfactory mates.
- (3) Men who marry and are then widowed. These men risked marriage and supposedly remained married until the deaths of their spouses.

It is quite plausible to hypothesize that each of these groups comes to Skid Row for somewhat different reasons and in response to a different combination of factors. Among the never-married one might seek an explanation for the handicaps, fears, or aversions that caused them to turn away from the usual pattern of family living. This is, in itself, a most worthy topic for research. The findings of the present analysis may be of even more fundamental importance for theories of courtship and marriage and family life than for theories dealing with alcoholism. Among the men with broken marriages one might seek for evidences of personality disturbances that might lead to marital dissolution, or for psychological mechanisms that would cause a person to react so violently to the breakup of his marriage that he would renounce normal community life and retreat to the all-male society of Skid Row. Among the widowed one might seek for evidences of over-dependency upon the wife, personality deterioration and disorganization resulting from the loss of family, or a desire to escape from the disgrace of being a conspicuous and unwanted dependent in the home of a relative. Following the principle already stated above, pooling the data for all these types of men and making a single analysis without regard to marital status might lead to vague and inconclusive findings, whereas a separate analysis for each group may lead to more definite and unambiguous findings.

Because drinking behavior and marital status undoubtedly are themselves interdependent and highly correlated factors, it is indicated that they should be simultaneously controlled. This is the procedure that has been followed; each of the statistical tables from which the material in this and the following chapters has been derived is a three-variable table, in which each factor regarded as potentially related to living on Skid Row has been simultaneously cross-classified with drinking classification and marital status.¹

The line of reasoning followed is simple: If a factor is significantly and meaningfully related to the presence of alcoholic men on Skid Row, but not to the presence of teetotalers or light drinkers, it is interpreted as being a factor in Skid Row alcoholism. This factor is then examined separately for never-married and divorced-or-separated men for each drinking group to learn how marital status affects the picture. This process is repeated over and over for a wide variety and a large number of items. Thus, a catalog of significant relationships is compiled for each of the following few groups of homeless men on Skid Row:

1. Chronic alcoholics² -- never married.
2. Chronic alcoholics -- with broken marriages.
3. Moderate drinkers -- never married and with broken marriages.
4. Controlled drinkers -- never married.
5. Controlled drinkers -- with broken marriages.

A theoretical synthesis is then attempted.

Unfortunately, this study design contains a serious flaw. It explicitly assumes that each factor is not equally important for each of the above groups and that it is of little or no importance for at least one group. There is no way of determining, except by contrasting homeless men with the general male population (for which no data on most of these topics are available), the variables that are common to all groupings of Skid Row men. Wherever possible, this defect is somewhat compensated for by informal and conjectural comparisons with "normal" conditions, but as has been indicated, this is a very unsatisfactory and possibly misleading mode of analysis. Luckily, the factors that bring non-alcoholics to Skid Row are so different in most respects from those associated with alcoholics, and the factors that

¹Because the sample of interviews for homeless widowed men is considerably below the minimum number necessary for such detailed analysis, it was not possible to carry out a separate analysis for widowed men. Hence, most of the material in Chapters 1-3 refers to never-married bachelors and men who were separated or divorced.

²In this and subsequent chapters, the term "chronic alcoholics" is equivalent to the combined "heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts" classification.

bring bachelors to Skid Row are so different from those that bring men with broken marriages, that this limitation is much less serious than at first might appear.

Another very important qualification must be re-emphasized at this point: The findings presented here are based upon data furnished by the men themselves. Although the interviews were conducted in a climate that appeared to be one of almost complete frankness and truthfulness in all but a very few cases, it must be remembered that all kinds of selective biases could have been at work. It has often been observed that these men are likely to dress up their life histories to gain sympathy from mission workers or to impress fellows, and their improvements upon fact have often been rehearsed so many times that they themselves may sincerely believe them. In remembering his childhood, the homeless man may be tempted to compare it with his present situation and paint a picture of himself as a normal happy boy who was later victimized by fate. Or he might project all of his difficulties and failures upon his family and the poor start he got in life. In any event, the data report what the man apparently thinks was the situation, but this may be only a crude approximation or even a distortion of the situation that actually existed. We have only his side of the story. The major basis for trusting the data presented in the next three chapters is that there is a surprising absence of the kinds of response that would indicate deliberate deception or unconscious distortions in defense of self. Nevertheless, all of these findings must be regarded as tentative until tested by objective observation via other means.

This study design may be summarized as follows: In the analysis which follows, a search is made for factors that help to explain the arrival on Skid Row of three groups of men:

- a. Controlled drinkers -- teetotalers and light drinkers.
- b. Moderate drinkers -- homeless men who are somewhat heavy drinkers by general standards.
- c. Uncontrolled drinkers -- heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts.

In making this search, the independent effect of marital status will be assessed, controlled, and interpreted.

Method of presenting the evidence. The quantity of materials generated by the three-variable tabulations is much too large to reproduce in this report. As a compromise, the following procedure has been adopted. The responses to each major inquiry are shown as percentage distributions, cross-classified singly with marital status and a three-fold set of drinking categories. Table 1-1 and the tables that follow it illustrate the format.¹

¹Since there are many tables with exactly the same headings, in order to save space, they have been presented in continuous running form, divided only by the subject headings.

Happiness of parents' marriage (Table 1-1). In response to the question, "How happy was your parents' marriage?", more than 70 per cent of the men claimed their parents' marriage was either "unusually happy" or "happy," while only about 13 per cent reported it was "unhappy," "very unhappy," or that the parents were separated or divorced. A fairly high percentage of Skid Row men (11 per cent) had been reared by only one parent or by no parent (guardian, other relative, or institution) or had parents who were separated or divorced. The percentage of men whose parents had been unhappily married or who had been reared by one parent or by other persons was slightly greater among men who had been divorced than among men who had never married. Thus, there was a tendency for the sons of unhappily-married parents to be in the group of men with marital problems, in comparison with the widowed or single men.

When the data are examined in detail, it is found that a disproportionately large percentage of the Skid Row men who had unhappily-married parents turned out to be heavy drinkers or alcoholic derelicts. This is true both for men who had never married and for divorced or separated men. Conversely, men whose parents had been unusually happily married tended to be concentrated in the teetotaler or light-drinker class. Surprisingly, Skid Row men who came from broken homes (had been reared by only one parent) had no greater tendency toward alcoholism than Skid Row men who had been reared by happily-married parents. Thus, the oft-reported slogan that "Skid Row alcoholics come from broken homes," with the implication that the broken home caused the alcoholism directly, is not supported by these materials. Coming from a broken home may have predisposed a man to end up living on Skid Row but apparently tended much less, if at all, to predispose him to become an uncontrolled drinker.

Since all but a comparatively small fraction of Skid Row men come from homes where both parents were present and reported to have been happily married, and since the percentages of heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts were only moderately higher among men whose parents were unhappily married than among men whose parents were happily married, it must be concluded that unhappiness of the parents' marriage could not possibly have predisposed more than a few of the men toward alcoholism.

Characteristics of the father. In designing the interview to be administered to the homeless men, it was hypothesized that perhaps the basic characteristics of their parents might be associated with the presence of the men on Skid Row. Accordingly, a variety of questions concerning the characteristics of the father and mother were asked. Following is a summary of the inquiries concerning the father.

Occupation of father (Table 1-2). The men on Skid Row are drawn predominantly from workingmen's families. More than four out of five of those interviewed had fathers who were operatives, craftsmen, unskilled non-farm laborers, or farmers. Only about 17 per cent of the men came from families where the father was a "white-collar" worker. A higher percentage of the divorced or separated men on Skid Row came from middle-class families than did the men who had never married. Thus, when the sons of middle-class

families arrive on Skid Row, marital discord seems to be a more significant factor in their problems than is the case for men coming from lower-class families.

Moreover, a higher percentage of the men who claimed a higher-than-average socio-economic status for their fathers tended to be heavy drinkers or alcoholic derelicts than did the men who were teetotalers or light drinkers. Skid Row men whose fathers were in business, either as managers and officials or as sales workers, were especially inclined to be alcoholics. This was true both for single men and for men with broken marriages, but was much more pronounced for the married than for the never-married men. Chronic alcoholism was also especially prevalent among single men who were sons of unskilled laborers.

Contrary to what might be expected, of Skid Row men with a farm background, a disproportionately small share were among the uncontrolled drinkers. Both the never-married and the previously-married sons of farmers and farm laborers were concentrated among the teetotalers and light drinkers rather than among the uncontrolled drinkers. Also, the fact that 80 per cent of all the residents have a non-farm background is itself significant. This contradicts a presently widely held sociological theory that Skid Row is a haven for rural folk who migrate to the city, get disorganized as a result of the conflict of urban and rural ways of living, thinking, and behaving, and seek refuge on Skid Row.

Father's income (Table 1-3). The men were asked to classify their family into one of four broad income groups: "very poor," "poor," "comfortable," or "well-to-do." Almost two-thirds of the men reported they came from "comfortable" families, while only seven per cent said their families were "very poor." This also contradicts a widely held theory that extreme poverty of the family drives men to Skid Row, either because of lack of economic opportunity or because of drinking caused by lack of hope for a better level of living. While poverty of the family apparently has some effect, it appears not to have been a factor in the case of at least seven out of each ten men on Skid Row; however, poverty seems to have been a very definite factor in explaining why a high percentage of men on Skid Row have never married. A much higher percentage of the single men were from very poor and poor families, and fewer were from well-to-do families than were the separated or divorced men.

Poverty in childhood appeared to have no positive relationship to drinking status; however, men who claimed to be from well-to-do and comfortable families were heavy drinkers or chronic alcoholics in above-average proportions, both among single and among separated and divorced men.

Only two sets of significant relationships developed from the income-of-father classification with respect to drinking. A disproportionately large share of the separated and divorced men who came from very poor families were also teetotalers or light drinkers, while a disproportionately large share of men from well-to-do families (both single and separated and divorced men) were moderate (neither controlled nor uncontrolled) drinkers. Since both of these findings refer to small groups of

men, it is difficult to assign any great explanatory value to them. Thus, poverty of the fathers seems to help explain the arrival on Skid Row of some men for economic reasons but to have little, if any, effect upon their arrival there for reasons of drinking. Nor is Skid Row a collecting-place for the alcoholic sons of wealthy fathers. Only about six per cent of the men claimed to have come from wealthy families, and of these only about 35-40 per cent (an average share of all Skid Row men) were uncontrolled drinkers.

When taken together, the evidence accumulated so far suggests that more than one-half of all homeless men on Skid Row, and perhaps as many as two-thirds, come from families that were comfortable or well-to-do and where the parents were happily married. Thus, the search for explanatory factors must probe more deeply into the family background.

Personal characteristics of father (Table 1-4). Each respondent was asked, "What kind of person was your father?", and his responses were probed to bring out the basic temperament and personal characteristics of the parent without biasing the responses. Replies to this open-ended question were coded into a rather detailed set of categories. The codes are divided into two broad groups: "good" traits and "bad" traits. It is abundantly clear that all but a small minority of the men reported nothing but good traits for their fathers. Affection and hard work or industry were the two traits of the father most often mentioned. Those who did voice criticism of their fathers most frequently mentioned that they were hot-tempered or given to fits of rage, were mean and abusive, or domineering and demanding. In general, the men who were separated or divorced tended to praise their fathers more than did men who had never married.

Although most men said only kind things about their fathers, the men who were heavy drinkers or chronic alcoholics were much more inclined to report fathers with "bad" traits than were the teetotalers or light drinkers. For example, of the men who indicated that their fathers were emotionally unstable, domineering, unfriendly, mean, unaffectionate, or lazy, an extraordinarily large percentage were uncontrolled drinkers. This was especially the case among the never-married men. But the relationship is not a clear-cut one; there was a smaller but nevertheless significant tendency for an extraordinarily large percentage of alcoholics to claim their fathers were gentle, friendly, or gregarious. Thus, many of the heaviest drinkers showed an unusually large degree of negative reaction to their fathers, while other cases showed an extraordinarily positive degree reaction.

Attitude toward father (Table 1-5). Coders were asked to evaluate the respondent's description of his father and then to classify his over-all feeling for the father into one of the following categories:

- (a) Very critical of father, with evidence of intense dislike.
- (b) Critical of father, with evidence of moderate degree of dislike.
- (c) Not critical of father, but little evidence of affection.
- (d) Critical of father, but also expresses liking for him.
- (e) Not critical of father, with evidence of a moderate level of affection.
- (f) Uncritical of father, with evidence of great affection.

Table 1-5 summarizes the percentage of men falling in each of these categories. The typical reaction fell into Category (e) or (f) -- one of affection for the father, with no criticism whatsoever. More than one-half (59 per cent) of the men voiced no criticism of the father while showing evidence of moderate or strong affection. Intense dislike of the father was inferred from the interview responses for only seven per cent of the men, and moderate dislike was indicated by an additional six per cent.

Of the men who openly expressed dislike for their fathers, a higher percentage were chronic alcoholics than were the men who either were not critical or showed some active affection. This relationship was especially strong among the never-married men. Among married men it also seemed evident that a disproportionately large share of those who were completely uncritical of their fathers and showed great affection for them were also light drinkers or teetotalers, while those who showed lack of affection or dislike tended to be uncontrolled drinkers.

Father's treatment of children (Table 1-6). Each respondent was then asked to describe the father's treatment of the children and his attitude toward them. The results of this inquiry are summarized in Table 1-6. All but a small fraction of the men (roughly 80 per cent) claimed favorable treatment from the father. Only a small minority claimed that the father was abusive, gave too much discipline, or that he was neglectful or was otherwise to be criticized for his treatment of his children. However, alcoholism was more prevalent among the minority of men who did report mistreatment by the father than among those who gave the father an unfavorable report. This was much more prevalent among the never-married men than among those who were divorced or separated.

Father's prison record (Table 1-7). More than 90 per cent of the men interviewed said their father had never served a prison sentence, and only six per cent said he had served such a sentence. Where the father had served a sentence, the son was much more inclined to be an uncontrolled drinker.

Father's drinking (Table 1-8). Only about 20 per cent of all homeless men had fathers who were heavy or periodic drinkers. This proportion, however, was much higher (31 per cent) among the Skid Row men who themselves were chronic alcoholics. Thus, having a father who drank heavily is positively correlated with alcoholism among Skid Row men.

Characteristics of the mother.

Personal characteristics of the mother (Table 1-9). When asked, "What kind of a person was your mother?", all but a very few men extolled their mothers' virtues in words of high praise. Following are the traits that were attributed most frequently to the mother:

	<u>Total</u>
Loving, affectionate, good to children.	59%
Gentle, kind.	32
Good housekeeper, good cook	34
Understanding, sympathetic.	21
Hard worker, industrious.	22
Vague but positive ("a good woman," "no bad habits"). . .	43

As Table 1-9 shows, the derogatory categories, such as "mean," "abusive," "hot-tempered," "not understanding," "no affection for children," "depressed or morbid," "reactionary or old-fashioned," "stingy," "spend-thrift," "lazy," "dishonest," or "emotionally unstable," were each used by only one or two per cent of the men. Thus, the homeless men on Skid Row place almost no responsibility for their troubles upon their mothers. This was true both of the uncontrolled drinkers as well as of the teetotalers and light drinkers. Actually, there was a slight tendency for the chronic alcoholics to be even more laudatory of their mothers than the non-alcoholics. Whereas the teetotalers were more inclined to describe their mothers in less emotional terms, such as "hard-working," "industrious," or "a good housekeeper," the heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts were a little more inclined to use the categories of "loving," "gentle and kind," "understanding and sympathetic."

If Table 1-9 on the characteristics of the mother is compared with the corresponding Table 1-4 for the father, it can be seen immediately that far more virtues and fewer faults were ascribed to the mother than to the father. In view of this testimony, it can only be concluded that, as reported by the men, the personal characteristics of their mothers were not of a type that would be conducive to heavy drinking or to a life of social isolation.

Attitude toward mother and implied level of affection (Table 1-10). The extent of this adulation may be seen more clearly in Table 1-10, which measures the over-all level of criticism of the mother and the implied level of affection for her. This table corresponds to Table 1-5 for fathers. Almost 80 per cent of the men implied a moderate or high level of affection for their mothers and made no comment of any kind that would imply criticism of them. About 17 per cent did venture some criticism, but of these, more than two-thirds immediately indicated that they also had affection for their mothers. Only about five per cent of the men were both critical of their mothers and showed evidence of dislike. Among single men there was a slight tendency for the men with little affection for their mothers to be uncontrolled drinkers. But the fraction of chronic alcoholics who had such a reaction to their mothers was so small that at most it could be only a comparatively minor factor in the over-all etiology of alcoholism.¹

¹Before the interviews were undertaken, the reputation of these men as "mother-lovers" was appreciated. The interviewers were given special coaching to help them encourage the men to express any critical thoughts they might have about parents or spouse. As the statistics show, despite almost open invitations to the respondents to criticize their parents, the interviewers failed to evoke responses showing any high level of criticism or resentment of parents, and especially the mother.

It is significant that the men showed no restraint in expressing criticism of other men on Skid Row, of the hotels, their employers, the missions, or almost any other topic about which they were resentful or critical. It is, therefore, quite plausible to assume that they lacked such feelings about mother and father.

Mother's treatment of children (Table 1-11). In view of the above findings, it is not surprising that less than two per cent of the men reported that their mothers were "abusive" or "neglectful" of their children, and that almost all of the comments concerning treatment of the children were favorable. About one man in ten reported his mother was "strict," and an additional nine per cent said the mother was more protective than the father, but they approved of this treatment. In neither case was there any positive association between these descriptions of the mother and alcoholism. Thus, there is no evidence whatever that poor child-rearing practices by the mothers were responsible for the presence of homeless men on Skid Row.

Mother's drinking (Table 1-12). Less than one per cent of the men reported having a mother who was a periodic or heavy drinker. More than 80 per cent of the mothers never drank; about 15 per cent were light drinkers; and only three per cent were moderate drinkers. There was a slight tendency for light- or moderate-drinker mothers to have sons who are uncontrolled drinkers, but, again, so few uncontrolled drinkers had drinking mothers that this could at best be a very minor factor in explaining drinking behavior.

Summary. It can be concluded only that if the treatment given to the homeless men by their mothers during their boyhood predisposed them in any way to a Skid Row career, the sons certainly were not sufficiently aware of it to report it or else had long since erased it from memory. In fact, one might easily get the impression from these results that the men exhibited an abnormally low level of criticism and an equally abnormal high level of affection for their mothers. Whether this is a neurotic trait or simply a rather normal idealization of the past by persons who are living in a very lonesome and familyless present cannot be evaluated at this point, although some evidence is presented later in this chapter.

Attachment to parents. After asking the men about the father and mother individually, the interviewers then asked a series of questions designed to bring out any unusual attachments to one parent or the other or an unusual degree of dependence upon parents.

Which parent was liked most (Table 1-13). When asked, "Which of your parents did you like most, your father or your mother?", about one-half readily stated it was the mother, and only eight per cent (one-sixth as many) stated they loved the father most. About 30 per cent said they loved both parents about the same. Men who loved their mothers most were somewhat more inclined to remain single than were men who showed no parental preference or preferred the father. There was a small but significant tendency toward uncontrolled drinking among more mother-lovers than among father-lovers or men with no preference for either parent.

Which parent helped you the most when you were growing up? (Table 1-14). This question tended to elicit answers similar to the one concerning liking for parents, except a slightly larger proportion of the men indicated that the father had helped them the most than were willing to admit affection for the father. About one-half of the men insisted

that the mother had helped them the most, while about 30 per cent said the parents had helped them equally. As before, a slightly higher proportion of the men who believed their mothers had helped them the most were chronic alcoholics. Also, chronic alcoholism was extraordinarily prevalent among the small group of men who reported that "neither parent helped very much."

Coders' evaluation of excessive attachment to parents (Table 1-15). The coders were asked to study the entire section pertaining to home and family life and to try to determine whether there was evidence of excessive or abnormal attachment to one parent. They were asked to code each man into one of the following categories:

- (a) No evidence of excessive attachment to either parent.
- (b) Definite evidence of excessive mother-attachment, dislike for father.
- (c) Definite evidence of excessive mother-attachment, toleration for father or no father.
- (d) Definite evidence of excessive father-attachment, dislike for mother.
- (e) Definite evidence of excessive father-attachment, toleration of mother or no mother.
- (f) Definite evidence of excessive attachment to both parents.
- (g) No parents, unable to classify.

The coders could find no evidence for excessive attachment to either parent for 50 per cent of the men, while one-fourth of the men showed definite signs of excessive attachment for one parent or the other, or both. About 23 per cent of the men showed mother-attachment, while about four per cent showed father-attachment, and four per cent showed excessive attachment to both parents. The differences in this respect between never-married and separated-and-divorced men were negligible.

Among men who showed no evidence of attachment for either parent, there was a small but highly significant deficit of chronic alcoholics, while for men with a mother-attachment there was an excess of alcoholics. Where the attachment was to the father or to both parents, there seemed to be very little extraordinary predisposition toward alcoholism. Thus, if the evaluation of the coders was reliable and unbiased by their knowledge of the drinking behavior of the men (they were warned to guard against such a bias), there appears to be a moderate but unmistakable correlation between an abnormal or unusually intense attachment for the mother and excessive drinking. However, these facts must not be overlooked: (a) A great many of the men on Skid Row who are not chronic alcoholics also have an excessively strong mother-love; perhaps this is a factor predisposing a man to live apart in a familyless situation rather than a factor predisposing to pathological drinking behavior. (b) A very high percentage (in fact, more than 65 per cent) of the chronic alcoholics did not show evidence of excessive attachment to the mother. On balance, excessive mother-love could not alone account for the presence of more than five per cent of the chronic alcoholics on Skid Row. Thus, although it is a very consistent and unmistakable factor, it is also a comparatively weak one as an over-all explanation of chronic

alcoholism. It might be concluded that the signs in the missions saying, "Have you written to your mother lately?", the many mission sermons that make use of the mother theme, and the oft-observed deference and obedience which homeless men show for matronly welfare workers who fit the mother stereotype, have a solid basis in observable fact, for more than one-half of the men loved their mothers more than their fathers, believed their mothers helped them more than their fathers, and about one in four showed an abnormally strong attachment to the mother. But this seems to be an outstanding characteristic of both teetotalers and light drinkers on Skid Row almost as much as among the alcoholics.

Overdependence on mother or mother-substitute (Table 1-16). In addition to evaluating the degree of emotional attachment to the parents, the coders were asked to evaluate whether or not the men displayed evidence of overdependency upon the mother or the mother-substitute (guardian, step-mother, or female relative in whose home they lived). Some psychiatrists have observed that persons with "dependent personalities," who rely upon more dominant and autonomous personalities for guidance and direction, often fall victims of personal disorganization when that source of support is removed. The Skid Row men are commonly thought to be highly dependent upon their mothers, the supposition being that herein lies the explanation of their living pattern. In about ten per cent of the cases the coders believe they did detect very strong evidence of such overdependence, while in an additional 20 per cent of cases they found an evidence of a moderate degree of overdependence. Thus, in about 30 per cent of the cases there seemed to be evidence of at least some overdependence upon the mother. In about 56 per cent of the cases the coders could find no evidence of overdependency, while in about 13 per cent of the cases they were unable to make a dependency classification.

Overdependency upon the mother as rated by the coders was somewhat higher among the men who were separated or divorced than among those who had never married. Also, overdependency was significantly related to chronic alcoholism among both single and separated and divorced men. Overdependency and alcoholism were more closely correlated among the single than among the separated and divorced men. Thus, the coders' ratings do lend tentative support to this theory, although the explanatory effect is small.

Reasons for preferring one parent (Tables 1-17 and 1-18). When a man reported that he liked one parent more than the other, he was asked, "Why do you think you liked your (father)(mother) the most?" The responses given are reported in Tables 1-17 and 1-18. Where the mother was preferred, the reasons given were (in order of frequency of mention):

	Per cent of all homeless men who preferred mother
She was more interested in me	41
She was more companionable.	23
She was more understanding.	17
She took care of me	14
She gave me presents.	14
She was more affectionate	8
She defended me, took my part	8.

Approximately the same ranking and proportions were found for never-married men as for separated or divorced men. In comparison with all men, a concentration of chronic alcoholics was found among the men giving each of the above types of response, but were especially concentrated among single men in the categories "more companionable," "defended me," and "took care of me." Among the married men, alcoholism was most pronounced among men who preferred their mothers because they were "more understanding," "more interested in me," or "other parent behaved badly."

The most impressive single thing about these categories is that together they indicate an extraordinarily egocentric view of the parent. Almost all of the reasons given for liking the parent express selfish pleasures derived from association with the parent, use of the parent for psychological self-gratification, or appreciation for personal services rendered to them by the parent. There is very little expression of liking of the parent in terms of appreciation for his desirable characteristics or for altruistic motives. These seem to be the responses of a dependent, the kind of answer one would expect from a child or a teenager. It is difficult to pass judgment on these responses because one does not know how a cross-section of the "normal" adult population would respond to this question. It is quite possible that a high percentage of persons would revert to a childlike point of view and would interpret the situation as they did when they were children, if asked to answer this question.

Domestic discord in parental home. After querying the respondents about their liking for their parents and their parental preference, if any, the interviewers then asked a series of questions about domestic discord in the respondents' childhood homes.

Quarreling by parents (Table 1-19). The men were first asked whether or not there was quarreling by the parents. About 75 per cent reported that their parents did not quarrel a lot, and only about 15 per cent reported a substantial amount of discord in their home. Among this minority of men where there was domestic discord, however, the proportion of heavy drinkers was substantially above the expected proportion. An above-average proportion of heavy drinkers came from homes where there was severe family discord. Conversely, an above-average percentage of the teetotalers and light drinkers came from homes where the parents did not quarrel a lot.

Who was to blame for quarreling (Table 1-19). About one-half of the men whose parents quarreled a great deal placed the blame on the father; only about nine per cent blamed the mother; another nine per cent blamed both; and more than one-fourth said they did not know. These proportions were roughly the same for both the never-married men and the men who were separated or divorced. Among men who blamed the father, a disproportionately large share of both the ever-married and single men were heavy drinkers or chronic alcoholics.

Reasons for parents' quarreling (Table 1-20). When asked to give the reasons why their parents quarreled, of the 15 per cent of men whose parents did quarrel frequently, 29 per cent reported that drinking by the father was a major reason. The second most important specific reason given was that the father was unfaithful and ran around with other women. The

mother was reported as unfaithful by none of the married men and by only about three per cent of the single men. About one-half of the men gave vague or general reasons for their parents' quarrels which did not involve either drinking or marital infidelity. Thus, domestic discord appears to have been present in the homes of only a minor fraction of the homeless men on Skid Row. It was more prevalent in the homes of men who later became drinkers. However, since drinking by the father was a major topic of discord, and a disproportionately large share of drinking sons had fathers who drank, it probably is safe to conclude that, aside from the problem of drinking by the father, there was not a great deal more domestic discord in the parental homes of men who later became chronic alcoholics on Skid Row than in the homes of men who later ended up on Skid Row as teetotalers or light drinkers.

Other children in the family.

Size of family (Table 1-21). Men on Skid Row come from families of all sizes, with no particular concentration at any specific number of family members. In comparison with the general population, however, a disproportionately large share of the Skid Row population is drawn from large families. That this is true may be seen from the following comparison.¹ The right-hand column of the table below shows the number of children ever born in 1940 to native white women 45-49 years of age who had completed only 5-6 years of grammar school (a rough approximation of the socio-economic level from which Skid Row men come). The left-hand column shows the size of families from which Skid Row men come. It is evident that a disproportionately large share of the Skid Row men come from families with seven or more children, and a disproportionately small share come from families with one to four children:

Number of children	Families of Skid Row men	Native white women 45-49 years of age in 1940, with 5-6 years of grammar school
Total.	100.0	100.0
1 child.	8.3	12.7
2 children	7.7	17.5
3 children	9.0	15.3
4 children	15.2	13.8
5-6 children	20.0	18.9
7-9 children	27.3	14.8
10 or more children. .	12.6	7.0

However, this characteristic applies to the teetotalers and light drinkers as well as to the uncontrolled drinkers. Hence, coming from an unusually large family seems definitely to predispose toward living on Skid Row but is not necessarily a factor predisposing a man to heavy drinking.

¹Source: 1940 Census of the United States, Differential Fertility, Women by Number of Children Ever Born, Table 109.

Birth order of homeless men (Table 1-22). In about 60 per cent of the cases the man on Skid Row was either the youngest child, the oldest child, or next to the oldest. This is a somewhat higher proportion than would be expected on the basis of chance, given the size distribution of families. Also, being the youngest child or the oldest child is significantly related to being an uncontrolled alcoholic drinker. Occupying an intermediate position between oldest and youngest seems not to have any significant relationship with being an uncontrolled drinker. One might speculate that perhaps Skid Row men are often the oldest or youngest children of their families because they came from large families and stayed in the parents' home probably until the mother's death.

Relations with siblings (Table 1-23). The men were asked how well they "got along" with their brothers and sisters while they were still living at home. About 20 per cent of the men reported that they got along unusually well with their brothers and sisters, while 65 per cent said they got along "all right" with comparatively little trouble. Only about 15 per cent reported serious trouble among the children. Of these, about one-half said they got along fairly well, but that there was a considerable amount of bickering. The remainder were about equally divided between those who reported serious difficulty with only one child and those who reported severe trouble with two or more brothers and sisters. Wherever there was bickering reported in the family, the percentage of men who were chronic alcoholics increased. This was true for both never-married and married men.

Favoritism by parents (Table 1-24). The men were asked whether or not the parents showed favoritism toward one child, and if so, which parent and toward which child. About 62 per cent of the men reported that the parents had no favorite. This question is of importance in testing two hypotheses: (a) that homeless men are overprotected boys who have become disorganized after death of the overprotective parents, and (b) homeless men are rejected boys who were "pushed aside" in favor of other brothers or sisters. Excluding from consideration persons who were the only children in their families, about 37 per cent of the respondents reported that there was definite favoritism in their families. In about 14 per cent of the cases, the respondent claimed that he was the favored child, and in about 13 per cent of the cases, the parents were said to favor another child. In only about four per cent of the cases did the respondent say he was definitely rejected by one or both parents. Among single men, both the hypotheses of overprotection and of rejection get mild support from the data. Although the number of cases is small, a significantly higher percentage of the single men who claimed they were their mother's favorite child were uncontrolled drinkers, and a significantly higher per cent of those who indicated they were definitely rejected by one or both parents were uncontrolled drinkers. A small but significant percentage of those who claimed there was no favorite child in their family were also uncontrolled drinkers. Strangely, among the single men who reported the parents favored a brother or sister, there was no tendency toward alcoholism. Among the teetotalers who had never married, the love of the parents for another child was a significant variable -- a disproportionately large share of these men reported that one or both parents favored a brother or sister.

Leaving home and death or remarriage of parents.

Age at leaving home (Table 1-25). In comparison with the general population, the Skid Row men seem to have left home either at a very young or an unusually old age. About 11 per cent of the homeless men left home before they were 16 years of age, and about 50 per cent left home after the age of 20. Those who were separated or divorced left at an even earlier age than the single men. It has been said that there is a great concentration of men on Skid Row who did not leave home until they were nearly middle-age, and this seems to be true for a substantial proportion of the never-married men. Almost 20 per cent of the single men did not leave home until after they were 30 years of age, and 10 per cent were 35 years old before they left home. (There were two cases, one single and one divorced, who left home after reaching 55 years of age!) A minority of both the single and the ever-married men left home at the "normal" ages of 18-24 (38 per cent of single men and 48 per cent of the ever-married men). Even those who married appear to have done so either at extraordinarily young or unusually older ages.

Among single men who left home at extraordinarily young ages, a significantly higher than average percentage were uncontrolled drinkers. The single men who left at older ages (above 30 years of age) tended to be teetotalers or light drinkers but not chronic alcoholics. Actually, except for the small group who left before age 15, all of the drinking differences were found to be small; approximately the same proportion of men were in each drinking classification irrespective of age at the time of leaving home. Among separated and divorced men, the age of leaving home is completely unrelated to drinking status, except that those who left at a very young age tended to be teetotalers.

Status of parents at time of leaving home (Table 1-26). About 43 per cent of the men left their parents' homes when both parents were still alive and living together. In about 14 per cent of the cases the father had died and the mother was still living as a widow, and in 10 per cent of the cases the mother had died and the father was a widower. In only about six per cent of the cases (equally divided) had one parent died and the other parent remarried. In 15 per cent of the cases both parents had died. It is often said that homeless men are those who have remained with a widowed mother until her death or remarriage. The coders were asked to make a special count of such cases; 13 per cent of the single men and 4 per cent of the married men had remained with the mother until her death. Only about one per cent had left home after the remarriage of a widowed mother.

Uncontrolled drinking occurred with unusual frequency among the very small group of single men whose parents were both living but were separated or divorced at the time the men left home, or whose fathers were deceased and whose mothers had remarried. There was a preponderance of teetotalers among the men who had lived with the mother until her death. In other words, this pattern seemed to cause men to be living on Skid Row but not to be alcoholics. Among the separated and divorced men, the greatest concentration of alcoholism is found among the group of men whose parents were both alive and living together when the men left home. Thus, the status of the parents at time of leaving home has little effect upon the drinking behavior of the married men.

Present status of parents (Table 1-27). At the time the men were interviewed, about 70 per cent of the single men and 60 per cent of the separated or divorced men had lost both parents. In only about five or six per cent of the cases were both parents still alive and living together. This, of course, is due to the older average age of the men themselves; in many cases their parents had died since the men left home. Only about seven per cent of the single men had a widowed mother, and three per cent had a mother who had remarried. About five per cent had a father living. Since they are a younger group, a higher percentage of the separated or divorced men tended to have one or both parents still living.

Uncontrolled drinking among unmarried men was significantly concentrated where both parents were living together, where both parents were living but separated or divorced, or where the mother had remarried. As just pointed out, however, these are only small groups of men. Among separated and divorced men, uncontrolled drinking was concentrated among men whose parents were living together, or who had a widowed mother or a widowed father.

Age at death of father (Table 1-28). Almost one-third of the respondents reported that they were not fully grown (had not reached 20 years) when they lost their fathers through death. In those cases where the father's death occurred when the boy was only 10-14 years of age, it is positively associated with uncontrolled drinking, if the man never married. Among the married men there is no significant relationship between drinking and age at death of the father.

Age at death of mother (Table 1-29). Only a very small percentage of the men lost their mothers through death before reaching 20 years of age (13 per cent of single men and 22 per cent of married men). Among the men who had never married, there was a significant tendency toward uncontrolled alcoholism for those who were between the ages of 15 and 19 when they lost their mothers. Alcoholism was also concentrated among men who were 35 or older when their mothers died, or whose mothers were still living. A similar though less intense relationship was present among ever-married men.

Age at which widowed or divorced parent remarried (Table 1-30). It was pointed out above that about six per cent of the men had a widowed parent who had remarried, and that among the single men of this group there was a small excess of alcoholism. This group was further subdivided to learn whether drinking behavior was affected by the age of the respondent at the time of the parent's remarriage. Almost two-thirds of the remarriages of mothers of single men occurred before the man was 15 years of age, and it is among this group that alcoholism is especially concentrated. In contrast, the separated or divorced men were older, on an average, when their parents remarried, and there was no significant relationship between the remarriage of the parent and alcoholism.

Effect of remarriage of widowed parents upon the homeless men (Table 1-31). Each man whose parent had remarried was asked a series of questions concerning how he was affected by the remarriage. Almost one-half of them said that it had no effect -- that they considered the foster parent as a

real parent. Nevertheless, among the single men in this group there was a significantly higher percentage of alcoholism. About 40 per cent of the single men whose parents had remarried reported some effect. In about one-fourth of the cases they felt strange or neglected as a result of the remarriage, and in this group there was an excess of alcoholism. One-fifth of the cases reported open conflict and hostility, either with the foster parent or their own parent. Strangely, in this group there was a deficit of alcoholism. Instead, these men tended to be teetotalers who had retreated to Skid Row without ever marrying.

Coders' evaluation of childhood home life of the homeless men.

After reading through the entire interview and keeping in mind the comments made in response to all questions, the coders were asked to make a series of ratings concerning the home life of each man. They were asked to make these ratings as objectively as possible, without reference to the present characteristics of the man at the time of the interview.

Unfavorable conditions in the respondent's boyhood family situation (Table 1-32). A list of conditions which would seem to predispose a child to develop a disorganized, unhappy, abnormal adult personality was drawn up, and the coders were asked to state whether or not each of these situations existed in the families of the homeless men. Following is a list of these conditions, with the percentages of the single men and of the separated and divorced men who fell in each category:

	<u>Percentage of single men</u>	<u>Percentage of separated or divorced men</u>
a. Disorganized, alcoholic, neurotic, psychotic parents.	9.7	12.4
b. Broken home	19.4	27.5
c. Parents neglected children, showed lack of affection.	9.5	9.2
d. Parents pampered and babied the respondent	9.3	12.8
e. Family was uneducated or poor, low socio-economic status.	19.4	17.0
f. Home was filled with strife and conflict	9.9	12.0
g. Parents inflicted severe physical punishment	7.2	10.7
h. Man had no home as a boy, was brought up in institution.	2.9	2.7
i. Parents ignored boy, or else bullied him or gave other ego-destroying treatment.	4.1	4.2
j. Boy was victim of parental unlove, was shown little, if any, affection	5.8	6.3
None of the above	31.3	31.0

Aside from broken homes, (b) above, and low educational and socioeconomic status, (e), each unfavorable family situation applied only to a minor share of the population -- 7 to 12 per cent. However, these conditions tended to be only partially duplicative, so that about 70 per cent of the men had one or more of these unfavorable conditions in their home life. The childhood home life of men who had married and divorced or separated was consistently poorer than that of men who had never married. Thus, there is unmistakable evidence that unsatisfactory home life as a child is associated with lack of success in marriage.

With respect to alcoholism, among the men who had none of the undesirable conditions in their boyhood family life, there is a comparative deficit of heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts and an above-average proportion of teetotalers and light drinkers. This is true both for men who had never married and for the separated and divorced men. Thus, a comparative absence of all undesirable family conditions is conducive to a lower incidence of alcoholism. The following summary illustrates the point:

	Per cent of men who are uncontrolled drinkers	
	Never-married men	Separated or divorced men
Total.	26.8	41.1
With none of the "bad" family conditions.	13.7	34.3

When the "bad" family conditions are examined singly for their effect in promoting alcoholism, the following items seem most conducive to heavy drinking among unmarried men:

- Parents "pampered" and "babied" them
- Parents disorganized, alcoholic, neurotic, psychotic.
- Home filled with strife, conflict
- Broken home.

Neglect and lack of affection, coming from families of low socio-economic status, parents inflicting severe punishment or giving ego-destroying treatment, or being unloved, showed no significant relationship toward promoting alcoholism among single men.

Among the separated or divorced men, the following items were associated with chronic alcoholism:

- Parents disorganized, alcoholic, neurotic, psychotic.
- Parents "pampered" and "babied" them
- Home filled with strife, conflict
- Parents inflicted severe punishment
- Parents ignored, bullied, or gave ego-destroying treatment
- Was a victim of unlove.

Thus, not only did a higher percentage of the separated and divorced men experience each of the undesirable types of family life, but a greater number of these variables were related to alcoholism. It may be that these experiences made it difficult or impossible for the men to enjoy a satisfactory marriage, and that the combination of an unsuccessful marriage and a poor childhood family situation together account for the higher rate of alcoholism among the separated and divorced men.

Favorable conditions in the respondent's boyhood family situation (Table 1-33). A list of conditions which would seem to predispose a child to live a normal, happy, mentally-healthy adulthood was drawn up, and the coders were also asked to state whether or not each of these conditions existed in the families of the homeless men. Following is a list of these conditions, with the percentage of the single men and of the separated or divorced men who fell in each category:

	Percentage of single men	Percentage of separated or divorced men
a. Parents normal, well-adjusted, stable personalities	55.7	38.3
b. Parents were compatible, marriage was happy.	63.1	41.7
c. Parents loved their children, cared for them well.	56.9	42.8
d. Parents appeared to give children good training for adulthood. . .	25.8	21.2
e. Family income was adequate. . . .	52.2	45.5

These ratings, of course, were made on the basis of the material given by the men and hence reflect their own interpretation of their home situations.

On an average, the men who had never married experienced more favorable family situations than did the men who were separated or divorced.

It was impossible to determine these factors for about nine per cent of the single and 23 per cent of the separated or divorced men.

The meaning of these statistics is subject to the interpreter's point of view. If one begins with a theory that poor family conditions are the leading cause explaining why men arrive at Skid Row, then it would be surprising to find that roughly one-half of the men report excellent or good family situations. If one begins with the presumption that it is desirable that 100 per cent of all persons should come from good family situations, then the proportions shown above are discouragingly low. Since similar measures are not available for the general population, one cannot learn just how much lower these proportions are than among the general population and among other low-income groups.

The coder's summary of home conditions was cross-classified by marital status and drinking behavior, and the cross-tabulation has been reproduced in full as Tables 1-32 and 1-33. From these tables a very disconcerting fact emerges:

Contrary to what might be expected, the men with "good" family background factors have drinking behavior that is only very slightly better than the average of Skid Row. One might have hoped that a very high proportion of the men from boyhood homes rated as "favorable" would be teetotalers or light drinkers and that there would be a comparatively large deficit of heavy drinkers or chronic alcoholics among them. Instead, roughly one-fourth or one-fifth of the men with "good" family background factors were uncontrolled drinkers, and this is only a very little less than what one would expect on the basis of chance selection from the Skid Row population.

It is clearly evident from Tables 1-32 and 1-33, from the above summary, and indeed from all the tables of this chapter, that poor family situations, taken singly or taken all together, cannot account for more than one-half of the alcoholism among the single men and more than one-fifth of the alcoholism among the separated or divorced men. (Among single men, 13.7 per cent of those with none of the undesirable family background factors were chronic alcoholics, whereas 26.8 per cent of all single men were chronic alcoholics. If all single men had had no adverse family background factors but were like the homeless men in all other respects, the percentage of alcoholism would be reduced, at most, by 13.1 percentage points, or by about one-half. A similar line of reasoning was followed in calculating the percentage for separated and divorced men.)

Summary. Materials reported in this chapter give strong support to the hypothesis that a poor home environment is conducive to marital discord, failure to marry, and alcoholism among men who are found living on Skid Row. In general, chronic alcoholism tends to be associated with:

- a. Homes where the parents are unhappily married and where there is quarreling and discord between husband and wife.
- b. Homes where the husband has "bad" personal traits -- drinking, infidelity, has served a jail sentence.
- c. Homes where the children are mistreated.
- d. Excessive emotional attachment and overdependency upon mother.
- e. Lack of affection or dislike for either parent.
- f. Serious quarreling between siblings.
- g. Development of an egocentric attitude toward parents.
- h. Being the mother's favorite child.
- i. Death of either father or mother during adolescence.
- j. Leaving home at an extraordinarily early age.
- k. Parents disorganized, neurotic, or psychotic.
- l. Being the youngest or the oldest child in a large family.

The analysis makes it abundantly clear, however, that family background factors alone cannot account for all of the Skid Row phenomena. Coming from a good home is no insurance against living on Skid Row, either as an unmarried or as a separated or divorced man, or as a teetotaler or a chronic alcoholic.

TABLE 1-1
HOW HAPPY WAS YOUR PARENTS' MARRIAGE?

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Testo- takers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Unusually happy	32.5	31.1	35.4	31.7	35.4	28.5	31.7
Happy	38.1	44.1	33.6	46.2	41.1	33.3	37.8
Rather unhappy.	6.5	6.2	7.6	4.1	4.7	4.5	10.6
Very unhappy.	4.6	4.7	5.5	2.1	3.5	3.0	7.6
Parents separated or divorced	2.0	1.7	1.9	4.1	1.0	3.6	2.2
Only one or no parent	9.2	7.2	10.8	9.7	9.5	12.0	6.4
No answer, vague answer	7.1	5.0	5.2	2.1	4.9	15.0	3.7

TABLE 1-2
FATHER'S OCCUPATION

Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Professional, technical, kindred worker	4.3	3.6	5.3	3.3	3.2	4.8	5.2
Farmer, farm manager.	20.0	19.6	20.1	23.8	24.4	21.1	13.3
Manager, official, pro- prietor, excluding farm	9.1	8.1	11.6	5.0	7.4	6.9	13.1
Clerical, kindred worker	1.7	2.7	1.2	-	1.2	0.5	3.2
Sales worker.	1.9	2.0	2.2	-	1.2	-	4.1
Craftsman, foreman, kindred worker	23.0	19.3	25.4	29.3	19.8	23.7	26.8
Operative, kindred worker	18.2	23.0	14.9	13.3	17.9	21.1	16.5
Private household worker, service worker	3.5	4.7	2.2	4.4	5.4	2.4	1.8
Farm laborer, foreman	0.8	1.2	0.7	-	1.6	-	0.4
Laborer, excluding farm and mine	11.9	11.8	12.1	14.4	13.4	10.5	11.1
Occupation not reported	5.5	3.9	4.3	6.6	4.3	9.1	4.5

TABLE 1-3
FATHER'S INCOME STATUS

Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Very poor	7.2	9.3	4.9	8.3	9.3	5.5	5.7
Poor.	19.8	21.2	18.7	19.3	20.9	17.9	19.7
Comfortable	63.2	63.9	66.1	57.5	61.3	62.7	66.1
Well-to-do.	6.2	3.4	8.8	8.3	5.1	7.7	6.6
Income not reported	3.6	2.2	1.6	6.6	3.4	6.2	1.8

TABLE 1-4
KIND OF PERSON FATHER WAS

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<u>Good traits of father:</u>							
Happy, good-natured. . .	12.0	10.1	14.1	11.2	8.7	13.5	15.6
Gentle and kind. . . .	16.8	18.6	15.9	15.7	16.3	19.5	15.6
Friendly, popular, everyone liked him. . .	10.9	12.2	8.5	14.9	11.2	10.9	10.6
Even-tempered, calm, hard to get excited . .	6.5	9.0	3.4	11.2	6.9	6.8	5.8
Understanding, sympathetic, empathetic.	9.3	5.6	10.4	17.9	11.0	8.6	7.4
Loving, affectionate, good to children. . . .	44.5	40.7	47.4	48.5	50.0	38.0	41.4
Hard worker, good provider, ambitious . .	52.3	50.8	50.1	70.1	55.4	52.6	47.8
Honest, dependable, kept his word	11.3	10.5	13.2	7.5	11.0	12.0	11.3
Emotionally stable . . .	3.9	4.9	1.8	9.0	5.0	2.3	3.4
Quiet, uncommunicative, not boisterous.	3.2	4.7	2.7	-	3.8	4.1	1.6
Gregarious, liked to be around people. . . .	6.0	3.6	7.4	9.0	4.8	3.4	9.5
Liberal, progressive in views.	1.0	0.6	1.6	-	1.2	-	1.6
Good associates, straight, home-man. . .	12.4	10.1	13.9	14.9	14.2	10.2	11.3
Other positive but vague	42.1	45.2	40.9	35.1	42.9	46.6	38.0

TABLE 1-4 -- Continued

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
<u>Bad traits of father:</u>							
Depressed, unhappy, morbid, brooding. . .	0.5	0.6	0.5	-	0.6	1.1	-
Mean, abusive.	6.9	7.5	7.0	2.2	5.2	4.1	11.1
Unfriendly, hostile, disliked people, not liked	1.5	3.9	0.0	-	1.2	1.1	2.4
Hot-tempered, grouchy, given to fits of rage	8.1	8.4	8.8	4.5	6.3	10.5	8.7
Not understanding, unsympathetic, incon- siderate, cruel . . .	4.2	4.9	3.6	4.5	3.8	5.3	4.0
Cold, distant, little affection for children	3.7	2.8	3.8	6.7	3.5	4.1	3.7
Lazy, poor worker, not steady, not ambitious	1.7	1.7	1.6	2.2	1.7	1.9	1.6
Dishonest, cheating. .	0.5	0.6	0.5	-	0.6	-	0.8
Emotionally unstable .	2.2	3.0	2.2	-	1.2	1.9	4.0
Boisterous, loud, show-off, talkative .	1.5	1.9	1.4	-	0.6	1.9	2.4
Solitary, liked to be alone, withdrawn. . .	0.5	0.6	0.5	-	0.6	1.1	-
Domineering, demanding, ascendant	7.6	5.1	9.9	6.7	5.6	7.1	10.6
Meek, easygoing, let people take advantage	1.6	1.5	1.6	2.2	1.2	3.8	0.8
Reactionary, conserva- tive, old-fashioned .	3.3	3.0	2.7	6.7	4.6	2.3	2.1
Stingy, miserly, not willing to have comfort	1.9	1.1	2.2	3.7	1.7	3.0	1.3
Spendthrift, couldn't handle his money. . .	1.5	2.6	1.1	-	1.7	1.1	1.6
Rough-tough associates, rough character . . .	1.5	0.6	1.4	5.2	1.0	3.4	0.8
Other negative but vague	6.4	5.4	7.4	6.7	4.0	5.6	10.3

TABLE 1-5
ATTITUDE TOWARD FATHER

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Very critical, intense dislike.	7.4	7.2	6.1	13.7	6.8	6.5	8.9
Critical, moderate dislike.	6.2	5.1	7.8	3.8	2.9	5.3	11.4
Not critical, little evidence of affection.	10.0	12.6	7.4	11.4	11.4	13.7	5.4
Critical but liked.	17.8	17.9	20.1	9.2	9.2	20.5	27.8
Not critical, moderate affection.	37.2	39.4	35.7	36.6	49.9	28.1	25.9
Uncritical, great af- fection.	21.4	17.7	22.9	25.2	19.8	25.9	20.5

TABLE 1-6
FATHER'S TREATMENT OF CHILDREN

Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Strict, rigid but not abusive.	11.5	12.0	11.3	10.9	10.5	10.0	13.8
Abusive, too strict, too much discipline.	10.1	7.9	11.1	11.6	9.1	9.6	11.8
Neglectful, ignored children.	3.8	4.5	4.1	-	2.8	2.8	5.8
Abandoned children, as- sumed no responsibility.	2.3	2.5	1.0	7.0	1.8	3.2	2.3
Companionable, played with children.	17.1	12.2	20.9	20.2	14.5	20.5	18.4
Tried to train, teach, reason with children.	16.2	12.2	21.1	11.6	18.4	12.9	15.6
Protective from other parent, a go-between.	0.5	0.7	0.6	-	0.6	1.2	-
Vague but positive treatment.	54.9	64.4	49.4	43.4	60.0	50.2	51.0
Vague but negative treatment.	3.5	2.7	3.9	4.7	1.2	6.8	4.3

TABLE 1-7

DID YOUR FATHER EVER SERVE A JAIL SENTENCE?

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Never served sentence .	90.6	92.5	89.0	90.8	94.2	89.0	86.6
Served minor sentence .	4.6	5.2	4.2	4.6	3.9	3.5	6.5
Served major sentence .	1.0	1.1	1.1	-	-	0.8	2.5
Doesn't know.	3.8	1.3	5.7	4.6	1.9	6.7	4.4

TABLE 1-8

DID YOUR FATHER DRINK?

Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Never drank	36.2	31.8	41.8	29.8	36.8	37.2	34.6
Light drinker	12.6	13.3	10.8	17.2	14.7	14.5	8.1
Moderate drinker.	10.0	10.6	10.1	8.2	6.8	10.8	14.1
Periodic drinker.	5.7	5.5	5.7	4.5	3.3	6.7	8.4
Heavy drinker	13.9	12.7	15.8	11.2	8.9	12.3	22.2
Not heavy drinker but no other information .	21.6	26.1	15.9	29.1	29.5	18.6	12.7

TABLE 1-9

KIND OF PERSON MOTHER WAS

Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<u>Good traits of mother:</u>							
Happy, good-natured. .	5.8	4.3	7.0	6.6	6.9	4.4	5.3
Gentle, kind	31.8	29.6	34.8	27.9	33.1	28.1	32.4
Friendly, popular, everyone liked her. .	7.3	6.4	8.4	5.9	9.0	3.0	8.0
Even-tempered, calm, hard to get excited .	4.5	3.2	5.7	4.4	2.3	4.8	7.4
Understanding, sympathetic, empathetic.	20.5	22.8	18.1	23.5	20.3	24.4	18.1
Loving, affectionate, good to children. . .	58.6	58.8	54.2	77.9	58.4	58.1	59.0
Hard worker, good provider, ambitious.	22.5	23.2	23.3	15.4	26.4	23.0	16.8
Honest, dependable, kept her word	3.5	2.3	3.9	5.9	4.8	1.1	3.5
Emotionally stable . .	4.6	4.9	3.9	6.6	4.0	5.9	4.5
Quiet, uncommunicative, not boisterous. . . .	5.5	5.1	5.6	4.4	3.4	6.7	7.4
Gregarious, liked to be with people. . . .	2.8	2.3	2.0	8.1	2.7	2.2	3.5
Liberal, progressive in views.	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-
Good associates, straight, stay-at-home	11.1	9.2	13.1	10.3	14.4	7.0	9.6
Good housekeeper, cook, wife.	33.6	32.8	33.6	36.0	32.8	39.3	30.9
Other vague but positive	43.2	45.4	41.5	41.9	46.4	36.3	43.6

TABLE 1-9 -- Continued

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and di- vorced	Widowed	Teeto- talers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
<u>Bad traits of mother:</u>							
Depressed, unhappy, morbid, brooding. . .	0.4	1.1	0.0	-	0.6	0.7	-
Mean, abusive.	1.3	1.3	1.1	2.2	1.7	1.1	0.8
Unfriendly, hostile, disliked people, not liked	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-
Hot-tempered, grouchy, fits of rage.	1.1	0.4	2.0	-	0.4	1.9	1.6
Not understanding, unsympathetic, incon- siderate, cruel . . .	0.6	0.9	0.5	-	-	1.9	0.5
Cold, distant, little affection for children	0.9	1.5	0.5	-	1.0	1.1	0.5
Lazy, poor worker, not ambitious	0.2	0.0	0.4	-	-	-	0.5
Dishonest, cheating. .	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-
Emotionally unstable .	0.2	0.0	0.4	-	-	-	0.5
Boisterous, loud, talkative, show-off .	0.9	0.4	1.4	-	1.5	-	0.5
Solitary, liked to be alone, withdrawn. . .	0.8	0.6	1.1	-	1.1	-	0.8
Domineering, demanding, ascendant	6.5	6.4	4.5	15.4	6.1	10.4	4.3
Meek, easygoing, let others take advantage	4.3	3.4	5.0	4.4	2.3	1.9	8.8
Reactionary, old- fashioned, conservative in views.	1.3	0.6	2.2	-	1.7	-	1.6
Stingy, miserly, not willing to have comfort	1.2	0.0	1.6	3.7	0.6	3.0	0.8
Spendthrift, couldn't handle money.	0.8	0.0	1.6	-	0.6	-	1.6
Rough-tough, ran with rough crowd	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-
Bad housekeeper, sloppy, neglected home. . . .	0.3	0.0	0.5	-	-	-	0.8
Other vague but negative traits.	0.5	45.4	42.6	-	1.1	2.2	-

TABLE 1-10

ATTITUDE TOWARD MOTHER

Response	All home-less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Very critical, intense dislike	1.9	2.2	1.7	2.3	2.8	3.1	-
Critical, moderate dislike	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.8	2.4	2.7	4.6
Not critical, little evidence of affection	4.1	4.3	4.5	2.3	2.8	4.3	5.9
Critical but liked	11.7	10.8	13.8	6.8	7.9	8.5	19.0
Not critical, moderate affection	36.1	43.4	31.3	31.6	46.2	33.7	24.1
Not critical, great affection	43.0	36.1	45.7	53.4	38.1	47.7	46.4

TABLE 1-11

MOTHER'S TREATMENT OF CHILDREN

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Strict, rigid but not abusive	10.4	9.8	10.9	11.2	9.8	13.2	9.4
Abusive, too strict, too much discipline	1.6	1.3	2.3	-	1.2	2.4	1.7
Neglectful, ignored children	1.4	1.6	1.2	2.2	2.2	1.2	0.6
Abandoned children, assumed no responsibility	0.3	-	-	2.2	-	-	-
Companionable, played with children	3.4	2.7	2.7	8.2	3.4	4.8	2.3
Tried to train, teach, reason with children	20.1	20.5	20.9	16.4	21.9	16.4	20.2
Protective from other parent, go-between	8.9	8.0	9.5	10.4	6.6	11.2	10.5
Vague but positive treatment	72.0	70.9	71.9	74.6	71.7	71.6	72.7
Vague but negative treatment	0.8	1.6	0.4	-	0.6	0.8	1.1

TABLE 1-12

DID MOTHER DRINK?

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Never drank	80.4	80.5	80.3	79.7	85.5	77.2	75.3
Light drinker	15.0	14.6	15.1	15.8	10.7	17.0	19.6
Moderate drinker	2.2	3.0	2.2	-	1.7	2.3	2.9
Periodic drinker	0.3	-	0.5	-	-	1.2	-
Heavy drinker	0.3	-	0.7	-	0.4	-	0.5
Not a heavy drinker but no other information	1.8	1.9	1.1	4.5	1.7	2.3	1.6

TABLE 1-13
WHICH PARENT LIKED MOST

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Liked both same	28.5	29.1	29.4	28.3	30.2	26.1	28.3
Liked father best	8.2	8.3	9.2	5.5	3.8	6.0	9.1
Liked mother best	48.1	51.5	46.2	56.6	47.5	42.6	53.3
Lived with only one parent or none	9.2	7.2	10.8	9.7	9.5	12.0	6.4
No information	6.0	3.9	4.4	-	4.0	13.2	2.9

TABLE 1-14
WHICH PARENT HELPED MOST WHILE GROWING UP

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Neither one very much	1.8	1.6	2.6	-	0.9	0.9	3.9
Father helped the most	13.8	15.3	13.9	11.7	16.1	10.2	13.5
Mother helped the most	48.7	45.8	52.3	54.5	43.2	48.0	57.2
Equal help	27.8	32.6	25.4	26.2	34.7	22.5	22.4
Not living with any parent	1.4	0.8	1.5	3.4	1.7	2.4	-
No answer	6.5	3.9	4.4	4.1	3.5	15.9	2.9

TABLE 1-15
CODERS' EVALUATION OF EXCESSIVE ATTACHMENT TO PARENTS

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
No evidence of exces- sive attachment to either	60.5	59.6	61.9	71.7	64.8	56.2	58.0
Mother attachment, dislike of father	3.9	3.5	3.9	6.2	5.0	0.9	4.7
Mother attachment, toleration of father or no father	19.1	20.4	20.4	12.4	15.3	17.4	26.0
Father attachment, dislike of mother	0.8	1.4	-	2.1	1.4	-	0.5
Father attachment, toleration of mother or no mother	3.2	3.1	4.2	-	2.1	4.8	3.4
Excessive attachment to both parents	3.5	5.0	2.7	2.1	3.8	3.6	2.9
No parents or unable to classify	1.4	0.8	1.5	3.4	1.7	2.4	-
No information	7.7	6.2	5.5	2.1	5.9	14.7	4.4

TABLE 1-16

CODERS' EVALUATION OF EVIDENCE OF OVER-DEPENDENCY ON MOTHER OR MOTHER SUBSTITUTE

Response	All home-less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Yes, very strong evidence	9.6	8.8	10.8	9.5	7.0	8.6	13.6
Yes, but only moderately	20.5	18.5	23.8	16.9	17.3	24.4	21.7
No evidence of over-dependency	56.5	59.9	53.0	68.0	63.8	55.5	47.6
Not enough information to classify	13.5	12.8	12.4	5.6	11.9	11.5	17.1

TABLE 1-17

REASONS FOR PREFERRING FATHER

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
More affectionate	2.8	7.0	-	-	-	-	8.1
More companionable, spent time with him	36.1	48.8	26.3	37.5	45.1	15.0	35.1
More understanding	8.3	-	15.8	-	11.8	-	8.1
More interested in his welfare	22.2	18.6	22.8	37.5	17.6	40.0	18.9
Took his part, defended against other parent	2.8	-	5.3	-	-	-	8.1
Let him have own way	8.3	7.0	10.5	-	11.8	15.0	-
Gave him presents	13.0	7.0	10.5	62.5	17.6	10.0	8.1
Other parent behaved badly	9.3	16.3	-	37.5	11.8	10.0	5.4
No reason for the preference	25.0	16.3	35.1	-	19.6	25.0	32.4

TABLE 1-18

REASONS FOR PREFERRING MOTHER

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
More affectionate	7.6	7.9	7.3	7.3	9.1	12.7	2.3
More companionable	23.1	22.6	25.9	14.6	18.2	22.5	29.5
More understanding	17.1	21.1	10.1	28.0	18.2	15.5	16.6
Interested in him, normal to prefer	41.3	37.0	42.0	53.7	40.9	40.1	42.9
Took his part, defended him	8.2	9.1	5.9	13.4	6.9	10.6	8.3
Let him have own way	3.8	2.6	3.8	7.3	6.2	2.1	1.8
Gave him presents	14.2	15.1	16.4	3.7	16.1	16.9	10.1
Took care of him	14.1	17.0	12.2	11.0	17.5	14.1	9.7
Other types of reason	0.9	-	2.1	-	1.1	-	1.4
Other parent behaved badly	10.6	9.4	11.5	11.0	7.7	5.6	17.5
No reason for preference	7.7	7.9	8.7	3.7	7.7	5.6	9.2

TABLE 1-19
WHICH PARENT BLAMED FOR QUARRELING

Response	All home-less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Blames father . . .	45.5	49.3	43.0	16.7	38.7	27.5	58.8
Blames mother . . .	9.1	7.0	12.2	-	14.5	12.5	3.5
Blames both	9.1	12.7	8.2	-	9.7	7.5	9.4
Blames neither . . .	1.6	4.2	-	-	4.8	-	-
Unable to assess the blame	27.3	22.5	26.5	50.0	27.4	30.0	25.9
No information . . .	7.5	4.2	5.1	33.3	4.8	22.5	2.4

TABLE 1-20
REASONS FOR PARENTS' QUARRELING

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Father's drinking . .	28.9	33.8	30.6	-	19.4	20.0	40.0
Mother's unfaithfulness, ran around .	1.1	2.8	-	-	-	-	2.4
Father's unfaithfulness, ran around .	12.8	16.9	12.2	-	14.5	22.5	7.1
Reasons other than drinking	49.7	53.5	53.1	16.7	58.1	40.0	48.2
Mother's drinking . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Too young to know reason	20.3	12.7	20.4	50.0	22.6	30.0	14.1
No information . . .	5.9	-	8.2	33.3	4.8	15.0	2.4

TABLE 1-21
NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
One	7.9	8.0	8.7	6.2	8.3	10.8	4.9
Two	9.3	7.4	10.8	11.7	8.7	8.7	10.6
Three	11.6	8.7	14.7	11.7	14.0	7.8	11.3
Four	14.0	14.6	13.4	17.9	14.0	12.0	15.5
Five	9.1	11.3	8.1	8.3	8.0	10.2	9.8
Six	8.1	8.0	9.2	6.2	9.2	5.1	9.1
Seven	8.4	10.7	5.3	15.9	9.0	9.0	7.1
Eight	6.7	7.4	6.6	6.2	6.4	6.0	7.6
Nine	9.6	8.2	10.8	9.7	7.3	9.3	13.0
Ten or more	10.2	12.2	9.7	6.2	12.7	8.1	8.6
No information . . .	5.1	3.7	2.6	-	2.4	12.9	2.5

TABLE 1-22
BIRTH ORDER OF RESPONDENT

Response	All home-less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Only child	7.9	8.0	8.7	6.2	8.3	10.8	4.9
Oldest child	19.4	15.9	20.2	33.8	19.6	13.5	24.1
Next to oldest	14.9	15.0	15.5	13.8	16.5	16.5	11.3
Third child	15.9	15.5	17.3	13.8	13.2	15.6	20.1
Fourth child	12.1	15.0	10.8	10.3	12.8	13.2	10.1
Fifth child	5.8	6.6	6.3	2.1	4.0	5.1	8.8
Sixth child	4.3	3.5	5.2	4.1	5.9	0.9	4.7
Seventh child	3.9	3.7	4.0	5.5	4.3	2.1	4.9
Eighth child	2.9	3.3	2.9	2.1	2.1	4.2	2.9
Ninth or higher order	6.9	9.9	5.0	6.2	9.4	4.2	5.7
Youngest	24.9	30.5	22.9	20.2	26.5	16.8	29.2
No information	6.0	3.7	4.0	2.1	4.0	13.8	2.5

TABLE 1-23
RELATIONS WITH SIBLINGS

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Got along unusually well with all	21.1	18.8	19.7	31.1	20.5	24.2	19.9
Got along alright, little trouble	62.5	66.2	63.3	49.2	66.0	61.9	58.3
Got along but there was bickering	8.0	7.8	7.3	12.3	5.4	7.8	11.6
Got along with all but one sibling	6.0	4.1	8.5	2.5	5.7	3.9	7.7
Severe trouble with two or more	2.3	3.0	1.2	4.9	2.3	2.2	2.5

TABLE 1-24

DID PARENTS HAVE FAVORITE CHILD?
Of those with parents and siblings

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
No favorite	61.6	65.9	59.9	69.8	66.1	53.3	62.0
Both favored the respondent	5.5	4.5	6.9	4.7	5.2	4.5	6.5
Mother treated respondent as favorite, not father	5.2	5.1	5.8	2.3	3.5	7.3	6.0
Father treated respondent as favorite, not mother	3.3	1.9	3.8	7.0	3.5	4.2	2.3
Both parents favored another	7.3	6.8	7.8	9.3	7.0	6.9	8.1
Mother favored another, father none	2.4	2.1	3.4	-	2.7	1.0	3.1
Father favored another, mother none	3.2	2.6	4.2	2.3	2.3	3.5	4.2
Both parents re- jected respondent.	0.7	1.7	-	-	0.6	0.7	0.8
Father rejected, not mother	1.7	1.9	2.0	-	1.2	3.1	1.3
Mother rejected, not father	1.1	0.9	1.1	2.3	1.6	1.0	0.5
No information	9.9	8.5	7.8	2.3	8.5	17.3	6.2

TABLE 1-25

AGE AT LEAVING HOME

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Under 15 years	11.1	8.8	12.8	13.3	9.9	13.2	11.3
16-17 years	17.9	19.2	18.0	16.0	18.6	16.3	18.3
18-19 years	16.9	14.7	19.5	18.2	17.5	9.3	21.7
20-21 years	14.7	12.8	14.2	25.4	16.5	16.5	11.0
22-24 years	11.8	10.7	13.9	9.4	10.7	14.8	11.0
25-29 years	12.4	13.5	11.1	14.4	12.4	13.4	11.7
30-34 years	5.7	8.9	3.7	1.7	7.0	3.8	5.2
35-44 years	4.1	7.3	2.1	-	3.5	4.3	4.7
45-54 years	1.3	2.3	0.8	-	1.3	1.9	0.9
55-64 years	0.5	0.8	0.4	-	1.2	-	-
65 and over	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No information	3.6	0.9	3.6	1.7	1.3	6.5	4.3

TABLE 1-26

WERE PARENTS LIVING AT TIME RESPONDENT LEFT HOME?

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Both parents deceased	15.3	18.8	13.6	14.5	14.0	22.2	11.5
Both parents living, living together . .	42.9	39.6	45.2	55.9	41.9	39.3	47.2
Both parents living, separated or divorced	3.6	3.7	4.0	-	1.9	4.8	4.9
Father deceased, mother a widow . . .	14.3	14.8	15.8	9.7	17.3	7.8	15.2
Father deceased, mother remarried . .	3.6	3.1	3.4	7.6	5.0	3.0	2.2
Mother deceased, father a widower . .	9.6	12.0	9.5	4.1	9.9	6.3	12.0
Mother deceased, father remarried . .	3.8	3.5	4.2	4.1	4.7	3.6	2.7
Lived with mother until her death, then left home . . .	7.3	12.8	3.9	4.1	8.1	9.9	3.9
Lived with father until his death, then left home . . .	3.3	4.3	3.1	2.1	2.8	6.6	1.5
Lived with widowed mother until her remarriage, then left home	0.2	1.2	0.5	-	1.0	-	0.7
Lived with widowed father until his remarriage, then left home	1.1	0.6	1.0	4.1	1.6	1.8	-
No information . . .	6.8	4.5	4.2	4.1	5.2	12.9	4.2

TABLE 1-27

PARENTS LIVING OR DEAD NOW?

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Both parents deceased	65.5	70.5	59.3	86.9	73.8	62.8	55.8
Both parents living, living together . .	5.3	5.0	6.8	1.4	3.8	4.8	7.9
Both parents living, separated or divorced	2.2	2.1	2.9	-	1.0	3.3	2.9
Father deceased, mother a widow . . .	9.3	6.8	13.6	2.1	6.6	5.1	16.5
Father deceased, mother remarried . .	3.1	2.9	3.9	1.4	4.0	2.1	2.7
Mother deceased, father a widow . . .	4.3	3.7	5.0	4.1	3.8	2.4	6.4
Mother deceased, father remarried . .	3.0	2.9	3.6	2.1	2.4	4.2	2.9
No information . . .	7.4	6.0	5.0	2.1	4.5	15.3	4.9

TABLE 1-28

AGE OF RESPONDENT AT DEATH OF FATHER

Response	All home-less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Less than 10 years old	8.6	3.2	9.7	7.6	10.1	7.8	7.1
10-14 years old	6.6	6.8	6.9	6.2	7.1	5.1	7.1
15-19 years old	6.5	5.0	7.8	7.6	7.1	6.0	5.9
20-24 years old	9.6	11.6	8.4	10.3	9.0	9.6	10.6
25-34 years old	15.6	17.7	15.7	12.4	17.8	12.3	15.2
35-44 years old	15.1	14.4	16.8	12.4	15.6	9.9	18.7
45-54 years old	5.3	4.1	4.2	13.8	4.3	8.7	3.9
55 years old and over	2.2	3.3	1.5	2.1	1.6	3.6	2.0
Father living	14.6	13.8	18.3	5.5	11.1	13.8	20.1
No information	15.9	15.1	10.8	22.1	16.3	23.1	9.3

TABLE 1-29

AGE OF RESPONDENT AT DEATH OF MOTHER

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Less than 10 years old	7.4	7.2	7.3	10.3	8.5	8.7	4.7
10-14 years old	5.0	2.9	7.3	4.1	4.7	6.0	4.7
15-19 years old	7.7	9.3	7.8	4.1	5.5	7.2	11.3
20-24 years old	6.4	6.8	6.9	4.1	7.6	5.1	5.7
25-34 years old	15.0	19.0	11.8	17.9	16.5	19.2	9.3
35-44 years old	12.8	13.0	11.8	17.9	14.2	9.3	13.8
45-54 years old	10.6	9.5	10.2	16.6	11.6	6.3	12.5
55 years old and over	2.9	3.3	2.4	4.1	4.2	1.8	2.0
Mother living	19.9	16.9	27.1	4.8	15.4	15.3	30.0
No information	12.4	12.0	7.4	15.9	11.8	21.0	6.1

TABLE 1-30

AGE OF RESPONDENT WHEN PARENT REMARRIED

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Less than 10 years old	14.0	19.0	8.5	29.4	12.0	7.1	23.1
10-14 years old	33.9	46.0	26.4	35.3	44.6	26.2	21.2
15-19 years old	16.1	3.2	23.6	17.6	15.2	31.0	5.8
20-24 years old	7.5	-	10.4	17.6	6.5	7.1	9.6
25-34 years old	11.8	17.5	10.4	-	13.0	14.3	7.7
35-44 years old	7.5	9.5	7.5	-	8.7	-	11.5
45-54 years old	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
55 years old and over	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No information	9.1	4.8	13.2	-	-	14.3	21.2

TABLE 1-31

EFFECT UPON RESPONDENT OF REMARRIAGE OF PARENT

Response	All home-less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
No effect, foster parent treated as own	47.8	47.6	48.1	47.1	53.3	38.1	46.2
Some effect, felt estranged from other parent	17.7	23.8	17.0	-	16.3	14.3	23.1
Open conflict with foster parent, not own.	19.9	14.3	17.9	52.9	21.7	35.7	3.8
Open conflict with own parent, not compatible with foster parent	1.6	4.8	-	-	3.3	-	-
Child sent to live with other relatives, orphanage	6.5	9.5	5.7	-	3.3	7.1	11.5
Remained with parent not remarried	4.3	-	7.5	-	2.2	-	11.5
No information	3.8	-	6.6	-	-	11.9	3.8

TABLE 1-32

UNFAVORABLE CHARACTERISTICS OF BOYHOOD SITUATION

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Disorganized, alcoholic, neurotic, psychotic parents	10.1	9.7	12.4	4.1	6.4	11.1	14.5
Poor, uneducated family.	17.5	19.4	17.0	13.1	21.0	13.8	15.5
Home filled with strife and conflict	10.9	9.9	12.0	12.4	8.1	11.4	14.2
Broken home	23.5	19.4	27.5	24.8	23.2	24.9	22.6
Parents inflicted severe punishment	9.4	7.2	10.7	14.5	7.3	8.7	13.0
Neglect, lack of affection	9.0	9.5	9.2	8.3	7.5	11.7	8.8
Pampered and babied	10.3	9.3	12.8	6.2	8.0	6.9	16.5
Ignored, bullied, ego-destroying treatment	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.5	3.3	3.9
Victim of unlove	6.2	5.8	6.3	8.3	4.3	9.3	6.1
Wild, irresponsible in youth	9.6	7.4	11.0	14.5	4.7	11.1	15.5
Strong wanderlust in youth	20.8	23.7	20.4	17.9	16.5	12.6	33.7
No home, institutional living	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.1	2.3	3.9	2.2
No unfavorable condition reported	33.6	31.3	31.0	39.3	38.0	39.6	22.4

TABLE 1-33

FAVORABLE CHARACTERISTICS OF BOYHOOD SITUATION

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Parents normal, well adjusted	50.3	55.7	38.3	57.9	55.8	42.9	48.4
Parents compatible, marriage happy	56.0	63.1	41.7	63.4	58.8	51.5	56.0
Parents loved, cared for children	53.1	56.9	42.8	55.9	58.1	42.9	54.3
Parents offered good training for adulthood	24.9	25.8	21.2	23.4	28.2	21.9	22.6
Family income adequate.	53.4	52.2	45.5	60.7	49.0	53.8	59.2
Man was well-adjusted during adolescence and early manhood	45.3	41.6	39.2	60.0	45.1	47.4	43.7
School performance average or better . . .	45.9	46.8	39.7	42.8	39.3	39.0	60.9
Early work performance normal	34.3	29.7	31.1	43.4	34.5	31.8	36.1
Age 20-25 man appeared socially and psycho- logically mature . . .	20.9	12.4	20.7	31.0	22.2	20.4	17.2
Unable to determine . .	8.8	8.9	22.8	2.1	7.5	16.2	4.7

THE HOMELESS MAN ON SKID ROW: VOLUME II

Continuation Studies

Chapter 2

COURTSHIP, MARRIAGE, AND FAMILY LIFE OF SKID ROW MEN

Almost one-half of the men who live on Skid Row (about 45 per cent) have never married, and almost all of the remainder have married but have been divorced or separated from their wives. These facts lead one to the hypothesis that the present status of these men is somehow related to their courtship and marriage experiences. The present chapter focuses on this sector of their lives. The topic requires two separate inquiries:

- (a) Why didn't the single men ever marry? Did these men ever participate in a courtship, and if they did, why did it not culminate in marriage?
- (b) What caused the marriages of the separated and divorced men to fail? In what ways are these failures related to the presence of these men on Skid Row?

The material assembled suffers from certain limitations which must be pointed out before beginning the analysis. Although the findings are consistent and meaningful, it is nevertheless true that the single-interview approach allowed "only one side of the story" to be obtained. To the extent that courtship and marriage are potent and emotion-laden factors relating to a man's presence on Skid Row, it is a subject about which he might be highly sensitive -- especially if the story reflects upon him as a person. It is surely possible that Skid Row men would be inclined to revise the history of their courtships and marriages in order to lessen whatever feelings of guilt, failure, and regret they might have about them. Thus, distortion may occur which is not intentional but merely the unconscious or semi-conscious effect of brooding over the past. It would have helped to have a parallel interview with the woman or women involved, as well as the testimony of one or more objective observers, but obviously these sources of data were beyond reach.¹

¹Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine what form the biases may take. One man in a state of self-hatred may blame everything on himself and will tolerate no hint that his wife or fiancée failed to do everything she could to make the relationship successful. Another man may place the entire burden of guilt upon the female party, implying that "she would have driven any man to drink," etc., and showing little awareness that he might have been at least partly responsible for what happened. Still others may project their difficulties onto third parties -- family members, in-laws, or others who "interfered" with an otherwise normal and happy courtship or marriage.

The subject of courtship and marriage was introduced while the respondent was deeply engrossed in describing his boyhood and young adulthood. The effect, in many cases, was to produce an emotional upset. Some declared, "It is too personal, do I have to tell?" or "I'll talk about anything but that!" Not infrequently the interviewers were faced with the unpleasant choice of pressing the issue and risking termination of the interview, or of giving in and glossing over this subject which appeared to be of paramount importance. The tactic, in these cases, was to make a few gentle efforts toward getting the conversation flowing on this subject, but if it seemed to threaten the whole interview, the conversation was shifted to other topics, and an attempt was made to re-open the subject later in the interview.

As a consequence of such difficulties, another limitation of the material is that because of unavoidable failures in interviewing, no information was obtained about several really acute cases of emotional stress and personality disorganization associated with courtship and marriage. The statistics presented here probably understate the prevalence and intensity of courtship and marriage problems, simply because several men refused to discuss the subject. Thus, there is the built-in bias that if the factor is of critical importance, in a certain percentage of cases no information is obtained; but if the factor is of lesser importance, it is more readily discussed.

The courtship experiences of never-married homeless men.

Were you ever engaged to be married? (Table 2-1). If a man has never married, the first question that comes to mind is whether he ever contemplated marriage seriously enough to become engaged. Of the men who had never married, about three-fourths (74 per cent) reported that they had never been engaged. The one-fourth who had been engaged reported, of course, that their engagements had been broken. This tends to cast doubt on the hypothesis that large numbers of single men retreat to Skid Row after failing to get the woman they want. Instead, it may suggest that a large share of the never-married men either were under-active in courtship matters or else held unconventional ideas about marrying the women they courted. Strangely enough, chronic alcoholics were much more prevalent among the once-engaged-but-never-married men than were teetotalers or light drinkers. There was a tendency for men who had never been engaged to be non-drinkers or controlled drinkers. Nevertheless, about one-fifth of all never-engaged men were chronic alcoholics.

Were you ever in love? (if never engaged) (Table 2-2). Probing further, the interviewers asked the large group of never-married and never-engaged men whether they had ever been in love. Approximately one-half said "yes" and one-half said "no." Again the chronic alcoholics were more inclined to have taken an active interest in the opposite sex; the teetotalers and light drinkers tended to deny that they had ever fallen in love.

When taken together, these two questions lead to the conclusion that more of the chronic alcoholics led an active and normal courtship life than did the teetotalers and light drinkers, who appear to have been more repressed, timid, or disinterested. Among the chronic alcoholics for whom information was available, 92 per cent had had some definite heterosexual interest (had married, been engaged, or been in love), while among the teetotalers and light drinkers the percentage who had had any heterosexual interest was 78 per cent.

Why was your engagement broken? (Table 2-3) The one-fourth of the single men who had been engaged were asked how their engagement was broken. Following is a tabulation of the reasons given, in order of frequency:

	<u>Per cent of all ever-engaged single men</u>
Fiancee died.	21
Drifted apart during military service . . .	15
Respondent moved away, girl obtained another boy-friend	14
Feelings toward each other changed.	12
Quarrels, reasons other than drinking . . .	8
Respondent moved away, failed to write. . .	7
Girl's parents forbade the marriage, interfered	5
Quarrels over respondent's drinking	4

When one searches these responses looking for an explanation of why the man is on Skid Row, the results are rather disappointing. Instead of responses showing tragic personal disorganization and withdrawal from society following a thwarted romance, one finds a rather conventional set of reasons of the type that one would expect from a cross-sectional survey of unmarried persons in the general population. It could be suspected that at least some of the very large percentage of men whose fiancées "died" were giving evasive responses to ward off further questioning. But even without accepting this tragic explanation at its face value, it is nevertheless clear that at least one-half, and perhaps more, of the engagements were broken off because the man either lost interest in that particular girl or did not want to marry anyone.

Who broke the engagement? (Table 2-4) In order to determine more clearly how seriously the man had taken his engagement, the interviewer asked him who took the initiative in dissolving it. Excluding those who reported that the fiancée had died, only about one man in three said that the girl broke the engagement. In about one-half of the cases the man claimed he had initiated the separation or that it was by mutual agreement. This reinforces the conclusion suggested in the preceding paragraph. A higher percentage of the chronic alcoholics admitted that the girl suggested breaking the engagement than did the men who were teetotalers or light drinkers.

Did you ever fall in love again after your engagement was broken? (Table 2-5). Only a very few (18 per cent) of the single men with broken engagements reported that they ever gave love a second chance.

Why do you suppose you never married? (Table 2-6). After exploring the history of their engagements and love-affairs, interviewers asked all single men the somewhat challenging question, "Why do you suppose you never got married?" This question was followed by a series of neutral probes aimed at getting a full picture of the man's own interpretation of why he had never married. Following are the types of reply given, arranged in order of frequency mentioned:

	Per cent of all never-married men
Stayed single from choice: did not want to get married.	35
Could not afford to get married; income was not large enough	32
Could not interest a girl of the type he wanted	20
Was afraid marriage would not succeed for him	6
Did not care for women, not interested in girls	6
Had to support other relatives (mother, sisters, etc.)	4
Knew his drinking would ruin a marriage	2
Did not know.	9

Unless these responses were pure rationalizations, the men made it abundantly clear that they had remained single either from preference, for economic reasons, or because they were unable to meet and win the kind of girl they wanted. Only a small minority (about 9 per cent) had stayed single because they were afraid a marriage would fail because of their drinking or other factors. With the possible exception of men whose fiancées died, there was no evidence of heartbreak and life-long personality blight resulting from a broken engagement. Apparently the small percentage of single men who had been engaged did not regard the experience as a severe personal blow. Instead, the picture that emerges is that of a rather low level of interest in marriage and perhaps even in sex.¹

Do (did) women interest you much sexually? (Table 2-7). In order to help interpret the meaning of the evidence concerning why unmarried homeless men had never been engaged or even in love, each was asked, "Do (did) women interest you much sexually?" One man in six excused himself from answering the question, except retrospectively, on the basis of age, while one in fourteen failed to answer at all. Of those who were willing to give either a yes-or-no answer (counting as "yes" those who used to be interested),

¹Many of the never-married men on Skid Row are definitely homely (ugly) or even have disfigured faces or unusual features that would cause them not to be taken seriously as a suitor by many women. Hence, just as the least employable members of the labor market tend to drift onto Skid Row, so the male leftovers of the marriage market may tend to follow the same path -- especially when they have low incomes and no social contacts.

30 per cent said "no" and 70 per cent said "yes." All but a small fraction of the men who said that women did not interest them sexually were teetotalers or light drinkers; only 13 per cent of the chronic alcoholics reported that they had no sexual interest in women. When considered with the other evidence about the engagements and love-affairs of heavy drinkers and chronic alcoholics, this constitutes a rather strong denial of the hypothesis sometimes suggested by psychiatrists that chronic alcoholics have latent homosexual tendencies. The evidence accumulated makes it far easier to believe that most of them have a heterosexual drive but that in a disproportionately high percentage of cases (a) it is directed, consciously or unconsciously, toward inappropriate persons, such as mothers or other female relatives, (b) they are very repressed and, due to internal conflict, are unable to express themselves sexually as they want, or (c) they dislike or fear the institution of marriage and must rely on casual and promiscuous sex contacts. Drinking can also be a substitute for infidelity for men who have fallen out of love with their wives or whose wives have fallen out of love with them.

Present association with women (Table 2-8). Pursuing this line of inquiry, the men were asked, "Do you associate with women nowadays?" More than one-half of the men (including those who said they were too old) reported "no"; the remainder said that they did. Most of the men interpreted this question as a polite way of asking whether they were having intercourse. Hence these statistics tend to indicate the proportion of men who are currently heterosexually active. A much higher percentage of chronic alcoholics claimed to be sexually active than did the teetotalers and light drinkers. (Almost two-thirds of the latter group said they do not associate with women nowadays, whereas only 40 per cent of the chronic alcoholics said this.)

Since most of the men were inclined to interpret the question, "How often do you associate with women nowadays?" as referring to frequency of intercourse, the responses can, with caution, be interpreted in this vein. The median frequency for all single men apparently was twice a month, but the median frequency reported by the unmarried chronic alcoholics was four times a month. On the one hand, these data indicate considerable disinterest, and perhaps non-participation, in sex, but they also indicate that sex relations with women are not as rare among Skid Row men as many observers believe. It appears that more than one-half of all unmarried Skid Row men who are not too old are still sexually active. Among these, the chronic alcoholics appear to be much more active than do the light drinkers.

Attitudes toward homosexuals (Table 2-9). The large proportion of single men who showed no interest in sex, who do not associate with women, and who have never been in love, raises the question of homosexuality on Skid Row. The men were asked, "Some people say that some of the men living along West Madison Street (other Skid Row area) have sex experiences with other men. How do you regard this?" In coding this material, it was assumed that respondents who showed either approval or extreme and violent disapproval would tend to have either active or latent homosexual tendencies, while most of those who showed mild dislike or disgust but not an extreme emotion of reaction to the subject were considered not to have such tendencies. About two per cent of the men confessed approval of homosexuals, and 10 per cent showed violent disgust and hatred. (It is difficult to assert that all of those who gave

a violently negative reaction toward homosexuals are themselves latent homosexuals. For example, a very high per cent of the widowed men reacted in this way.) Chronic alcoholics tended to show a little less tolerance for homosexuals than did the teetotalers and light drinkers.

Estimated percentage of homeless men who are homosexuals (Table 2-10). The men were asked to estimate what percentage of the men on Skid Row they thought had sex experiences with other men more or less regularly. A large share (32 per cent) of the men pleaded ignorance and claimed they did not know. An additional 30 per cent thought there were "almost none" or "less than five per cent." Among those who thought there was a significant number, the estimates varied all the way from five per cent to more than 50 per cent, with the estimates tending to be concentrated somewhat at 10, 25, and 50 per cent. In general, separated and divorced men estimated more homosexuals than did the single men, and teetotalers and light drinkers gave higher estimates than did the chronic alcoholics.

From this material, the following tentative conclusions might be drawn regarding homosexuality:

- (a) There is a significant number of actively homosexual men on Skid Row. The percentage is probably about five per cent of the men.
- (b) The attitude toward homosexuals is only slightly less intolerant than it is in the general population.
- (c) Homosexuality probably is just as prevalent among the teetotalers and light drinkers as among the chronic alcoholics.
- (d) The hypothesis of homosexuality alone cannot account for all of the large number of single men who have never been engaged or in love who live on Skid Row.

Coders' evaluation of courtship and sex history (Table 2-12). In order to integrate all of the material assembled concerning the courtship history and sex activities of the single men, the coders were asked to classify each respondent in one of the following seven categories:

	<u>Teetotalers and light drinkers</u>	<u>Heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts</u>
Man was never engaged, never in love, not interested in women.	25%	5%
Man was a heavy drinker, was afraid his marriage would fail.	-	21
Man was engaged, but engagement broken.	17	25
Man was never engaged, but once in love	17	20
Man was never engaged, never in love, but interested in women.	16	13
Man led a merry life, active sexually, but not willing to marry	10	8
Man remained in parents' home, had family responsibilities, until too old to marry	8	4
Not enough information to classify. . .	7	4

This classification, which takes account of several different variables at once, helps to clarify the picture somewhat. First, it shows that the single men on Skid Row have remained single for a variety of reasons and that these reasons vary according to the man's drinking behavior (see Table 2-6). The unmarried teetotaler or light drinker who lives on Skid Row shows definite signs of being sexually inert. One-quarter of these men reported they had never been in love and confessed that women had not interested them. An additional 33 per cent had never been engaged but said that women interested them or that they had once been in love. Only ten per cent could be classified as unwilling to marry but having led an active sexual life. Since the evidence already presented makes it implausible that all of these men could be homosexual, it can be concluded only that a very large proportion of them have spent a lifetime of comparative sexual inactivity. It is therefore tentatively concluded that one reason why many non-alcoholic, unmarried, low-income men live on Skid Row is that they have been undersexed, autosexual, or else sexually shy and repressed to the point of having had very little sexual expression throughout their lives.

The unmarried heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts present a very different picture, however, for they show a much greater level of sexual activity. Only five per cent of this group had never been in love and had not been interested in women sexually. An additional 13 per cent had been sufficiently active to have been interested in women but not to have fallen in love. While larger proportions had been in love or had been engaged, one-fifth of the single alcoholics said they had never married because they feared their drinking would ruin the marriage. The chronic alcoholics apparently have had much more conflict than have teetotalers and light drinkers regarding their needs for marriage, family life, and sex. This may help to explain why, as reported earlier,¹ very few of them expressed a liking for the Skid Row life.

Previous family life of men who are separated or divorced.

How long did you and your wife live together? (Table 2-13). It is not true that the marriages contracted by homeless men were dissolved quickly after the wedding. The average (median) duration of marriage for homeless men who were widowed or divorced was seven years. The proportion of Skid Row marriages dissolved during the first year probably is no greater than in the general population; 85 per cent of the marriages lasted two years or more. Many (10 per cent) lasted twenty years or more. This is evidence that the couples made an effort to make their marriages work and gave up only after months or years of trial. Therefore, these separations and divorces were not the actions of tempestuous young people but of couples approaching middle-age, very often with young or adolescent children in the household. In many cases the men appear to have stayed with their wives until the children were grown and then to have deserted to live on Skid Row.

¹The Homeless Man on Skid Row, National Opinion Research Center Report No. 65, I (Chicago, 1959), Chapter 5, pp. 90 et sub.

How was your home life? (Table 2-14). About two-thirds of the men claimed that at first the marriage was happy and well-adjusted but that quarrels and troubles occurred later. Almost one-fourth reported that the marriage was never well-adjusted and that there was trouble almost from the start. A very few of the separated and divorced men (six per cent) refused to concede that the marriage was ever anything but well-adjusted, calm, happy, and normal.¹ Trouble tended to crop up early in the marriage more frequently for men who were chronic alcoholics than for men who were teetotalers or light drinkers.

What kind of a wife was she? (Table 2-15). Despite the fact that they were estranged, only 14 per cent of the men would declare that the spouse had been a bad wife, and only four per cent accused her of being "very bad." Instead, more than 50 per cent rated their wives as either "good" or "very good"; almost one-fourth of the men were neutral and stated that their wives had been neither unusually good nor unusually bad. Interestingly enough, the chronic alcoholics were generally less critical and more appreciative of the virtues of their estranged wives than were the teetotalers and light drinkers.

What did you like best about your wife? (Table 2-16). Almost every man was able to specify at least one trait about his wife which he liked, even though he tended to be quite vague about it. The traits mentioned, in order of frequency, were:

Good housekeeper	39%
Nice personality	22
Good mother to children. . . .	19
Pretty, sexually attractive. .	16
Vague but positive	18

These ratings did not vary much according to drinking classification; however, fewer of the alcoholics rated their wives as pretty or sexually attractive, and emphasized instead their virtues as mothers.

What did you dislike about your wife? (Table 2-17). Even though the interviewers tried hard to make the men see that "nobody is perfect" and "everybody has at least one fault," more than one-fourth of the men (28 per cent) refused to name anything they disliked about their estranged wives. In the cases where a criticism was voiced, two types of statement dominated all of the others:

- (a) She was always restless, always on the go 28% of the men
- (b) She nagged and complained, argued all of the time . 21% of the men.

A few men complained that their wives were poor housekeepers, were extravagant; that they were frigid and not interested in sex; that they "put on airs" and

¹A few of these men were only temporarily separated from their wives while searching for work in the city, or while on a "lost weekend" spree on Skid Row. Some were men who projected the blame for their marital troubles upon relatives or other persons.

thought they were better than other people; or were poor mothers and neglected their children. These, however, were only secondary and minor complaints in comparison with the two major criticisms. The teetotalers or light drinkers tended to cite restlessness as the trait they disliked most in their wives. Chronic alcoholics, on the other hand, more often mentioned nagging, complaining, and arguing as the trait they disliked most.

Who was to blame for the separation or divorce? (Table 2-18).

When asked which party was primarily at fault for the separation, 40 per cent of the men frankly shouldered the blame. Only one-third placed the blame completely on the wife, while about ten per cent thought that neither or both were at fault. Relatives were blamed in three per cent of the cases, and ten per cent of the men failed or refused to answer. The chronic alcoholics accepted responsibility for their marital failures more than twice as often as did the teetotalers and light drinkers, who were more inclined to blame their wives. Only one-fourth of the non-alcoholics thought they were primarily at fault, although a sizable proportion admitted that both husband and wife were at fault.

Cause of the separation or divorce (Table 2-19). When asked to specify the cause of the separation or divorce, the men listed the following as major causes:

Quarrels over matters other than drinking	43%
Drinking by the respondent.	27%
Wife's infidelity.	25%
Husband's infidelity.	5%.

Incompatibility, independent of drinking, was rated as the leading cause of dissolution of marriage among Skid Row men. Among chronic alcoholics, however, the man's drinking was cited as the major cause and explained almost one-half of the cases.

Infidelity of the wife was given as the cause for one-fourth of the broken marriages. This reason was given even more frequently by the teetotalers and light drinkers than by the chronic alcoholics. If true, this could be a most powerful explanation of why many men are on Skid Row. Few events can happen in the life of an American male that will disorganize him more, subject him to greater ego-destroying torture, and make him feel more disgraced in the eyes of others, than to discover that his wife is "having an affair" with another. Homicide and suicide commonly result from this situation, and most men who undergo this experience probably incur lifelong personality effects. Hence, it is quite plausible that discovering he has an unfaithful wife could be sufficient cause to many a man to retreat to Skid Row. On the other hand, it must be recognized that many separated and divorced men may have attempted to reverse an unfavorable reaction to their own behavior as husbands by claiming that their wives had been unfaithful. A careful reading of the interviews where the accusation of infidelity was made leads to the impression that many, if not all, of the reports are true, however. Some of the emotional scenes mentioned in the opening paragraphs of this chapter turned out to be based upon this theme. One cannot help suspecting that some of the refusals to discuss the matter at all may

be additional uncounted instances of the same phenomenon. Hence, it is tentatively concluded that the disorganizing effect of infidelity by the wife is an important factor in the presence of many separated and divorced men on Skid Row. In view of the tentative nature of the data, however, it would be improper to affix the proportion at exactly 25 per cent (as the statistics indicate); it could be more than this or considerably less. Also, this finding does not mean that the husband is completely innocent of any wrongdoing or that he lacked personality traits that would provoke or tempt a wife into infidelity.

Table 2-19 makes it clear that nearly one-half of the separated and divorced men who are chronic alcoholics admitted that drinking broke up their marriages.

Coders' evaluation of reasons for separation or divorce (Table 2-20). The coders were asked to review the entire marital history of each man and to categorize it in one of five broad classes. The results of this evaluation are as follows:

	Per cent teetotalers and light drinkers	Per cent heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts
<u>Marriages broken by drinking</u>		
<u>Total</u>	11 ^a	47
Marriage unstable from beginning, due to drinking.	1	12
Marriage happy at first, later broken due to drinking.	10	35
<u>Marriages broken by incompatibility (other than drinking)</u>		
<u>Total</u>	75	41
Marriage unstable from beginning, due to incompatibility	25	16
Marriage happy at first, later broken due to incompatibility	50	25
<u>Marriages normally happy, still in effect, separation temporary.</u>	6	4

^aThese are men who said they were once heavy drinkers but who were teetotalers or light drinkers at the time of the interview.

The coders were not asked to judge the validity of the claim that the wife was unfaithful but were instructed to classify it simply as "incompatibility." If the respondents' reports were unbiased, and if the coders'

subjective interpretations were correct, it should be concluded that basic incompatibility (independent of drinking) was responsible for the dissolution of the majority of marriages of Skid Row men. Even among the chronic alcoholics, incompatibility for reasons other than drinking was only slightly less important than the husband's drinking. As has been admitted, the interviewers were able to obtain "only one side of the story," and there is no way of determining how closely the basic material corresponds to fact. Even allowing a generous margin for bias, however, the impression remains that many men are on Skid Row because of an unhappy marital situation. It is suggested that the reactions of Skid Row men to their unsuccessful marriages may be an important factor in their drinking.

Summary and conclusion.

Single men. It appears that the sizable concentration of single men on Skid Row contains a large group of undersexed or sexually shy men who, although not active homosexuals, have a very low level of interest in women and no desire for marriage. In addition, there appears to be a small but significant proportion of active homosexuals. In both of these groups chronic alcoholism is less prevalent than among the Skid Row population generally. Among the never-married men there is also a group who are sexually active but who have never married because of lack of interest. A disproportionately large share of this group are chronic alcoholics. Some of them believe they would fail in marriage because of their drinking. Thus, among unmarried men on Skid Row there is a positive correlation between alcoholism and interest in the opposite sex. Responsibility for uncontrolled drinking and for remaining single should be sought among the family background factors and the personality factors (see Chapters 1 and 3, respectively).

Separated and divorced men. It appears that many of the separated and divorced men flee to the Skid Row environment in confusion and disorganization as a rather direct result of the failure of their marriages. Skid Row houses several hundreds of men who do not drink excessively and who appear to have come there as a result of a broken marriage caused by incompatibility for reasons other than drinking. This is the reason given for about 75 per cent of all separations or divorces.

Heavy drinking (from whatever cause) is the basic reason for the dissolution of at least one-half of the marriages of separated or divorced alcoholics on Skid Row. In the remainder of cases, other factors are present in addition to drinking: (a) unfaithfulness in the wife, (b) nagging, complaining, or arguing by the wife, (c) restlessness, unhappiness of the wife, or (d) other basic incompatibilities that may or may not have been accompanied by moderate or heavy drinking by the husband. In many of these cases the man admits that he was primarily responsible for the breakup of the marriage. But it appears that in the interaction of husband and wife over these difficulties, the personality of the man undergoes disorganization, and drinking increases. The act of separation or the events that precipitate the separation appear to have such a disorganizing effect that the man's drinking becomes uncontrollable, and he eventually lands on Skid Row.

TABLE 2-1

WERE YOU EVER ENGAGED TO BE MARRIED?

Single men, by drinking
classification

Response	Total single men	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Yes.	25.0	20.0	19.4	36.6
No	73.9	80.0	80.6	59.6
No information . .	1.1	-	-	3.7

TABLE 2-2

WERE YOU EVER IN LOVE?

Single men, never engaged, by
drinking classification

Response	Total single men, never engaged	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Yes.	47.3	36.5	56.6	62.5
No	46.5	54.8	39.8	34.4
No information . .	6.2	8.7	3.6	3.1

TABLE 2-3

WHY WAS THE ENGAGEMENT BROKEN?

Single men, once engaged, by
drinking classification

Response	Total once- engaged single men	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Quarrel over drinking	3.8	5.8	-	3.4
Quarrel other than drinking .	8.4	11.5	-	8.5
Feelings toward each other changed.	12.2	7.7	30.0	10.2
Respondent moved away and failed to write.	6.9	-	-	15.3
Respondent moved away and girl found other boy-friend . . .	14.5	19.2	-	15.3
Drifted apart while in military service	15.3	17.3	-	18.6
Girl's parents objected and convinced her it was unwise.	4.6	5.8	-	5.1
Fiancee died.	21.4	21.2	55.0	10.2
Other general reasons, no money, other family interfered. . .	10.7	11.5	15.0	8.5
No information.	2.3	-	-	5.1

TABLE 2-4

WHO BROKE THE ENGAGEMENT?

Single men, once engaged, by
drinking classification

Response	Total once- engaged single men	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Respondent broke engagement .	35.1	36.5	15.0	40.7
Girl broke engagement	26.7	21.2	15.0	35.6
Mutual agreement.	14.5	15.4	15.0	13.6
Fiancee died.	21.4	21.2	55.0	10.2
No information.	2.3	5.8	-	-

TABLE 2-5

DID YOU EVER FALL IN LOVE AGAIN AFTER
YOUR ENGAGEMENT WAS BROKEN?

Single men, once engaged, by
drinking classification

Response	Total once- engaged single men	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Yes	18.3	21.2	-	22.0
No.	79.4	73.1	100.0	78.0
No information.	2.3	5.8	-	-

TABLE 2-6

WHY DO YOU SUPPOSE YOU NEVER MARRIED?

All single men, by drinking classification

Response	Total single men	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Knew his drinking would ruin a marriage	2.5	-	-	8.1
Had to support mother, brothers, sisters.	3.8	3.1	8.7	1.9
Was afraid marriage would not succeed for him.	6.5	5.8	8.7	6.2
Could not interest a girl of type he wanted	19.8	21.9	15.5	19.3
Could not afford, situations prevented.	31.5	32.3	29.1	31.7
Did not want to get married, wanted to be single.	34.9	26.9	47.6	39.8
Did not care for women, not interested in them	5.5	11.2	-	-
Does not know why he never married.	8.8	9.6	8.7	7.5
No information.	9.2	10.4	8.7	7.5

TABLE 2-7

DO WOMEN INTEREST YOU MUCH SEXUALLY?
All single men, by drinking classification

Response	Total single men	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
No.	28.1	36.9	29.1	13.0
Yes	51.7	43.5	45.6	68.9
Used to but too old now . . .	12.8	11.5	16.5	12.4
No information.	7.4	8.1	8.7	5.6

TABLE 2-8

HOW OFTEN DO YOU ASSOCIATE WITH WOMEN NOWADAYS?
All single men, by drinking classification

Frequency	Total single men	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Never	57.0	65.2	61.1	40.5
Yes, once per month	7.2	4.8	11.1	8.6
Yes, twice per month.	8.0	5.6	10.4	10.4
Yes, three times per month. .	1.5	1.6	-	2.3
Yes, four times per month . .	8.2	5.3	1.4	17.6
Yes, five times per month . .	-	-	-	-
Yes, six times per month. . .	1.6	-	4.2	2.7
Yes, seven times per month. .	-	-	-	-
Yes, eight times per month. .	2.3	3.7	2.1	-
Yes, nine or more times per month.	3.9	3.7	4.2	4.1
Yes, times per month not specified.	9.5	9.1	5.6	12.6
No information.	0.8	0.8	-	1.4

TABLE 2-9

ATTITUDES OF SINGLE HOMELESS MEN TOWARD HOMOSEXUALS

Response	Total single men	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy Drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
O.K. if they leave him alone, or indifferent	25.1	28.1	25.7	19.8
Likes them, they are O.K. . .	1.8	1.3	-	3.6
Sorry for them but does not like	7.8	4.5	13.9	9.5
Mild dislike, tolerates them if they leave him alone. . .	25.9	24.9	29.2	25.7
Moderate dislike, disgust, avoidance.	17.7	14.7	18.7	22.1
Violent, extreme dislike, hatred	9.6	9.1	10.4	9.9
Something wrong with them mentally	19.2	18.7	28.5	14.0
Something wrong with them physically	12.3	9.9	15.3	14.4
Never had any experience with them	4.9	6.4	4.2	2.7
No information.	12.0	17.4	2.1	9.5

TABLE 2-10

ESTIMATE OF PROPORTION OF HOMELESS MEN WHO ARE HOMOSEXUAL

All homeless men, by marital status and drinking classification

Per cent of homeless men	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teeto- talers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Almost none	19.6	22.3	18.9	15.7	19.7	18.7	20.3
1-4 per cent.	10.7	14.2	8.3	8.4	10.9	9.6	11.1
5-9 per cent.	5.8	3.6	9.2	1.7	3.1	8.1	7.7
10-14 per cent.	6.2	7.2	5.7	6.2	4.5	3.8	10.4
15-19 per cent.	1.3	0.7	1.8	1.7	0.4	1.0	2.7
20-24 per cent.	4.7	3.4	6.8	1.7	3.4	6.5	5.0
25-29 per cent.	6.1	4.3	8.0	6.7	5.1	6.7	7.0
30-39 per cent.	1.5	1.1	2.0	1.7	0.4	2.6	2.2
40-49 per cent.	1.2	0.7	1.2	3.4	1.2	1.4	0.9
50 per cent or more . .	3.5	3.1	3.2	6.7	3.9	2.2	3.8
Does not know	32.1	33.2	30.4	41.6	40.2	28.9	23.7
No information.	7.3	6.2	4.5	4.5	7.2	10.5	5.2

TABLE 2-11

ATTITUDES OF HOMELESS MEN TOWARD HOMOSEXUALS

All homeless men, by marital status and drinking classification

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Tecto- talers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
O.K. if they leave him alone, or indifferent.	21.9	25.1	21.2	16.3	24.2	17.9	21.9
Likes them, they are O.K.	1.7	1.8	1.4	3.4	1.8	1.4	2.0
Sorry for them, but does not like.	8.9	7.8	10.4	8.4	7.2	10.5	9.9
Mild dislike, tolerates them if leave him alone.	25.6	25.9	26.6	25.8	25.4	23.9	27.3
Moderate dislike, disgust, avoidance	18.8	17.7	19.7	23.0	17.5	21.1	18.7
Violent, extreme dislike, hatred.	11.1	9.6	11.8	16.3	11.3	11.7	10.2
Something wrong with them mentally.	19.2	19.2	19.3	23.0	22.8	16.5	16.5
Something wrong with them physically.	12.8	12.3	15.0	7.9	11.6	13.2	14.0
Never had any experi- ence with them	4.1	4.9	3.4	5.1	4.9	3.6	3.6
No information.	12.0	12.0	8.8	6.7	12.7	13.4	10.1

TABLE 2-12

CODERS' EVALUATION OF COURTSHIP AND SEX HISTORY

Single men, by drinking classification

Evaluation	Total single men	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Man was heavy drinker, afraid marriage would fail.	7.1	-	2.9	21.1
Man led a merry life, active sexually, not willing to marry	8.6	9.6	6.8	8.1
Man remained in parents' home, family responsibility, too old	8.0	8.1	13.6	4.3
Man was engaged but it was broken	18.9	17.3	13.6	24.8
Man never engaged but once in love	19.8	16.9	27.2	19.9
Man never engaged, never in love, was interested in women	15.3	16.2	16.5	13.0
Man never engaged, never in love, not interested in women	17.2	25.0	16.5	5.0
Not enough information to classify	5.2	6.9	2.9	3.7

TABLE 2-13

NUMBER OF YEARS EVER-MARRIED MEN LIVED WITH THEIR WIVES,
BY DRINKING CLASSIFICATION

Response	Separated and divorced				Widowed, total
	Total	Teetotal- ers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts	
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Less than one year.	7.2	5.7	6.2	8.9	6.9
1 year.	6.5	8.6	4.7	5.6	6.9
2 years	9.9	9.5	14.1	8.1	6.9
3-4 years	13.1	14.8	9.4	13.7	13.1
5-6 years	8.9	9.0	16.4	4.8	4.6
7-9 years	16.6	13.3	23.4	15.7	8.5
10-14 years	14.8	11.0	8.6	21.4	13.1
15-19 years	11.4	14.3	7.0	11.3	13.8
20-24 years	4.9	6.7	3.1	4.4	8.5
25 years and over	5.8	5.7	7.0	5.2	15.4
No information.	0.9	1.4	-	0.8	2.3

TABLE 2-14

HOW WAS YOUR HOME LIFE?

Ever-married men, by drinking classification

Response	Separated and divorced				Widowed, total
	Total	Teetotal- ers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts	
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Well-adjusted, calm, happy, normal.	5.6	5.7	8.6	4.0	75.4
Well-adjusted followed by quarrels, trouble. . . .	63.0	63.3	68.8	59.7	9.2
Never well-adjusted from start.	23.9	23.3	18.0	27.4	2.3
No information or not enough to classify . . .	7.5	7.6	4.7	8.9	13.1

TABLE 2-15

WHAT KIND OF WIFE WAS SHE?

Ever-married men, by drinking classification

Response	Separated and divorced				Widowed, total
	Total	Teetotal- ers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts	
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Very good wife.	16.4	7.1	25.0	19.8	46.2
Good wife	39.6	39.5	43.0	37.9	40.8
Neither unusually good or bad	24.4	23.3	21.1	27.0	2.3
Bad wife.	9.7	17.1	8.6	4.0	2.3
Very bad wife	3.9	5.2	-	4.8	-
No information.	6.0	7.6	2.3	6.5	8.5

TABLE 2-16

WHAT DID YOU LIKE BEST ABOUT YOUR WIFE?
Ever-married men, by drinking classification

Response	Separated and divorced				Widowed, total
	Total	Teetotal-ers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts	
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Was pretty, sexually attractive	16.0	16.2	22.7	12.5	9.2
Nice personality, easy to get along with	22.0	21.9	21.1	22.6	43.1
Good mother to children	18.8	16.7	11.7	24.2	13.1
Good wife to him (vague, general)	11.4	10.0	9.4	13.7	14.6
Was good housekeeper, good cook.	39.2	41.0	35.2	39.9	50.0
Helped him in his work.	2.9	2.9	1.6	3.6	2.3
General and vague likes	18.3	20.5	19.5	15.7	10.0
Nothing mentioned as liked	4.1	5.7	2.3	3.6	-
No information.	8.9	9.0	7.0	9.7	8.5

TABLE 2-17

WHAT DID YOU DISLIKE ABOUT YOUR WIFE?
Ever-married men, by drinking classification

Response	Separated and divorced				Widowed, total
	Total	Teetotal-ers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts	
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Was not pretty, did not keep herself up.	-	-	-	-	-
Was a poor mother, did not care for children.	1.9	1.4	2.3	2.0	-
Was a poor housekeeper, poor cook.	7.3	5.7	7.0	8.9	2.3
Was restless, on the go, drank too much	27.6	41.9	17.2	21.0	4.6
Was extravagant, spent more than they could afford	6.7	9.5	4.7	5.2	4.6
Nagged, complained, argued	21.2	16.7	21.9	24.6	9.2
Was cold, not enough interest in sex.	3.2	5.7	-	2.8	-
Put on airs, thought she was better than others	1.5	1.4	-	2.4	-
General, vague dislikes	10.2	11.0	9.4	14.9	3.8
Nothing mentioned as disliked	27.6	19.5	43.8	26.2	64.6
No information.	6.7	5.2	4.7	8.9	13.1

TABLE 2-18

WHO WAS TO BLAME FOR THE SEPARATION OR DIVORCE?
Ever-married men, by drinking classification

Response	Total separated and divorced	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Wife was to blame	32.8	46.6	21.9	26.6
Respondent was to blame	39.9	24.8	39.1	53.2
Both at fault	7.5	12.4	9.4	2.4
Neither, just incompatible.	2.4	1.0	4.7	2.4
Relatives	3.4	1.4	7.0	3.2
No information.	9.9	8.1	14.1	9.3
Separated temporarily: work, living conditions.	4.1	5.7	3.9	2.8

TABLE 2-19

WHAT WAS THE CAUSE OF YOUR SEPARATION OR DIVORCE?
Ever-married men, by drinking classification

Response	Total separated and divorced	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Temporary because of work	3.2	5.7	1.6	2.0
Respondent's drinking	27.0	9.5	25.1	42.7
Wife was unfaithful	24.9	37.6	10.2	21.8
Respondent was unfaithful	5.1	2.9	7.0	6.0
Quarreling other than drinking	42.8	44.3	50.8	37.1
"Lost weekend," not estranged	1.7	-	2.3	2.8
Wife's drinking	1.5	2.9	2.3	-
No information.	10.6	9.5	16.4	8.5

TABLE 2-20

CODER'S EVALUATION OF RESPONDENT'S MARRIAGE
Ever-married men, by drinking classification

Evaluation	Total separated and divorced	Drinking classification		
		Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Marriage normally happy, still in effect, separation temporary.	4.4	5.7	3.9	3.6
Marriage first happy, later broken due to his drinking .	22.5	9.5	20.3	34.7
Marriage first happy, later broken due to incompatibility	37.0	50.5	39.1	24.6
Marriage unstable from begin- ning due to drinking	6.8	1.4	4.7	12.5
Marriage unstable from begin- ning due to incompatibility.	19.5	24.8	18.0	15.7
Not enough information to classify	9.7	8.1	14.1	8.9

THE HOMELESS MAN ON SKID ROW: VOLUME II

Continuation Studies

Chapter 3

PERSONALITY TRAITS OF SKID ROW MEN

Family backgrounds and the courtship and marital histories of Skid Row men were explored in the two preceding chapters. In this chapter a third type of factor that may help to explain why homeless men are on Skid Row will be examined -- the personality traits of the Skid Row men. These traits, which vary from one individual to another and are not themselves to be wholly explained in terms of differences in family background and courtship-marriage experiences, may be related to the presence of the men on Skid Row. The interviews that were conducted with homeless men made a special effort to get at this particular set of variable factors.

A note on methodology. Before these findings are presented, however, it is necessary to take note of some important limitations of the survey-type interview as a means of developing valid data on the personality traits of individuals.

It is evident that one cannot discover and measure the basic personality characteristics of individuals by simple, direct questions. They presume a kind and degree of self-knowledge which individuals seldom possess. They also presume a degree of frankness which respondents are seldom willing to give. But in the one-shot, survey-type interview, the researcher need not be limited to such simple, direct questions; nor, when he does use direct questions, does he need to take the answers given at their face value. In any case, he would not, unless he were terribly naive, depend upon any one or two questions to provide a basis for assessing the more complex and often quite subtle aspects of a respondent's personality.

In the interview schedule administered to our sample of homeless men, batteries of questions were used, some direct and some indirect, some open and some closed, and some designed merely to open up a field of inquiry which was then explored through intensive, non-directive probing. The technique was to question each respondent in such way and to such an extent that a fairly large and varied sample of his behavior (verbal and non-verbal) was evoked. Thus, many questions asked were not intended primarily to elicit factual information or categorical self-judgments but to stimulate a flow of conversation about some aspect or area of the respondent's experience.

In recent years there has been a great deal of experimentation in survey research with the use of "projective techniques" to obtain information of a kind that clinical psychologists use in an assessment of basic personality traits or conditions. This experimentation has included not

only the use of "thematic apperception" test items, but also the use of short descriptions of hypothetical situations concerning which the respondent is asked to state his views or to anticipate what his reactions would likely be if he himself were actually involved in such a situation. In the exploratory and pretest phases of the present study, devices of this type were tried, with very discouraging results. It seemed that they just would not work for this group of respondents. The fact that they didn't work was thought to be due to a combination of several different factors: (a) The homeless man was already involved in a situation of personality stress far more acute and dramatic than most of the situations that could be simply portrayed by pictures or hypothetical stories. At best, most of the situations into which the man might be asked to project himself would seem better or more normal than the situation in which he was actually involved. At worst, these situations seem puerile or humorous in the sense of being a bitter jest or indirect mockery of the homeless man. (b) Many of the homeless men appeared incapable of "projecting" easily. Their inability to think in terms of abstractions or to imagine themselves in another situation completely free of the Skid Row element, their short attention-span, and their inability to understand or remember all of the significant details of a projective device, appeared to underlie this incapability. (c) Another important element was disinterest and lack of motivation. The men were generally highly egocentric and hence were quite anxious to talk about themselves, but acted as if they had far too much trouble of their own to care very much about "the man in the picture" or "what Mr. Jones should do" about the situation in which he was involved. In short, it appeared early in the study that as long as the interview concentrated on the man himself and his own present situation and problems (or the background of these problems), the respondent tended to be lively, spontaneous, and confident; but when projective techniques were introduced into the interview, the man became confused and self-conscious and often thought that the interviewer was "playing games" with him. Rapport fell rapidly, the man seeming to conclude that the interviewer really did not understand what the Skid Row situation was like after all.

Perhaps this limitation on the method of collecting personality data might have been largely overcome had it been possible actively to involve trained clinical psychologists to subject each respondent to examination. But even if the costs of doing so would not have been prohibitive, there would have been no way of getting our sample of homeless men on Skid Row to cooperate, and probably few clinical psychologists would have been willing to spend the endless hours in Skid Row hotels that would have been required of them. Whether or not they would have been able to circumvent the obstructive factors mentioned above is, of course, not known.

Actually, the method of handling the interviewing which was used represents admittedly a compromise with the realities of the situation. Little use was made of projective-type devices, but a great deal of experimental effort went into the development of questions that would encourage the respondent to give a full and free expression of his thoughts and feelings about himself and about important aspects of his life situation. In addition

to the prepared questions that were carefully designed to present standard stimuli or complexes of stimuli, neutral or non-directive probes were employed throughout the interview to draw the respondent out as fully as possible.

By rigorous selection and training of interviewers, with persistent emphasis on the importance of establishing rapport with this particular type of respondent, an effort was made to approximate, as closely as could be, given the limitations set forth above, the diagnostic clinical interview. Interviewers who were not quite able to elicit a high degree of confidence and trust on the part of respondents were replaced.

Corresponding care had to be taken in the coding and analytical phases of the study in order to derive from the recorded responses a reasonably accurate classification of the homeless men in terms of important personality differences among them. Two procedures suggested themselves at this point: a statistical and a clinical procedure. The statistical procedure would have required the development of a quantitative index or scale-rating of each respondent with respect to each of the several personality items deemed to be relevant for purposes of the study. Given these detailed ratings, the full range of techniques of scaling -- latent-structure analysis, factor analysis, and analysis of variance -- would presumably have been available for arriving at appropriate classifications. Actually, however, too little clinical material has been statistically analyzed for purposes of classifying personality traits to make this approach feasible. The second approach -- the clinical -- requires that the coders perform substantially the same mental tasks as those performed by the clinical psychologist when he makes a diagnosis. Thus, the coders are instructed to examine the materials developed in the interviews, taking into account every bit of information available, and to arrive at an over-all judgment concerning the correct classification of each respondent in terms of each relevant aspect of his personality. This approach places a heavy responsibility on the coders.

In this study the latter of these approaches -- the clinical -- was adopted. This decision was a logical follow-through from the orientation that had been adopted in the collection of the data. Although this decision made the coding phase of the study very time-consuming, it avoided the necessity of extensive methodological research before the data could be quantified and statistically analyzed; it avoided having to build up statistical scores, item by item, before summary classifications could be devised. Put somewhat differently, the coders' classifications in terms of the predetermined list of personality traits were used directly as statistical codes.¹

¹The author acknowledges with pleasure the very helpful advice and assistance of Dr. Arthur Hartman, Director of Psychology and Research of the Psychiatric Department of the Municipal Court of Chicago. As a clinical psychologist who has perforce made rapid one-sitting diagnostic evaluations of a wide variety of persons brought before the courts (including many homeless men), and also as a psychologist well-informed concerning the use of projective techniques in personality assessment, Dr. Hartman gave much encouragement and many helpful suggestions. He is not, however, to be held responsible for the details of the procedure that was actually followed.

Graduate students in sociology or psychology (who had had formal training in social psychology and/or psychology) were employed as the clinical coders. They were carefully coached on the type of classification that was to be undertaken. Their first coding efforts were checked by the study director and supervisors to make sure they were all following identical definitions. Coders were repeatedly instructed to make each classification independently of the other classifications. Special emphasis was placed upon the necessity of maintaining independence between the drinking classifications and the classifications indicating neurotic or psychotic traits and the other sets of categories.

As was emphasized above, the clinical approach to survey interviewing yielded results that were only rough approximations of what might have been achieved under real clinical conditions; it must also be emphasized that the clinical approach to coding these materials could be expected to yield only rough approximations of the diagnoses that would have been made by professional clinical psychologists. Moreover, the coders were robbed of the rich information of facial expression, tone of voice, and other non-verbal aspects of the communication between interviewer and respondent which a clinical psychologist would have had if he had conducted each interview and then made his own diagnosis.

If this clinical approach to survey research were to be carried to its highest point of refinement, it would call for carefully-selected and highly-trained persons to obtain an interview and then immediately to code it. The experience gained on this project indicates very strongly that graduate students in sociology and psychology can be taught the techniques of clinical psychology well enough to accomplish this with a high level of reliability and validity.

Basic personality traits present in boyhood. While he was describing his family background, the man was asked the following question: "What kind of a person were you when you were 15-20 years old? (Probe: What other traits did you have?)" After all the man had to say about himself had been recorded in full, he was then subjected to eleven additional probes, each dealing with one aspect of personality:

- a. Were you happy or unhappy? (What kinds of things bothered you?)
- b. Did you know then for sure what you wanted to be? (What were your ideas about what you wanted to be then?)
- c. Were you a hard worker, or were you inclined to be easy-going on the job?
- d. Were you restless and always wanting to be on the go? (In what way?)
- e. Did you have a lot of friends, only a few friends, or were you more of a "lone wolf"?
- f. How did you spend your free time?
- g. Did you date girls before you were 20 years old? (IF "YES": How often?)
- h. Did you have any close friends who were boys?
- i. Did you run around a lot with a gang of boys?
- j. Did you have a reputation for having a quick temper? (IF "YES": What kinds of things made you flare up? How angry did you get?)
- k. Did you ever get into trouble with the police when you were young? (IF "YES": What kinds of troubles did you have? Were you arrested? Were you sent to a reformatory or a prison?)

All of the information furnished by the man was pooled, together with all the material available in other parts of the interview, and the coder was asked to identify whether the respondent did or did not have each of several specific personality traits in his youth. These traits were divided into two groups: "positive" traits, which theoretically should have helped to keep the man off Skid Row and away from chronic alcoholism, and "negative" traits, which theoretically might be expected to predispose him toward a Skid Row career. Table 3-1 is a tabulation of the positive traits, and Table 3-2 is a tabulation of the negative traits, each by marital status and by drinking classification. These statistics represent the coder's interpretation of what the man said he was like in his youth. (In some cases what the man actually said in response to Items a through k above was not used if he had given more precise data on some of these points in other parts of the interview.) These tables report the percentage of homeless men in each marital status or drinking classification who possessed each of the positive or negative traits.

Following is a list of positive traits possessed by so many Skid Row men that it must be concluded that they are comparatively ineffective in keeping a man off Skid Row:

	<u>Per cent of all homeless men</u>
Was happy in youth.	81
Had no trouble with police.	80
Had close friends who were boys	79
Was a steady worker, good worker.	77
Did not have a reputation for a quick temper. . .	70
Had many friends, or a few very good friends. . .	65.

The above data indicate that roughly two-thirds of the Skid Row men remember themselves as having lived a very normal boyhood. Their image of themselves is that of having been happy, even-tempered, law-abiding, with normal or above-average willingness to work, and with many friends. It will be recalled from Chapter 1 that they also said they were from normally happy homes where both parents had many admirable characteristics. These two sets of information lead to the very definite conclusion that the great majority of the homeless men feel that in their youth they lived under rather normal conditions.

However, a smaller percentage of the men who were chronic alcoholics (heavy drinkers or alcoholic derelicts) were inclined to report these positive traits (holding marital status constant) than were the men who were light or non-drinkers. (The items concerning friends tend to show no difference with respect to alcoholism.)

A larger percentage of the men who had attempted marriage (especially the widowed men) possessed these positive traits than did the single men.

When the list of negative traits of Table 3-2 is considered, it could be hypothesized that they might predispose a man to migrate to Skid Row, because their proportion among homeless men seems to be much higher than could be expected for the general population:

	Per cent of all <u>homeless men</u>
Did not have a definite occupational goal . . .	50
Was restless, always on the go.	43
Ran with a gang	32
Did not date girls.	25
Had a quick temper.	23
Had only a few friends or no close friends. . .	20
Had some trouble with the police.	14.

The top three items on this list, when taken together, are most revealing. Fully one-half of these men, almost all with average or better intelligence, could not recall ever having "wanted to be something" (even a fireman or a policeman) as a boy. Instead, they were filled with unchanneled energy expressed through restless wanderlust and running with a gang.

The men who remained single possessed the following negative traits to an extraordinary extent, in comparison with ever-married men:

- Had no occupational goal
- Was restless
- Ran with a gang
- Did not date girls
- Had only a few friends.

Men who later became chronic alcoholics possessed the following traits to an unusual degree, in comparison with non-alcoholic Skid Row men (holding marital status constant):

- Was restless
- Ran with a gang
- Had a quick temper
- Had some trouble with the police
- Was not a hard worker, was inclined to loaf.

Free-time activities in youth (Table 3-3). Eleven per cent of the homeless men said they had little or no free time for recreation during their youth. For the vast majority who did have time for recreation, the most popular activities were outdoor sports such as hunting or fishing, going to the movies, and dating. Yet 12 per cent said they loafed in taverns or pool-halls or associated with rough people, and six per cent said they loafed on street-corners. In comparison with ever-married men, the bachelors tended to exhibit the following leisure-time traits to an unusual degree:

- Had no free time for recreation
- Did not participate in sports or outdoor activities
- Engaged in indoor activities such as reading, music
- Did not date girls.

Chronic alcoholics exhibited the following leisure-time traits more frequently than did non-alcoholics, holding marital status constant:

- Loafed in taverns, associated with rough people
- Loafed on street-corners
- Participated in sports
- Attended sports events
- Attended the movies
- Dated girls more than once per week.

Summary. The general picture which one gets of the personality of the homeless man as a boy is that he was happy and well-adjusted in the boyhood situation but that he lacked occupational orientation, was restless, and ran with a gang. His free-time activity was of a physically active or "thrilling" type, with very little emphasis on vocational or avocational preparation. Those of this group who were more withdrawn, who did not date girls, or who had less free time because of the necessity to work, ended by coming to Skid Row as bachelors. Those who dated girls often, were quick-tempered, had trouble with the police, were inclined to be a little lazy, and/or who loafed on street-corners and in taverns, tended to become chronic alcoholics on Skid Row.

Mental abilities of Skid Row men. It was impossible, of course, to measure exactly the mental ability of the homeless men. A rough attempt was made, however, by giving two very short tests, an arithmetic test and a word test, as follows:

Arithmetic test: "Here are some problems like they used to give you in school. See if you can remember them:

$3 \times 3 =$
 $9 \times 9 =$
 $6+4+9 =$
 $11 \times 11 =$
 $56 \div 7 =$ "

/Score: Number of correct answers, from none to five.7

Word test: "And here are some words they used to teach you in reading. Do you still remember what they mean?"

/ Level of ability

a. eyelash roar scorch	DEFICIENT
b. muzzle haste	BORDERLINE
c. lecture Mars skill	DULL
d. juggler brunette regard	AVERAGE
e. lotus incrustation achromatic"	SUPERIOR <u>7</u>

This test was adopted, without change, from the Department of Psychiatry, Municipal Court, City of Chicago. The ratings of the level of mental ability indicated by the words were also adopted without change. It was not possible to administer these tests to a substantial share of the men. Several men of foreign birth were literate only in a language other than English. Several men refused to try because they were afraid they could not succeed.

At the time the interview was conducted, the interviewer was asked to rate the respondent's intelligence, independent of the test results, in one of the following categories:

Superior intelligence (should have gone to college)
Quick, alert, intelligent
Average
Dull, borderline intelligence
Deficient -- feeble-minded, moronic.

These three sets of information are presented as Tables 3-4, 3-5, and 3-6, respectively.

Arithmetic score (Table 3-4). With respect to the arithmetic score, almost one-fourth of the men who were asked the questions were able to get all of the answers correct. An additional one-fourth missed only one. Only one-fourth were so poor at arithmetic that they were able to get none or only one item correct. This would suggest that roughly one-half of the men remembered their third-grade arithmetic adequately, even though they may have had little occasion to use it for a long time. But at least one-fourth of the men were unmistakably deficient even at this simple level, and an additional one-fourth were "weak." About 12 per cent were mathematically illiterate, being unable to answer none or only the item "3 x 3."

Reading test (Table 3-5). On the reading test, only about one-fifth of the men were rated as below-average, while about 40 per cent were rated as above-average or superior. An additional one-fourth were rated as average.

Interviewers' rating of intelligence (Table 3-6). The interviewers tended to be a little less generous in their estimates of mental ability than the tests. Instead of rating only eight per cent as being "dull" or "borderline," they rated 18 per cent in one or the other of these categories (almost all in the "dull" category). They rated almost one-half as being "average" and more than 30 per cent as being above-average in intelligence. Thus, all three forms of evidence agreed that the average mental ability of Skid Row men is somewhat above average and that only 15 to 25 per cent of the men are dull, borderline, or deficient in their mental ability. It is not lack of brainpower, apparently, that is primarily responsible for most of the men being on Skid Row.

The bachelors of Skid Row showed a lower level of mental ability than the ever-married men. They scored lower on the two tests, and the interviewers tended to rate fewer of them in the "superior" or "above-average" group. However, the widower group tended to rate lower in mental ability than did either the single or the separated or divorced men, by all three measures.

In comparison with non-alcoholics on Skid Row, the chronic alcoholics definitely rated higher in mental ability than did the non-alcoholic men. This was a most consistent relationship in all three measures, with differences in marital status controlled. Therefore, not only are Skid Row men of average or above-average intelligence, but the chronic alcoholics on Skid Row are more intelligent, on the average, than the Skid Row men who are not chronic alcoholics. It is clear that with respect to mental ability, at least 80 per cent of the homeless men would have been capable of holding down a good job and performing as any other member of society if other factors had not been involved. This is a highly positive factor that should be taken into account in planning for their rehabilitation.

Did the man enjoy school? (Table 3-7). About two-thirds of the men who answered this question said that they did enjoy school. In view of their lower average mental ability, it would be expected that a higher percentage of the Skid Row bachelors would report that they did not like school, and this was the case. However, despite their above-average intelligence, a disproportionately large number of chronic alcoholics said they did not like school. Without attempting to assess responsibility, this finding suggests that a substantial number of chronic alcoholics on Skid Row are men of above-average intelligence or of average intelligence whom the school did not "reach" or "inspire." Although they were completely capable of completing high school, most of these men dropped out during grammar-school or early high-school years.

Mental health of homeless men. Scattered through the interview were several questions which, considered together, provided sufficient information for the coders to classify each man into one of the following four very broad categories:¹

	<u>Per cent of all homeless men</u>
Normal mental health	38
Aberrant (has some "odd" personality traits but not sufficiently disorganized to be classed as neurotic).	36
Neurotic	16
Psychotic.	4.

One homeless man in five was rated as definitely neurotic or psychotic, while an additional 36 per cent were rated as aberrant, or with some "odd" or "queer" personality traits not sufficiently disorganizing to be classed as neurotic or psychotic tendencies. There was too little information to classify about five per cent of the men. Thus, only a few more than one-third of the men on Skid Row are of average or normal mental health, a little more than one-third show aberrant traits, and 20 per cent are definitely in need of mental-health care.

¹In addition to those of Tables 3-9 and 3-10, items used to determine this mental-health rating were:

Hypochondria -- reporting three or more current physical ailments that had not been disabling and for which no medical care had been sought.

Tattoos -- in connection with other symptoms, are thought by psychologists to symbolize personal disorders.

Military punishment -- types of offenses while in military service.

Questions:

Do you ever see strange things like visions, fairies, ghosts, or things like that?

Do you have any extraordinary powers or abilities not possessed by other persons?

Do you ever hear people talking to you or about you when there is no one around?

If you were asked to describe yourself, what kind of a person would you say you are?

Do you think there are some people who want to hurt you? What kind of people are they?

Are there any special kinds of people you hate?

If you had your life to live over again, what kinds of things would you do differently?

If you could make three wishes and they would all be granted, what would you ask for?

Interviewers' ratings on: mood, talkativeness, aggressive behavior, anxiety, delusions, and hallucinations.

Interviewers' ratings of the degree of personal maladjustment of the men.

The questions in the above list were scattered at several different points in the interview, so as to reduce threat to the respondent.

Table 3-9 and Table 3-10, which represent responses of the men to specific questions, are presented to help substantiate the ratings of the coders. When asked, "How are your nerves?", "Are you inclined to be nervous or on edge?", "How often do you feel this way?", roughly one-half of the men reported that they were "almost never" nervous, whereas 22 per cent reported they felt nervous "frequently" or "most of the time." This is significant because "feeling nervous" is a phrase which neurotic persons commonly use to describe their symptoms. The men were also asked (much later in the interview), "Have you ever seen a doctor or psychiatrist or been in the hospital because of a nervous condition?" Table 3-10 summarizes the responses to this item. One man in six (16 per cent) reported he had been given medical attention because of a nervous condition. About one-half of this group had been examined by a psychiatrist, either in an office or while in the hospital.

If Tables 3-8, 3-9, and 3-10 are examined to determine the relationship of mental health to marital status and chronic alcoholism, it is found that widowed men have much better mental health, on an average, than separated and divorced or unmarried men. (The mental health of single men and separated and divorced men was roughly equal.) Holding marital status constant, it is evident that all but a small fraction of chronic alcoholics suffer from poor mental health. The proportion of psychotics or neurotics among the chronic alcoholics was more than twice that of the teetotalers or light drinkers, and in addition, a much higher percentage of chronic alcoholics were classified as having "aberrant" personalities.

Interviewers' ratings of personality adjustment (Table 3-11). At the conclusion of each interview, the interviewer was asked to rate the respondent's personality adjustment. The term "personality adjustment" was defined in terms of ability to participate in social situations without an unusual degree of interpersonal conflict. The results of the interviewers' reports are as follows:

	Per cent of all homeless men
Man has always been well-adjusted, still is . .	24
Man was maladjusted in past but is adjusted now	1
Man was once well-adjusted but not now.	15
Man was never well-adjusted but formerly was better adjusted than now	24
Man was always poorly adjusted.	32.

Thus, the interviewers believed that three-fourths of the homeless men were suffering from personal maladjustment. In comparison with the ever-married men, they tended to classify an extraordinarily high percentage of bachelors as "always poorly adjusted," while in a disproportionately large number of cases they tended to classify the separated or divorced men as "once well-adjusted but not now." The interviewers rated only six per cent of the chronic alcoholics as still well-adjusted and more than 70 per cent of them as never well-adjusted.

Integration of personality and internal conflict (Table 3-12).

The coders were asked to assess the degree to which the men were disorganized because of internal conflicts operating at the time they were interviewed. According to their estimates, only 29 per cent of the men evidenced no internal conflict. One-half were rated as somewhat disorganized because of internal conflict, while 16 per cent were rated as badly disorganized because of internal conflict. Men who were separated or divorced were rated as more disorganized than single men, while widowed men were rated as experiencing less conflict than either single or separated and divorced men.

Only nine per cent of the chronic alcoholics were rated as showing no internal conflict, and 31 per cent were thought to be badly disorganized by conflict. The reverse situation was observed for teetotalers and light drinkers; only eight per cent of this group were rated as having severe conflict, while 42 per cent appeared to be without internal conflict.

Hence, the analysis of the responses of the men themselves, the interviewers' ratings of personality adjustment, and the coders' ratings of psychotic or neurotic traits and degree of internal conflict all indicate that a high percentage of Skid Row men are in poor mental health and are poorly adjusted in their relationships to other people. The chronic alcoholics are in far worse condition than the teetotalers and light drinkers.-- a disproportionately large share exhibit symptoms of psychosis, neurosis, or personal maladjustment with respect to other people.

Personality characteristics. In addition to the over-all evaluations of intelligence and mental health, the coders were asked to classify each homeless man according to a series of basic personality characteristics. In the analysis which follows, the relationship of these characteristics to marital status or chronic alcoholism (with marital status held constant) is assessed.

Emotional stability (Table 3-13). The coders were asked to indicate the degree of emotional control exercised by each man. More than one-half (56 per cent) of the men were classed as emotionally stable, while almost 40 per cent were classified as unstable. Of the unstable group, almost one-fifth were identified as having violent tempers, while the others were regarded as unstable with respect to other emotional reactions. Men who were separated or divorced were rated as less emotionally stable than were men who were single, while widowed men were rated as much more emotionally stable than either single or separated or divorced men. Holding marital status constant, men who were chronic alcoholics were much less stable than teetotalers or light drinkers. Both those with violent tempers and those unstable with respect to other emotional factors were chronic alcoholics in a disproportionately high share of cases.

Extroversion-introversion (Table 3-14). Although two-thirds of the men on Skid Row were rated as being ambiverts (neither extroverted nor introverted, but varying as the situation requires), more than one-fifth were rated as introverts and only ten per cent as extroverts. The men who had never married or who were widowed were rated as introverts much more frequently than were the men who had been separated or divorced. Chronic

alcoholics were rated as extroverts relatively more often than were teetotalers or light drinkers, although the percentage of extrovert alcoholics still was not large (14 per cent). When the relationship between drinking and this classification is controlled by marital status, it is found that the equivalent of all of the excess extrovert chronic alcoholics are unmarried. The excess of introverts among the teetotalers and light drinkers was present both among the single and the separated and divorced men.

Conformity (Table 3-15). Each man was rated according to the degree to which he appeared to be a conformist or nonconformist with respect to social norms. Many people have regarded Skid Row men as being "social rebels" who delight in defying social rules of accepted or customary behavior. Only three per cent of all homeless men could be classed by the coders as definitely nonconformists, while there was evidence that 47 per cent were conformists. An additional 43 per cent were categorized as not strongly influenced by custom but not rebels. Widowed men were classified as conformists more frequently than were single or separated or divorced men. Teetotalers or light drinkers were found to be conformists more often than were chronic alcoholics. However, only a very small percentage of the chronic alcoholics (six per cent) could be classed as definite rebels or nonconformists; the bulk of this group just was not strongly influenced by custom. Thus, although there is a low level of compliance with social norms, this non-compliance appears to be based on lack of knowledge or concern (or both), but not on rebellion.

Hedonism-asceticism (Table 3-16). It has been said that one of the reasons men land on Skid Row is that they are hedonistic -- their primary motive is to satisfy today's needs for pleasure rather than to defer present joys in the expectation of later rewards. When asked to classify the men on a scale containing the three categories of "hedonistic," "normal," or "ascetic" (given to self-denial), the coders graded almost 60 per cent of the men as normal, but of the remainder, almost all were rated as hedonistic. Thus, there appear to be few ascetics living on Skid Row who deny themselves a more comfortable residence in order to save money, etc. Occasionally one hears of a miser who lives in this area and hoards pennies while growing rich off stock-market, real estate, or other business operations, but these cases are definitely exceptional. Immediate-pleasure-seeking seems to be a definite personality characteristic of almost one-third of the men. The bachelors were rated as more ascetic than the ever-married men. Few of the widowed men were classified as hedonistic, whereas an above-average proportion of the separated or divorced men were given this rating.

Hedonism seems to be an outstanding trait of chronic alcoholics, for almost two-thirds of the men were given this rating by the coders. (Coders were warned that drinking itself was not to be regarded as a symptom of hedonism.) Almost none of the teetotalers and light drinkers were classified as hedonistic.

Dependency-self-reliance (Table 3-17). Homeless men have often been said to have "dependent" personalities. By this it is meant that they need to rely on someone who is more forthright and decisive than they to guide them and to make decisions for them. The coders were asked to

review the relationship between each respondent and his parents, his spouse, and other persons with whom he had had close associations, to determine the extent to which he was dependent. Fifty-nine per cent of the men were rated as dependent to some degree, and 19 per cent as "very dependent." Widowed men were classed as "self-reliant" in more than one-half of the cases, whereas both the single and the separated and divorced men showed a high level of dependency. The alcoholic men were rated as considerably more dependent than the teetotalers or light drinkers. In fact, 30 per cent of chronic alcoholics were rated as "very dependent." Although this relationship was present among both single and separated or divorced men, the correlation between alcoholism and dependency appeared to be much higher among the bachelors than among the men with broken marriages.

Ambition (Table 3-18). From the work history of the men, their comments about the jobs liked and disliked, and their reasons for leaving one job and accepting another, the coders pieced together an ambition rating. This classification had four categories and should be of interest to those who plan to do rehabilitation work among these men:

	Per cent of all homeless men
Very ambitious, energetic, hard-working	7
Average level of ambition, striving to get ahead	50
Low level of incentive, little drive.	36
Very low level of ambition, lazy, "bum"	3
Unable to classify.	5.

Widowed men received a much higher ambition rating than separated or divorced men.

When cross-classified by drinking behavior, the findings show a very high correlation between low ambition and chronic alcoholism. Almost no chronic alcoholics were classed as ambitious, energetic, or hard-working, while more than one-half were rated as having low incentive or little drive. Teetotalers and light drinkers showed the reverse pattern -- a much higher level of ambition and lower percentage of "low drive." It should be noted, however, that 42 per cent of all chronic alcoholics were rated as having an average level of ambition or striving, and that 30 per cent of the teetotalers or light drinkers were rated either "low incentive" or "lazy." Thus, it is not an all-or-none relationship. Also, there is no answer here concerning the cause-and-effect problem between low ambition and heavy drinking. It can be claimed only that, throughout their working lives, men who are chronic alcoholics on Skid Row have never shown a really extraordinarily powerful ambition drive, and a below-average share of them even showed a normal or average amount of drive.

Sociability (Table 3-19). It has also been claimed that Skid Row is a collecting-place for people who hate other human beings and who are anti-social. By retreating to Skid Row a man can "pull into his shell" and have a minimum of social interaction. To test this idea the coders were asked to review the description each man gave of his life before coming to Skid Row, his "typical day" on Skid Row, the number and types of friends he

had, and what he did for recreation, and, on the basis of this information, to classify him as being either "sociable," "asocial," or "anti-social." This classification was made with respect to the man's attitude toward associating with people generally and not just with the people on Skid Row. More than one-half of the men (56 per cent) were rated as "sociable," while 33 per cent were rated as "asocial," and only four per cent were rated as definitely "anti-social." Thus, although there seems to be very little avoidance of human contact on the part of Skid Row men, a substantial share of them can "take it or leave it alone" when it comes to having friends or communicating with other human beings. The bachelors were definitely more asocial and anti-social than were the men who had been married. The correlation between sociability and drinking, holding marital status constant, was almost zero. Thus, the heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts are no more and no less sociable, according to these data, than are light drinkers or teetotalers.

Assimilation into life on Skid Row (Table 3-20). How well have the men managed to adjust themselves to Skid Row, to reconcile themselves to living there, and to feel "a part of things" there? By reviewing each man's likes and dislikes for the life on Skid Row and the people who live there, together with his projected evaluation of himself in relation to his opinions of Skid Row, the coders rated each man as "assimilated," "accommodated" (adjusted but not reconciled), or a "stranger" (feeling of intense dislike that could not be reconciled or adjusted). Only one-fourth of the men could be rated as definitely assimilated into Skid Row life, but 48 per cent were rated as accommodated -- they were "getting by." Twenty per cent were rated as feeling like strangers who could never get reconciled or adjusted to Skid Row life. The bachelors were assimilated in a higher percentage of cases than were the ever-married men, while the widowers were much less assimilated than either the bachelors or the men with broken marriages.

Teetotalers and light drinkers were rated as strangers in a higher percentage of cases than chronic alcoholics. Chronic alcoholics, however, tend to be only accommodated to, but not assimilated into, Skid Row living; 50 per cent of them claimed they were living on Skid Row unwillingly -- that they were more resigned to it than enamored of it.

Attitude toward self (Table 3-21). It was hypothesized that the men could have three possible attitudes toward themselves as a result of being on Skid Row. They could indulge in self-hate while accepting full blame for their failure; feel self-pity while excusing themselves for what had happened and rationalizing their failures; or they could feel self-respect, believing that they had done as well as could be expected under the circumstances (including those who did not sense they had failed). Table 3-21 classifies each man according to the rating the coder gave him on this scale. Almost one-half of the men seemed to feel respect for themselves. On the other hand, 28 per cent were rated as feeling self-pity and 18 per cent as feeling self-hate. The separated or divorced men were much more prone to feel self-hate and self-pity than were the single men, while the widowers felt very much more self-respect (and hence less self-hate or self-pity) than either the single men or the men with broken marriages.

The chronic alcoholics showed a very low level of self-respect. More than one-third expressed self-hate, and an additional one-third expressed self-pity. In fact, of those for whom a rating could be made, more than three-fourths expressed one of these two attitudes, and only 20 per cent were rated as feeling they had done as well as could have been expected. Among teetotalers the situation was quite different; almost two-thirds of this group felt self-respect, and most of the rest felt self-pity. Only eight per cent expressed self-hate and the attitude that they were fully responsible for their being on Skid Row.

Summary. This chapter has presented strong evidence that individual personality characteristics, quite independent of family background and courtship and marriage factors, are highly correlated with the presence of homeless men on Skid Row. Skid Row alcoholics tend to be men who in their youth were filled with wanderlust and comparatively below-average levels of aspiration or ambition to "get ahead"; who were inclined to run around with a "tough crowd" -- traveled in gangs, spent time in taverns and pool-halls, boycotted school, looked for a good time without much concern for the future. Skid Row alcoholics show much evidence of being in poor mental health; a high percentage indicate deviant personality traits that, in roughly one-third of the cases, are serious enough to cause the person to be classed as neurotic or psychotic. Alcoholics were shown not to be deficient in intelligence, and they are probably considerably above-average in intelligence in comparison with the social and economic strata from which they are drawn. With reference to specific personality traits, chronic alcoholics were shown to be more extroverted, less conformist, more hedonistic, more dependent, less ambitious, more sociable, more assimilated into Skid Row life, and more inclined to feel self-hate than teetotalers and light drinkers. These personality characteristics, combined with irregular employment or prolonged unemployment, low level of living, an unhappy family background or a family where the father drank or was himself disorganized, or marital discord (perhaps because of personal poor mental health) probably constitute the best possible "explanation" of Skid Row alcoholism that can be made at the present time.

SYNTHESIS OF CHAPTERS 1, 2, AND 3:

Conditions That Existed Before Arrival on Skid Row

Throughout the last three chapters several factors have been discussed as potential "causes" for a man's being on Skid Row. At times it has not been clear to what extent these conditions existed before the man came to Skid Row and to what extent they were developed after he arrived there. The matter of drinking is of paramount importance in this connection. The coder was asked to review the respondent's drinking history carefully and to determine whether chronic alcoholism existed before the man came to Skid Row or whether it developed after he arrived. Table 3-22 shows that in 84 per cent of the cases of chronic alcoholism, the man had a severe drinking problem before coming to Skid Row, that in 9 per cent of the cases the man acquired the drinking habit after he arrived, and that in 7 per cent of the cases the timing could not be determined. These proportions indicate that of the 3,000 chronic alcoholics on Chicago Skid Rows, roughly 2,600 had a drinking problem before they came, while about 300 became alcoholic as a result of (or at least while) living on Skid Row. Therefore, although Skid Row can be criticized for embroiling a man even deeper in alcoholism and allowing him to drink so incessantly and to such a degree of intoxication that rehabilitation is almost a hopeless matter, it cannot be claimed that more than a few hundreds of alcoholics are "born" on Skid Row. Of the men who did begin their drinking careers on Skid Row, roughly one-half appear to have done so out of the desire to be sociable, and one-half to escape conflict or ease other personal problems. Conspicuous among the latter group are the widowers.

This analysis makes it abundantly clear that the way to prevent Skid Row alcoholism is to take action to help the man with a drinking problem before he separates himself from his family or neighborhood; when he arrives on Skid Row because of drinking, he has progressed far toward alcoholic dereliction.

But, as this study has attempted to make clear, alcoholism is not the only force that helps to create Skid Row, and in fact is not even the leading one. A list of twenty different conditions or factors that might be thought to help "cause" a man to come to Skid Row was drawn up. The coder was instructed to search the entire interview, including the information and ratings of the interviewer, to determine whether each one of these factors was or was not present in the case of the homeless man. Some of these factors refer to family background, some to courtship and marriage, and some to psychological factors. Table 3-23 summarizes the results. Following, in order of frequency of rating, are the conditions which existed in the lives of the men before they arrived on Skid Row, as rated by the coders:

	Per cent of all homeless men		
	Total	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts	Teeto- talers and light drinkers
Irregular employment or unemployment (not due to drinking)	42	28	49
Chronic alcoholism, problem drinking.	38	85	9
Marital discord	28	41	19
Low standard (level) of living.	27	23	33
Social maladjustment.	26	35	22
Wanderlust, restlessness.	25	39	17
Emotional instability	20	37	10
Discontinuance of family (death of wife or parent).	16	14	15
Poor health, impairment of eyesight	10	6	15
Cultural conflict because of ethnic, religious background	10	2	15
Conflict with relatives other than wife	8	10	7
Poverty as a child.	8	6	10
Physical handicaps.	7	3	10
Failure in realizing ambitions.	6	8	6
Poverty in old age, too old to work, limited income, not a heavy drinker.	6	1	12
Extreme egocentricity (self-centered)	6	7	7
Criminal record	5	6	4
Borderline intelligence	3	2	4
Laziness.	2	3	2
Orphanhood.	2	2	2
None of the above: evaluation impossible	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
Average number of causes per homeless man.	3.0	3.6	2.7

As the last two lines of the table indicate, one or more of these causes appeared to be operating in all but about three per cent of cases. But the "causes" were not unitary. On the average, for each homeless man three of these causes appeared to be operating in combination. Heading this list, and much greater than alcoholism, are the hard facts of economic life. Our system seems to create a residue of chronic (though not necessarily culpable) losers, and Skid Row is the home of many of this group. Irregular employment, unemployment, and low income, taken together, seem far more powerful than alcoholism in explaining why people come to Skid Row. Moreover, it is commonly supposed that economic failure is, itself, involved in much uncontrolled drinking. If one looks for signs that the man is reaping punishment for his own miscalculations, misdeeds, and mistakes in his past life,

one can point only to such items as wanderlust, failure to realize ambitions, criminal record, and laziness (assuming that alcoholism is not a voluntary act). Even if all of these were not duplicated (if no man had two of these traits), only about one-third of the men would be involved. It seems that the Skid Row resident is differentiated from the "normal" or "average" citizen more by the differing conditions of economic life than by matters of personality, intelligence, or personal background, when separately considered. If the findings presented in these three chapters are correct, the "average" citizen, standing on Skid Row pitying its victims, can truthfully say, "There, but for the grace of God, go I."

TABLE 3-1

POSITIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS POSSESSED
BY HOMELESS MEN IN THEIR YOUTH

Per cent of men possessing each trait

Positive traits in youth	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Happy	81.3	80.4	85.5	88.3	84.6	73.9	82.8
Had definite occupational goal.	42.4	37.1	47.3	51.0	41.2	42.0	44.2
Hard worker, good (steady) worker.	77.1	74.8	81.6	86.2	85.8	67.0	73.0
Was not restless.	44.0	40.4	47.0	55.9	56.2	42.0	28.5
Had many friends or a few very good friends.	64.5	60.8	70.4	69.7	62.9	59.8	70.8
Dated girls, more than one time per week.	36.1	24.7	47.5	37.9	27.6	35.7	48.6
Dated girls, one to four times per month.	30.6	35.3	27.3	35.9	31.2	29.1	31.0
Had close friends who were boys.	79.3	79.4	82.9	84.8	79.2	75.4	82.8
Did not run around with a gang	58.4	56.9	61.1	67.6	67.8	54.4	48.4
Did not have reputation for quick temper	70.2	75.9	71.7	61.4	78.5	65.8	61.9
Did not have trouble with police.	79.6	81.9	81.3	85.5	87.7	73.3	73.5
No information.	6.4	4.7	3.1	2.1	2.6	15.3	4.4

TABLE 3-2

NEGATIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS POSSESSED
BY HOMELESS MEN IN THEIR YOUTH

Per cent of men possessing each trait

Negative traits in youth	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Not happy	5.2	4.9	5.7	5.5	5.0	4.8	5.7
Did not have definite occupational goal. . .	50.1	56.5	49.6	42.8	54.1	41.7	51.4
Not a hard worker, in- clined to loaf, take it easy.	12.5	15.7	11.1	9.7	8.1	12.0	18.9
Was restless.	43.4	47.2	45.4	32.4	32.1	40.2	61.9
Did not have many friends, "lone wolf" type	8.0	7.4	10.2	3.4	9.5	6.3	7.4
Had only a few friends.	20.3	26.6	15.8	22.8	23.4	18.6	17.4
Did not date girls. . .	25.0	33.4	20.2	22.1	37.1	18.0	13.5
Had no close friends who were boys.	12.5	13.8	12.6	11.0	15.9	9.3	10.3
Ran with a gang	31.9	36.7	30.7	28.3	26.3	27.6	43.2
Had reputation for quick temper	23.1	19.4	24.9	34.5	18.0	18.9	33.7
Had some trouble with police	13.7	13.4	15.7	10.3	9.2	11.4	22.1
No information.	6.4	4.7	3.1	2.1	2.6	15.3	4.4

TABLE 3-3

LEISURE-TIME ACTIVITIES OF HOMELESS MEN DURING THEIR YOUTH
Per cent of men having each activity

Leisure-time activities in youth	All homeless men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Had little or no free time	10.6	13.8	10.2	4.1	12.7	11.7	6.9
Participated in sports.	41.6	35.7	46.4	53.1	41.6	37.2	45.2
Observed sports	8.4	7.8	8.6	12.4	9.5	5.1	9.6
Outdoor activities, hunting, fishing, etc.	36.6	32.2	40.2	46.2	36.4	41.4	32.9
Movies.	24.8	23.5	26.0	31.0	22.2	25.2	28.3
Indoor activities, reading, music, games, church, family	16.9	19.6	14.4	22.1	17.5	15.9	16.7
Loafing on street-corners, lazy.	6.0	7.8	6.3	-	6.4	2.7	8.1
Loafing in taverns, pool-halls, associating with rough people.	11.5	9.3	14.2	10.3	6.1	9.9	20.4
Went to parties, dating, dances	20.4	16.3	22.9	29.7	16.1	22.8	24.6
Other, studied.	0.9	1.4	0.8	-	0.9	0.6	1.2
Boys' clubs, worked on cars, machinery.	1.8	1.4	2.7	-	2.1	1.5	1.7
No information.	10.6	11.1	6.0	5.5	8.1	19.8	6.6

TABLE 3-4

MENTAL ABILITY OF HOMELESS MEN
AS DETERMINED BY ARITHMETIC TEST

Score	All homeless men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
None correct.	3.8	3.9	3.4	6.2	6.7	2.2	1.3
One correct	9.9	10.5	8.7	12.9	8.4	13.2	9.5
Two correct	12.7	13.2	12.6	13.5	14.7	8.6	13.1
Three correct	18.3	16.4	20.0	23.0	16.7	17.9	20.6
Four correct.	21.2	21.8	22.9	15.7	20.2	17.5	25.1
Five correct.	21.9	20.3	26.3	14.0	16.6	28.0	24.2
No information*	12.2	13.9	6.1	14.6	16.6	12.7	6.1

*Foreign-born with severe language difficulty are in "No information" -- question not asked.

TABLE 3-5

MENTAL ABILITY OF HOMELESS MEN
AS DETERMINED BY READING TEST

Mental ability	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Deficient	6.1	6.6	5.9	4.5	6.9	5.5	5.6
Borderline.	2.1	2.2	1.8	3.4	2.2	2.6	1.6
Dull.	11.1	9.6	12.2	14.6	13.6	8.4	9.7
Average	25.5	26.9	26.7	20.2	24.7	24.4	27.5
Above average	32.7	30.0	37.4	30.9	23.5	38.8	40.4
Superior.	5.9	5.1	7.6	3.4	5.3	4.8	7.7
No information*	16.6	19.6	8.3	23.0	23.9	15.6	7.5

*Foreign-born with severe language difficulty are in "No information" -- question not asked.

TABLE 3-6

MENTAL ABILITY OF HOMELESS MEN
AS RATED BY INTERVIEWERS

Level of intelligence	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Deficient	0.7	1.2	-	-	1.2	0.7	-
Dull, borderline.	17.9	20.0	16.8	12.4	20.5	13.9	17.4
Average	47.5	47.3	45.0	60.7	48.3	51.7	43.3
Quick, alert.	24.1	23.0	27.4	20.2	21.2	22.5	29.3
Superior.	7.3	6.5	9.3	3.4	6.3	7.9	8.1
Not able to evaluate.	2.5	2.0	1.4	3.4	2.4	3.3	2.0

TABLE 3-7

HOMELESS MEN'S ENJOYMENT OF SCHOOL
DURING THEIR YOUTH:

Did respondent enjoy school?	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Yes	64.7	56.1	72.7	75.9	66.7	64.0	62.4
No.	27.2	35.7	23.9	17.9	25.8	21.3	33.9
Did not go to school. .	2.6	4.5	0.3	6.2	5.4	0.9	-
No information.	5.5	3.7	3.1	-	2.1	13.8	3.7

TABLE 3-8

MENTAL HEALTH OF HOMELESS MEN AS RATED BY CODERS

Mental health status	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts.
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Normal.	38.5	37.6	35.8	61.8	53.7	39.5	17.4
Aberrant.	36.2	39.3	37.5	21.9	30.2	35.6	44.5
Neurotic.	16.0	14.5	19.7	9.6	9.7	12.9	26.6
Psychotic.	4.4	5.5	3.3	3.4	4.3	3.6	5.0
Unable to classify. . .	5.0	3.1	3.7	3.4	2.0	8.4	6.5

TABLE 3-9

RESPONSES TO QUESTION, "HOW ARE YOUR NERVES?"

How often do you feel nervous or on edge?	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Almost never nervous. .	49.9	50.5	45.4	61.2	62.2	53.8	30.7
Occasionally.	27.3	30.5	27.9	13.5	23.5	28.5	31.4
Frequently.	9.8	9.7	9.9	10.1	6.6	7.7	15.6
Most of the time. . . .	12.5	8.8	16.2	15.2	7.7	10.0	20.8
No information.	0.5	0.4	0.7	-	-	-	1.4

TABLE 3-10

EXTENT TO WHICH HOMELESS MEN HAVE RECEIVED
TREATMENT FOR NERVOUS DISORDERS

Treatment received for nervous conditions	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No treatment.	82.0	85.9	78.2	91.6	90.6	82.8	70.0
Saw medical doctor* . . .	2.0	1.5	2.2	3.4	1.9	2.2	2.0
Saw psychiatrist.	3.2	2.7	3.8	3.4	1.2	3.8	5.3
Was in hospital	6.4	5.7	8.8	-	4.3	3.3	11.3
Saw psychiatrist and was in hospital.	4.7	3.8	6.6	-	2.0	2.2	10.2
No information.	1.7	0.4	0.4	1.7	-	5.7	1.1

* Excludes men in hospital.

TABLE 3-11

PERSONALITY ADJUSTMENT OF HOMELESS MEN
AS RATED BY INTERVIEWERS

Adjustment situation	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Always well-adjusted. . .	24.3	24.6	19.2	48.3	37.4	24.9	6.5
Maladjusted in past but not now.	0.5	0.8	0.3	-	0.4	0.7	0.4
Once well-adjusted but not now.	14.9	9.6	21.8	10.1	11.7	13.6	19.9
Never well-adjusted but formerly in better shape.	24.1	22.6	27.9	17.4	17.8	25.6	31.2
Always poorly-adjusted. .	32.1	38.4	28.9	20.8	29.0	27.5	39.5
Unable to classify. . . .	4.3	4.1	1.8	3.4	3.6	7.7	2.5

TABLE 3-12

DEGREE OF PERSONALITY INTEGRATION AND EXTENT OF
INTERNAL CONFLICT AMONG HOMELESS MEN

Integration and conflict status	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Well-organized, little internal conflict. . .	28.8	29.9	23.7	52.8	42.2	31.1	9.3
Somewhat disorganized. .	49.1	53.0	51.2	30.9	45.7	45.9	55.8
Badly disorganized, much tension, conflict	16.5	12.8	21.4	11.2	7.6	12.9	31.1
Unable to classify. . .	5.6	4.3	3.7	5.1	4.5	10.0	3.8

TABLE 3-13

EMOTIONAL STABILITY OF HOMELESS MEN
AS RATED BY CODERS

Emotional stability status	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Emotionally stable, normal control	56.4	60.0	52.0	71.9	71.8	56.2	35.9
Emotionally unstable, violent temper	7.1	6.6	6.4	10.1	5.1	6.5	10.1
Emotionally unstable, other than anger reactions.	32.1	31.6	37.6	16.3	20.9	27.3	50.8
Unable to classify. . .	4.4	1.8	3.9	1.7	2.2	10.0	3.2

TABLE 3-14

EXTROVERT-INTROVERT RATING OF HOMELESS MEN BY CODERS

Extrovert-introvert status	All homeless men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Extrovert	9.6	10.4	10.0	6.7	8.2	6.2	14.0
Ambivert.	63.3	60.5	68.6	64.0	62.6	64.8	63.0
Introvert	21.9	25.9	18.0	24.2	26.7	18.4	18.0
Unable to classify. . .	5.2	3.1	3.4	5.1	2.4	10.5	5.0

TABLE 3-15

CONFORMIST-NONCONFORMIST RATING OF HOMELESS MEN BY CODERS

Conformist-nonconformist status	All homeless men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Conformist.	46.6	45.3	46.7	61.8	60.2	45.9	29.1
Not strongly influenced by custom but not a rebel.	42.9	47.8	42.1	29.3	32.1	42.1	57.8
Nonconformist	2.8	2.7	2.5	5.1	1.6	0.7	5.9
Unable to classify. . .	7.7	4.2	8.7	3.4	6.1	11.2	7.2

TABLE 3-16

HEDONISM-ASCETICISM RATING OF HOMELESS MEN BY CODERS

Hedonism-asceticism status	All homeless men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Hedonistic.	29.3	26.9	38.0	6.7	9.4	19.9	62.8
Normal.	58.7	59.9	53.9	83.7	77.6	64.1	29.6
Ascetic	2.7	4.9	0.8	2.8	4.9	1.4	0.9
Unable to classify. . .	9.2	8.4	7.2	6.7	8.1	14.6	6.6

TABLE 3-17

PERSONALITY DEPENDENCY RATING OF HOMELESS MEN BY CODERS

Dependency-self-reliance status	All homeless men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Self-reliant.	36.0	36.4	32.9	55.1	45.9	35.4	23.2
Somewhat dependent. . .	39.3	38.2	43.8	30.9	37.7	37.8	42.5
Very dependent.	19.3	21.2	20.0	9.0	12.7	17.0	29.8
Unable to classify. . .	5.5	4.2	3.3	5.1	3.8	9.8	4.5

TABLE 3-18

AMBITION RATING OF HOMELESS MEN BY CODERS

Level of ambition	All homeless men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Very ambitious, energetic, hard-working. .	6.7	5.9	6.4	12.4	11.7	5.5	0.9
Average level of ambition, striving . .	49.6	48.5	50.3	59.0	53.8	51.9	42.4
Low level of incentive, little drive	35.8	37.8	37.8	27.0	27.9	32.8	48.7
Very low level of ambition, lazy, "bum". . .	2.6	4.1	1.4	-	2.3	0.7	4.3
Unable to classify. . .	5.2	3.6	4.1	1.7	4.2	9.1	3.8

TABLE 3-19

SOCIABILITY RATING OF HOMELESS MEN BY CODERS

Sociability rating	All homeless men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sociable.	56.2	51.4	61.2	66.9	56.8	57.7	54.2
Asocial	32.8	39.9	29.3	24.7	33.5	27.0	36.1
Anti-social	4.1	4.6	3.6	3.4	4.6	2.9	4.3
Unable to classify. . .	7.0	4.2	5.9	5.1	5.1	12.4	5.4

TABLE 3-20

ASSIMILATION-ACCOMMODATION RATING
OF HOMELESS MEN BY CODERS

Degree of assimilation	All homeless men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Assimilated, feels he belongs.	25.2	27.2	25.8	19.7	21.3	31.1	25.9
Accommodated, unwilling adjustment, reconciled	48.1	47.0	47.2	60.1	48.3	45.5	49.9
Stranger, forced to live here, intense dislike.	20.4	20.4	21.8	18.5	25.8	15.3	17.1
Unable to classify. . .	6.3	5.4	5.1	1.7	4.6	8.1	7.2

TABLE 3-21

ATTITUDE OF HOMELESS MEN TOWARD THEMSELVES
AS RATED BY CODERS

Attitude toward self	All homeless men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Self-respect, believes he has done as well as he could.	46.6	50.5	40.1	65.7	63.8	51.0	20.3
Self-pity, rationalizes, excuses failures . . .	27.6	27.3	30.9	17.4	22.8	25.1	35.7
Self-hate, accepts blame for failure. . .	18.1	17.6	22.1	6.7	7.6	11.7	36.8
Unable to classify. . .	7.8	4.6	6.8	10.1	5.8	12.2	7.2

TABLE 3-22

EXTENT TO WHICH ALCOHOLISM DEVELOPS
AFTER HOMELESS MEN COME TO SKID ROW

When drinking began	All homeless men	Marital status		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Chronic uncontrolled before arrival on Skid Row	84.4	82.0	86.2	78.6
Became chronic drinker after arrival, to socialize	4.1	3.2	5.0	-
Became chronic drinker after arrival, to escape.	4.7	4.1	4.4	21.4
Unable to classify	6.8	10.8	4.4	-

TABLE 3-23

CODERS' RATINGS OF CONDITIONS THAT EXISTED
PRIOR TO THE MEN'S ARRIVAL ON SKID ROW

Condition	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Chronic drinking. . . .	37.8	30.7	49.6	19.7	9.3*	25.6	84.7
Irregular employment (not due to drinking). . .	42.3	45.4	40.9	43.3	48.7	50.7	27.5
Marital discord	28.1	-	62.6	1.7	19.3	26.6	40.9
Conflict with relatives other than wife. . . .	8.4	10.9	7.2	5.1	7.2	8.4	10.2
Low standard of living. .	26.9	34.1	22.4	20.2	33.2	20.6	23.2
Poverty as a child. . . .	8.1	8.6	7.1	10.1	10.4	7.4	5.6
Orphanhood.	1.7	3.0	1.1	-	2.2	1.2	1.6
Physical handicaps. . . .	6.6	4.7	7.2	11.8	10.4	4.8	3.1
Poor health, eyes	10.5	7.3	9.9	27.0	14.7	8.6	6.3
Wanderlust, restlessness	25.0	30.4	22.6	14.6	16.7	21.1	39.0
Laziness.	2.2	4.1	0.9	-	1.5	1.9	3.2
Borderline intelligence	3.3	6.2	4.3	-	4.2	2.9	2.5
Criminal record	5.4	3.4	7.2	6.7	3.8	7.7	5.7
Emotional instability . .	20.5	15.0	29.1	9.6	9.6	17.7	37.2
Social maladjustment. . .	26.2	29.1	28.0	9.6	21.6	22.2	35.4
Egocentricity	6.1	8.0	4.7	5.1	6.6	3.6	7.2
Failure in realizing his ambitions.	6.3	6.8	7.2	1.7	6.3	4.3	7.7
Cultural conflict because of ethnic, religious background . .	9.7	13.8	5.7	9.0	15.4	9.3	2.3
Discontinuation of respondent's family, wife, or parent. . . .	15.6	18.6	5.8	47.8	15.1	19.1	13.5
Respondent too old to work, small or limited income, no family, not a heavy drinker. . . .	6.2	5.7	2.6	25.3	12.0	2.9	1.1
Unable to evaluate. . . .	3.4	3.6	1.7	1.7	3.5	7.2	0.4

* Includes men who at one time drank heavily but because of age, finances, health, etc. are no longer heavy drinkers; may have been on Skid Row for some time; drinking problem at time they came.

THE HOMELESS MAN ON SKID ROW: VOLUME II

Continuation Studies

Chapter 4

HOW HOMELESS MEN ARRIVE ON SKID ROW

Although it probably cannot provide many additional clues concerning the reasons why they have gravitated to Skid Row, it is instructive to learn from our sample of homeless men the sorts of events that immediately preceded their shifting to residence on Skid Row. The present chapter tries to trace the sequence of events precipitating some of these moves.

In obtaining information about this subject, the interviewers asked a series of open-ended questions, as follows:

"How did you happen to choose (West Madison Street) (other Skid Row area) as a place to stay?"

"Have there been any events or circumstances in your life that caused you to move here? Would you tell me what they are and what happened?
/PROBE: Well, you are living away from any family in a (hotel) (rooming-house) where only men stay. Many people would consider it an unusual place to live. Is there any particular reason for being here in your case?"

The interviewers were instructed to use this sequence of questions (plus any other of a similar non-suggestive type) to stimulate the men to "tell their stories" in their own words. Interviewers were also asked to be particularly conscientious about recording the responses to these items verbatim. This part of the interview was timed to come about fifteen minutes after the start, following a series of rapport-building questions on health, living conditions, and things liked or disliked about Skid Row.¹

¹It has often been claimed that when a homeless man "tells his story," much of it is likely to be pure fabrication, designed either to impress, provoke sympathy, or to accomplish some other ego-satisfying need of the teller. The interview tried to minimize this type of response by starting with a few simple topics about which the man would have no particular reason to lie. Consequently, when he started to "tell his story," he found he had inadvertently given much information about himself and was, therefore, in a position where he must either tell the truth or else skillfully incorporate into his answer the information he had already given. Moreover, the approach made to respondents in this study, which succeeded in assuring the homeless man of the interviewer's genuine interest and permissiveness, convinced him that choosing to tell some things and to omit others, or to "improve the facts" a little, would net him nothing, seemed to evoke rather full and frank answers.

Mode of introduction to Skid Row. The responses to the above questions were first reviewed for an answer to the query, "How did this man get to be familiar with Skid Row; how did he learn of its existence, and under what guidance did he come?". Table 4-1 summarizes the information obtained. The ways in which the men became familiar with Skid Row, in order of frequency of occurrence, were as follows:

	<u>Per cent of all homeless men</u>
a. Needed a cheap place to stay, had heard that this area provided cheap lodging; or else inquired about cheap lodging and was directed here	48
b. Came here primarily to get a job from the employment agencies; had heard from others that you could find work here.	24
c. Had worked on jobs located near Skid Row; got familiar with Skid Row through work (including deliverymen).	11
d. Had friends who lived here; got acquainted with Skid Row through them.	11
e. Came here by accident, just happened to land here, not familiar with Skid Row before. . .	8
f. Lived near here; was living in a nearby neighborhood	6
g. Was introduced to Skid Row by a welfare organization that sent him here for lodging or meals, having had no previous contact with any Skid Row anywhere	4
h. Was living in another part of town and came here for an occasional drink or drinking spree in the taverns	4
i. Came here to buy second-hand goods in pawnshops.	Less than 1 per cent.

(NOTE: The above categories add to more than 100 per cent because they are not all mutually exclusive. For example, a man could both have "lived near here" and "came here occasionally for a drink.")

If one were searching for a few categories in which to summarize how the men happened to get acquainted with Skid Row, he could subsume all of the above into four major ones, as follows:

- a. The "empty billfold" introduction, in which cheap lodging, search for work, hunger, lack of shelter, or other conditions associated with poverty guided him to Skid Row, often with institutional help. . . about 72 per cent
- b. The "rotten apple" introduction, in which Skid Row is the rotten apple which infects those who come in contact with it through living in adjoining neighborhoods or working in the vicinity. about 17 per cent
- c. The "hidden trap" introduction, whereby unsuspecting victims wander in and settle out of curiosity, ignorance, or because they have accepted the gift of a welfare organization which has sent them to Skid Row for the first time about 12 per cent
- d. The "birds of a feather" introduction, through which a man comes to Skid Row because he likes to drink there, has friends there, or feels affinity for the life that goes on there. about 15 per cent.

Even this rough allocation of the modes of introduction into these four categories suggests that the "birds of a feather" category ranks next to last, and that the man's first introduction to Skid Row takes place in response to poverty more than four times as often as in response to uncontrolled drinking. Moreover, the "rotten apple" and the "hidden trap" categories each seem to be as important as the "birds of a feather" category. There is unmistakable evidence, however, that all four of these categories are valid simultaneously, and that no one of them is unimportant.

Table 4-1 indicates that the method of introduction is not too dissimilar for the chronic alcoholics (heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts) and the teetotalers or light drinkers. In general, the teetotalers and light drinkers were somewhat more influenced by the "rotten apple" and "hidden trap" forces, while (as would be expected) a larger percentage of the chronic alcoholics were introduced via the "birds of a feather" route. It is highly significant, according to the men's stories, that the first introduction to Skid Row for about 82 per cent of all chronic alcoholics came through a search for employment, cheap lodging, by accident, or through some channel other than alcoholic friends or the taverns.

Married men were introduced to Skid Row via the "birds of a feather" channel more frequently than were the single men; this was especially true of married men who were chronic alcoholics in comparison with single men who were chronic alcoholics. Except for this difference, however, the mode of introduction of single and formerly-married men was nearly the same.

Motives for coming to Skid Row. In an effort to clarify further the above findings, the replies of the men were subjected to a separate special content analysis which attempted to determine the motives they had for moving into a Skid Row residence from a place outside Skid Row. Here, instead of asking, "How did he get to know about Skid Row?", the question was, "What was he looking for; what needs was he trying to satisfy?". The motives, as revealed by this analysis were as follows (see Table 4-2 for full details):

	<u>Per cent of all homeless men</u>
a. Needed a cheap place to live.	<u>69</u>
(1) Was pensioner, on public welfare	16
(2) Was looking for a job, had had no previous contact with Skid Row	33
(3) Was looking for a job, had had contact with other Skid Rows.	18
b. Was "down and out" (needed food, lodging, other direct and urgent help)	<u>11</u>
(1) Was looking for work, with no previous contact with Skid Row	7
(2) Had had previous Skid Row contact, or not necessarily looking for work.	3
c. Was seeking anonymity, isolation from family because of chronic drinking; desired to con- tinue drinking uninhibited by community forces	10
d. Was seeking anonymity, isolation from family or community because of a crisis or unpleasant situation other than drinking	7
e. Wanted to be near his work.	5
f. Other motives	2
Not able to determine motive.	5.

According to the men themselves, their original motives for moving onto Skid Row were overwhelmingly economic. Almost 80 per cent of all men interviewed claimed they first came to Skid Row under economic duress, with no motive other than to live in a cheap place or to seek temporary succor from a mission because they were "dead broke" and desperately in need of material help. Only about 11 per cent (one man in nine) admitted that the motive for coming was to drink without inhibition or to escape attention from friends or relatives because of drinking. As would be expected, almost all of the men who came to Skid Row for this reason were chronic alcoholics at the time of the interview.

The great prevalence of economic motives and the comparatively low frequency of drinking motives furnish a very different picture from the impressions that the general public seems to have of Skid Row. Instead of being just "a bunch of drunks who come down to Skid Row so they can stay drunk indefinitely or get drunk as often as they please," the men pictured themselves as losers in the competitive labor market or victims of monetary inflation.

Table 4-2 reveals two very important differences between the motives of single men and of separated and divorced men: (a) The single men appear to have been motivated much more by economic considerations than were the men who had been married; (b) the married men were motivated much more by the desire to escape and to seek obscurity than were the single men. This was true for both drinking and other reasons: 16 per cent of the separated and divorced men admitted that they came to Skid Row seeking anonymity because of their drinking; 11 per cent claimed to have sought obscurity for other reasons, presumably after having been separated or divorced for reasons not associated with drinking. Thus, although economic motives are very powerful and are operative among all groups of homeless men, the desire to find obscurity and the desire to escape from the former social setting are especially powerful motives among married men who have been separated or divorced because of drinking or for other reasons. This may be due, at least in part, to the fact that the single man who drinks heavily or who is experiencing other personal crises is under less compulsion to move in order to escape censure than is the married man.

How the first lodging on Skid Row was obtained. In a further effort to clarify the situation surrounding the first contact with Skid Row, the coders were asked to review the material for an answer to the question, "How did the man get his first lodging on Skid Row?". Table 4-3 summarizes the results. In more than three-fourths of the cases, the man chose his own lodging-place and paid for his own room. About one man in nine (11 per cent) started his career on Skid Row by sleeping in a bed given to him by a private or public welfare or charitable organization. (In a comparatively high proportion of cases [13 per cent] the interviews did not provide enough information to yield an answer to this question.)

Men who were separated or divorced were somewhat more likely than were single men to have been the guests of welfare or charitable organizations on their first night. These facts should not be construed to mean that the welfare and charitable agencies are responsible for starting these men off on careers of drinking, although in their desire to help down-and-out but inexperienced young men, they could have done this by placing them in a Skid Row environment. The facts seem to indicate that all but a comparatively small fraction of men arrive on Skid Row of their own volition and choose their first residences themselves, acting under no compulsion other than the motives that have already been described.

Events that precipitated coming to Skid Row. Speculation about arrival on Skid Row might lead one to ask, "Why did this man arrive on Skid Row at the particular time he did? Presumably he was under pressure to make a move for some time; what happened during the few days or weeks immediately preceding his move that might have 'triggered' or precipitated the moving?" Each homeless man's story was examined carefully to try to piece together a picture of the events that sent him to live in a Skid Row cubicle or rooming-house. In many cases the coders found it difficult to locate a single precipitating event; instead, they often found that a condition had existed until it finally became intolerable and led to the change of residence. Hence, the classification that was finally devised listed several specific types of incident and also a few general types of situation which, if continued long enough, could lead to a shifting of residence to Skid Row. Following is a list of the categories which express the events or conditions that seemed to have precipitated the decision to come to Skid Row.

	<u>Per cent of all homeless men</u>
1. Prolonged unemployment, loss of job, exhaustion of savings	33
2. Chronic heavy drinking (all forms)	30
a. Chronic heavy drinking, followed by breakup of marriage.	9
b. Chronic heavy drinking, followed by flight from family.	3
c. Chronic heavy drinking, other circumstances, general statement.	18
3. Seasonal or irregular employment, obtained through casual-labor employment offices . . .	26
4. Search for cheaper place to live while getting established (young man new to city)	14
5. Marital discord, not a chronic drinker pre- viously or discord not connected with drinking	12
6. Wanderlust; had led a life of wandering, was restless, on the go	11
7. Lack of or inadequate source of support -- pension or job (elderly man)	10
8. Lack of adequate income, no family help, no training; always had lived in cheapest type of places (younger man)	6
9. Breakdown of health, no funds to live elsewhere	8
10. Lack of family contacts -- became old or disabled but had no family with which he could live. .	9
11. Had an accident that caused loss of ability to work or severe handicap so that he was no longer eligible for his regular employment. .	6

	Per cent of all homeless men
12. Had experienced intense sorrow, grief, loneliness, or lack of orientation after death of a parent or spouse.	6
13. Had been disgraced, with prison record, not accepted most other places	4
14. Had experienced personal disorganization resulting from military service.	4
15. Needed or wanted to be near his work or near employment offices	3
16. Had experienced conflict with family, relatives other than wife, not a heavy drinker before coming to Skid Row	1.

According to the statements of the homeless men themselves, employment and prolonged unemployment were the major precipitating factors in their coming to Skid Row. In more than half the cases it was claimed that a work-connected situation "triggered" the move. In some cases it was no more than a search for casual day-labor or a job as a gandy-dancer as a last resort after having exhausted all financial resources while looking for better jobs. In other cases it was a move to conserve money in order that the search for a better job could be prolonged a few more days or weeks. Although uncontrolled drinking is the second item on the list of precipitating factors, it is only one-half as powerful as employment and unemployment. It is highly important that three out of every four men said they were dragged down to the level of Skid Row by lack of suitable employment or by financial distress. All too often we see the broken, discouraged man who has taken to drink to forget his discouragement and to make life tolerable, and who cannot visualize how he was on the day of his arrival here. While it is true that we have only the men's own word for it, the evidence presented is sufficiently strong to suggest that future efforts to attempt to deal with Skid Row should include preventive action to help discouraged and unsuccessful job-seekers in the big city, especially when they are young men.

Skid Row, however, creates some chronic alcoholics, and it collects some. Table 4-4 shows that 65 per cent of the men who were classified as heavy drinkers or as alcoholic derelicts had a drinking problem before they came to Skid Row and that this presumably helped to precipitate their decision to move. Much of this, however, was just general drinking behavior and previous general contact with Skid Row taverns. About one-fourth of all chronic alcoholics came to Skid Row after breakup of their marriages over drinking or as a flight from family because of drinking.

Especially noteworthy in the above list is the group of precipitating forces that could be classified as "just plain bad luck," such as breakdown of health, industrial accidents, and lack of a family to care for one in old age. These are hazards which most unskilled workingmen must risk, and for which Social Security is only a partial and inadequate protection. More than one-fourth of all residents on Skid Row landed there because of

such reasons. Taken together, this group of precipitating factors is greater than the force of alcoholism. Men who are sickly, disabled, or in poor health, and who live on Skid Row, apparently often turn to drink as a way of handling their problems, so that after several months' residence, we see only a chronic alcoholic and not the sick man who was forced to move to Skid Row by bad luck.

Also worthy of notice, although the group is small, are the men who like living on Skid Row and have no motive to move away because they do not sense its poverty, dirt, and abnormality; such men have never lived on a higher plane and do not hope for more. It is said that many hillbilly migrants to Chicago respond this way.

Two other sets of precipitating events are worthy of note: those indicating that the man had done something to "bring it on himself," such as spending a life of wandering instead of sticking to a steady job, or committing a crime and getting a prison record; and those that suggest the man was emotionally unbalanced or disturbed due to loss of parent or spouse, military service, or flight from home after a quarrel, etc.

Summary. The present chapter has tried to describe the situation that existed in the few days or weeks just preceding the move to Skid Row. In a sense, it is a review of the materials of the preceding chapters, looked at from the view of a man faced with a problem or a decision concerning where he should live. The mode of introduction to Skid Row, the motives for coming to Skid Row, and the events that precipitated the move were discussed in terms of the following concepts:

- a. The "empty billfold" phenomenon -- poverty, economic distress, unemployment, irregular employment.
- b. The "birds of a feather" phenomenon -- chronic alcoholics gravitate to this community of alcoholics.
- c. The "rotten apple" phenomenon -- familiarity through propinquity leads to acceptance.
- d. The "plain bad luck" phenomenon -- breakdown of health, industrial accidents, lack of family.
- e. The "wayward boy" phenomenon -- wanderlust, criminal career, prison record.
- f. The "emotional disturbance" phenomenon -- disorganization after death of a spouse, flight after quarrel with wife or family.
- g. The "hidden trap" phenomenon -- curious people may move to Skid Row to experience a thrill, and ignorant ones may wander there by accident and be trapped by the environment and find they cannot leave.
- h. The "uncritical acceptance" phenomenon -- men who are unaware that they are living in squalor and hence are satisfied to stay on Skid Row.

The arrival on Skid Row of at least some men is surrounded by each of these types. According to the testimony of the men, by far the most important of these is the first. The homeless men claimed the "empty billfold" was far more powerful than all of the others combined in precipitating the decision to rent a room on Skid Row. Comparatively unimportant are the prior drinking habits. Drinking, the men say, comes with tenure on Skid Row.

TABLE 4-1

HOW HOMELESS MEN GOT INTRODUCED TO SKID ROW

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Needed cheap place to stay, inquired for such	48.5	52.3	43.0	61.2	53.4	49.8	40.9
Worked near here before coming here to live. .	10.9	11.6	11.7	6.7	10.5	12.9	9.9
Lived near here, in nearby neighborhood. .	6.0	5.7	4.5	13.5	7.6	5.0	4.7
Had friends living here, learned of Skid Row from them.	10.8	9.9	12.0	6.7	8.4	12.7	12.6
First came to Skid Row to buy second-hand goods in pawnshops	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.7	0.4	-	1.1
Came to Skid Row for an occasional drink in the taverns.	3.5	2.6	5.0	-	-	3.1	8.4
Came for a job, heard about jobs available here	23.6	24.9	24.8	13.5	22.9	20.1	27.1
Sent by a welfare organ- ization, no previous Skid Row experience. .	3.6	2.4	4.5	5.1	4.3	2.9	3.1
Accident, just happened to come, not familiar with Skid Row.	8.0	9.5	8.0	3.4	8.6	6.0	8.6
No information.	7.3	5.4	9.1	2.8	5.3	8.1	9.3

TABLE 4-2

MOTIVES FOR COMING TO SKID ROW

Response	All home-less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Cheap place to live, total	69.2	70.0	67.5	79.2	77.6	71.8	56.0
On a pension, or sent by welfare organization	16.4	13.4	16.1	33.7	23.2	11.0	11.3
Working or seeking work, without previous Skid Row contact. .	33.0	39.2	28.9	26.4	37.0	38.5	23.5
Working or seeking work, with previous Skid Row contact. .	18.1	16.2	19.7	13.0	16.9	18.7	19.4
Was "broke" or "down and out," needed emergency help, total	10.6	11.3	10.6	9.6	9.5	9.5	12.9
Had no place to go, looking for work, no Skid Row experience.	7.3	8.2	7.2	5.1	6.9	6.2	8.6
Had no place to go, with previous Skid Row experience . . .	3.3	3.1	3.4	4.5	2.6	3.3	4.3
Desire for anonymity, isolation from family, because of drinking . .	10.5	6.9	15.5	5.1	0.4	6.2	27.3
Desire for anonymity, escape from convention, causes other than drinking.	6.8	2.2	10.3	8.4	4.3	9.3	8.1
Desire to be near work, sources of work	4.7	6.9	3.0	3.4	4.5	3.6	5.7
Desire to be near friends, relatives, welfare	1.9	3.1	1.3	-	3.0	-	2.0
Not enough information to determine.	4.9	5.4	3.3	2.8	2.4	6.0	7.4

TABLE 4-3

HOW RESPONDENTS OBTAINED THEIR FIRST LODGING ON SKID ROW

Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Through public welfare department disbursing order	4.9	3.1	6.4	6.7	4.7	5.5	4.7
Through private charity mission gave him bed .	6.0	5.8	6.2	7.3	4.7	7.4	6.6
Rented own room, chose own place.	75.8	76.8	75.9	77.0	78.1	75.6	72.7
Slept out in open, had no room.	0.2	0.3	0.3	-	-	-	0.7
Unable to determine . .	13.1	14.1	11.2	9.0	12.4	11.5	15.3

TABLE 4-4

EVENTS THAT PRESUMABLY HELPED TO PRECIPITATE
THE DECISION TO MOVE TO SKID ROW

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alco- holic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Chronic heavy drinking, followed by breakup of marriage.	8.6	-	19.1	1.7	1.5	7.2	19.2
Chronic heavy drinking, followed by flight from family.	3.0	2.8	4.1	-	-	2.6	7.4
Drinking in general, occasional previous Skid Row contacts. . .	18.3	19.8	18.2	11.2	6.6	11.7	38.8
Marital discord, pre- viously not heavy drinker, trouble not connected with drinking	12.5	-	27.8	-	9.7	12.4	16.2
Conflict with family, relatives other than wife, not connected with drinking.	0.9	1.2	0.4	1.7	0.4	1.4	1.1
Prolonged unemployment, loss of job, exhaustion of savings.	32.6	33.2	31.7	34.3	30.8	44.3	26.2
Seasonal employment, starting to work for railroad, labor con- tractor.	26.5	30.1	24.2	25.3	23.9	25.8	30.5
Accidental injury, causing loss of employ- ment, unable to perform type of work for which trained.	5.6	3.1	7.2	8.4	6.3	5.7	4.5
Breakdown of health, no funds to live elsewhere	7.6	5.0	8.7	15.2	11.5	4.3	4.8
Disgrace due to prison record or other cause, not accepted in former place of residence or desire to remain away.	4.1	4.6	4.5	1.7	3.0	4.3	5.6
Wanderlust, restlessness, need to be on the go .	10.6	14.6	7.6	5.6	7.7	7.2	17.1
Sorrow, grief, lack of orientation after death of parent or spouse. .	6.2	6.1	2.9	21.9	6.6	7.2	4.8
Lack or inadequate source of support—elderly men	9.6	8.0	7.1	28.7	15.2	6.5	4.3

TABLE 4-4 -- Continued

Response	All home- less men	Marital status			Drinking classification		
		Single	Separated and divorced	Widowed	Teetotalers and Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers and Alcoholic derelicts
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Lack of family to care for him -- elderly and disabled men	9.3	10.3	6.1	21.3	13.9	8.1	4.1
Personal disorganization resulting from military service.	4.1	3.8	5.5	-	2.0	1.4	8.8
Needed a cheap place to live while getting established -- young men.	13.9	18.4	12.5	2.8	20.0	10.8	8.3
Lack of or inadequate income, other vague financial.	6.0	7.8	5.3	2.8	6.7	6.0	5.0
Needed or wanted to be near his work, near employment offices . .	2.6	3.5	2.5	-	3.5	2.9	1.3
Other types of events, vague statements of events	1.3	1.5	1.4	-	0.8	1.4	1.8
No information.	4.4	5.3	2.0	3.4	5.7	6.5	1.1

THE HOMELESS MAN ON SKID ROW: VOLUME II

Continuation Studies

Chapter 5

RECREATION ON SKID ROW

What do the homeless men on Skid Row do for recreation? What recreation would they like but cannot have because they cannot afford it or because there are no facilities for it on Skid Row? These two topics are the subject of this chapter.

Current recreational activities. A list of ten types of recreation was drawn up. As each homeless man was interviewed, he was asked how often he engaged in each type of recreation. Following is a list of the activities and the percentage of men who engaged in each type on an average of once a month or more:

	<u>Per cent of men doing once a month or oftener</u>
Watching television	70
Going to a tavern or bar.	66
Going to movies	54
Attending mission services.	44
Playing cards	35
Going to Reading Room	28
Playing checkers.	19
Gambling, playing horses, playing numbers . .	6
Going to penny arcades, shooting-galleries. .	5
Going to burlesque shows.	4.

The last three items on this list form such a small part of the recreational activity of the men that they are dropped from the analysis that follows. It is well-known that penny arcades and burlesque shows are usually located on the Skid Row fringe. But it appears that these activities are not for the homeless men. As one informant said, "They are for the college boys." Servicemen on liberty, tourists, thrill-seeking couples, or people who are just curious enough to venture onto Skid Row are the economic life-blood of the tattoo artist, the burlesque queen, and the barker's wares at the penny arcade. This includes the "daring" bars and taverns which hint that there is stripteasing to be seen inside. The homeless men ignore these places.

Television is the leading form of recreation on Skid Row. The survey shows that 51 per cent of the men watch TV every day, and almost two-thirds of them watch it twice a week or more. Most hotel lobbies now have a television set which plays almost continuously from 10:00 A.M. until 10:30 P.M. It is probably true that at almost any time of the day or early evening the number of men watching television in hotel lobbies and the City of Chicago Reading Room is greater than the number of men in all taverns. Thus, the coming of television has created a major recreational competitor to

drinking, and the hotel lobby is a more attractive gathering-place than it formerly was. Limited seating space and poor acoustics in the hotels make it impossible for more than a small fraction of the patrons to enjoy TV. The Reading Room helps partially to allay this shortage and provides a quieter setting for watching, away from the noise of the typical cubicle-hotel lobby. Being able to watch several hours of television each day, without having to sit in a tavern to do so, has probably done more to combat excessive drinking by recreational means than any other thing. If one were to make a quick visit to the lobbies of all Skid Row hotels on a winter evening, he would find almost every seat filled with either TV-watchers or card-players, and in many hotels there would be men standing to watch the television.¹

Despite its popularity, there is much grumbling about television. There are disagreements over which channel to watch, over inability to hear because of noise, and over the great distance some men must sit from the screen.

Taverns. One-half of the total Skid Row population goes to a tavern twice a week or more, and almost one-third go every day. A very high percentage of these daily patrons, of course, are the chronic alcoholics who drink until they are intoxicated. But many of the moderate drinkers and light drinkers have the custom of drinking a little beer or "having a shot" with friends on one evening or more during the week. More than one-fourth of all homeless men use the taverns in this moderate way. Since, however, the chronic alcoholics come every day and the moderate drinkers come only a few times per week, on any one evening the chronic drinkers greatly outnumber the moderate and light drinkers on Skid Row and are very conspicuous because of their behavior. Many observers insist that if the three hundred worst drunks were to be taken off Skid Row, the taverns would not be much different from taverns anywhere else. This action, if taken as part of a rehabilitation program, probably would improve the taverns' atmosphere very drastically, as these persons say. It would also greatly reduce the police, jackrolling, and other drink-related problems.

In the effort to combat chronic alcoholism, it would be very easy to overlook the fact that the neighborhood tavern is one of the best-liked and most universal forms of recreation among men who work with their muscles -- and especially men who are without families. It would do no good to try to abolish workingmen's taverns, for they would only spring up at the closest possible point. The taverns, however, need to be regulated so that they do not become simply factories for getting the men intoxicated as fast as possible, for selling the maximum quantity of liquor to each customer, or a

¹If the City were to keep its Reading Room open later in the evening and provide even more television-watching space (with two sets tuned to different channels), it would probably also be used to capacity. (This, however, would require police protection against jackrolling for elderly men returning to their rooms later in the evening.)

convenient setting for prostitution, jackrolling, or tie-in activity with employment offices or hotels whereby the man owes his paycheck before he is paid.

Movies are very popular, and one-fourth of the men go twice a week or oftener. Skid Row has its own movie houses, and there are other neighborhood theaters nearby where many men go when they want to "get off the Row."

Attendance at church services, in a sense, is recreational. It gives the men something to do during the evening instead of sitting in the lobby (where many have sat all day) or in the tavern. They can participate in group-singing and get something to eat at the end. About one homeless man in fourteen makes this a part of his daily life, and more than one-fifth go twice a week or oftener. Yet about one-half of the men boycott the mission services altogether. It is quite possible that if the recreational aspect were emphasized a little more and the accusational aspect were tempered somewhat, the attendance would be larger and more frequent.

Reading Room. It is difficult to believe that as many men actually make use of the City of Chicago's Reading Room as their reports say they do. If the eight per cent of the sample who stated that they use this facility nearly every day is generalized to the entire Skid Row population, it implies that almost 975 different men are served every day in this one facility. It is true that during the winter months the Reading Room is filled to capacity almost continuously and that men line up outside in a long queue awaiting their turn to get in. (The queue sometimes gets half a block long and would be longer, but the men know they must wait for an hour in the cold before they can get inside.) Probably no single municipal facility for education, recreation, or welfare gets more intensive use than the Reading Room. It provides facilities not only for reading, but also for shaving, bathing, washing clothes, playing checkers, watching television -- all in a quiet atmosphere where there is no drinking. Many of the men who spend time here are those who have no place to go -- who sleep in freight-cars, warehouses, and other outdoor places. If the Reading Room were doubled in size, operated for longer hours, and its functions expanded, it could be made into an even more effective recreational weapon against alcoholism.¹ It badly needs the assistance of both public support (bigger budget) and of private charitable agencies.

¹Despite the fact that it is used almost to capacity throughout the day, the Reading Room needs to be improved. Many of the books are simply cast-offs of interest to no one. The magazines are often inappropriate. During a peak hour in the winter, a man wandering in off the street can find no magazine more interesting than a year-old Congressional Record to read. This unit has a devoted director and is well-run, but an effort should be made to convert this establishment into a rehabilitational-educational influence by increasing the budget and by stocking books that are of greater interest to the men and which would help arouse the men's interest in getting off Skid Row. Books and magazines on vocational subjects (mechanics, automobiles, electronics, photography), on sports, adventure, travel, health, etc. are conspicuously lacking. Even a carefully selected but small reference collection of books on psychology, personality problems, and alcoholism would probably be much-read by men who would really like to understand themselves more.

Playing cards and playing checkers are pastimes for a substantial number of men. Most hotels have the necessary cards and boards for this, and the clerks on duty are ordered to prevent gambling. However, two-thirds or more of the men never play cards or checkers. Among those who do find these games interesting, many play almost every day.

Recreation by drinking-disability-age status. The above over-all picture of recreation on Skid Row does not apply equally to all homeless men; their recreational activities differ according to age, extent of drinking, and extent of disability. Tables 5-2 through 5-7 present the recreation information for six different groups of men:

Elderly men who are severely or moderately handicapped (Table 5-2). This group of men has far less recreation than any other set of men on Skid Row -- the great majority of them participate in no recreational activity except watching TV in the hotel lobbies and taking an occasional drink in a tavern. Although a small percentage of them attend church services, go to the Reading Room, and attend movies, the rate of their participation is much below the average. When one considers what little recreation they do engage in, playing cards, going to the Reading Room, and attending mission services head the list.

Elderly men only slightly handicapped or not handicapped at all (Table 5-3). The picture of recreation for this group is similar to that for the first group, except it is somewhat less severe. These men participate in recreation more often than do the handicapped elderly men, but still to a small extent. The Reading Room is especially important for this group. Television, cards and checkers, and mission services are the other leading forms of recreation. About 20 per cent of these men go to the taverns rather frequently, and the rest almost never go.

Young and middle-aged men (20-64 years), severely or moderately handicapped, who are teetotalers, light drinkers, or moderate drinkers (Table 5-4). Like the elderly men, these younger disabled men tend to be inactive and to have little recreation. Since they are not chronic alcoholics, they visit the taverns only one to three times per week (one-third never go). While they attend movies, play cards, go to the Reading Room, and attend church services more often than the elderly men, they nevertheless participate less than do the men who are not handicapped (see below).

Young and middle-aged men (20-64 years), slightly handicapped or not handicapped at all, who are teetotalers, light drinkers, or moderate drinkers (Table 5-5). As would be expected, this is one of Skid Row's more active groups. More than two-thirds go to movies (almost one-half attend twice a week), and many have contacts off Skid Row. Their attendance at church services, use of the Reading Room, and watching TV are all slightly below-average for Skid Row, probably because many spend leisure time in other parts of the city. Because they are not chronic alcoholics, they go to the taverns only one to three times per week (one-third never go to Skid Row taverns).

Young and middle-aged men (20-64 years), severely or moderately handicapped, who are heavy drinkers or chronic alcoholics (Table 5-6). Men in this group have a double problem -- physical disability and alcoholism. Almost two-thirds of them are in the taverns every day. (Many of those who do not go to the taverns daily are bottle-drinkers.) However, they attend church services much more frequently than do the non-drinkers; they watch TV more often (possibly in the taverns); they make more frequent use of the Reading Room; and a higher percentage of them play cards than among the groups of younger men who are not heavy drinkers. Many of the men in this group are recovering from illnesses or injuries and cannot work. Although they are of working age, they have the problem of filling up a whole day as well as the evening. For this reason, they make more intensive use of Skid Row's recreational facilities than any other group.

Young and middle-aged men (20-64 years), slightly handicapped or not handicapped at all, who are heavy drinkers or alcoholic derelicts (Table 5-7). This last group are the most frequent patrons of the taverns. (They share this honor with the preceding group.) Since many have jobs, they attend movies oftener. Also, they go to mission services somewhat oftener than do the alcoholics who are handicapped.

Recreational activities the men want but do not have. In an effort to help find out what might be done to improve the recreational set-up on Skid Row, each man was asked to list the activities he would like to engage in but could not -- either because he could not afford it, because there were no facilities available to him, or for other reasons. Almost one-half of the men mentioned nothing. (For many of these men the "cure" would be to get off Skid Row, not to improve the recreation.) Of those who answered, the following are the types of thing wanted, in order of mention (for a tabulation of suggestions by the above six categories of men, see Table 5-8):

	<u>Per cent of men who suggested new types of recreation</u>
Bowling, participation in sports.	20
Attending sports events -- baseball, football games.	16
Going to the movies	16
Pursuing hobbies -- shopwork, handicrafts . . .	12
Going to other parts of the city, getting better social contacts.	9
Going to concerts, plays, talks	4
Painting, playing musical instruments	3
Watching TV, listening to radio, hi-fi.	2.

Thus, comparatively few men feel the need for TV (they may want improvement but have some access to it). A highly meaningful aspect of these suggestions is the desire to do something active, such as participation or making something. So very many of their waking hours are spent sitting, and most of the recreation now available on Skid Row is also of this type.

After weeks of reading papers, watching TV, playing cards and checkers, and talking to other people, the hotel lobby seems like a prison to the men. Many of them get out and walk -- drift along Skid Row -- just because they can't sit any longer.

It is important to note that the younger men, especially, vote for participation activities. Workers in missions, in welfare agencies, and in private charitable organizations have urged that these men be given a small park where they can pitch horseshoes, play baseball, or converse without having to be either in a bar or loafing on the street. Also, if a high-school gymnasium were made available to them in the evenings, it might do much to provide recreation of a more active type.

It is also important to note that although the teetotalers and light drinkers were most in favor of new forms of recreation, impressively large numbers of heavy drinkers also showed interest in changing Skid Row's recreational structure.

Reasons why the men do not pursue the forms of recreation suggested. The men were asked why they do not engage in the forms of recreation they suggested. In almost one-half of the cases the reason given was that they could not afford it. In about one-eighth of the cases there were said to be no facilities available, while in about one-seventh of the cases the men were just doing wishful thinking about an old hobby they had allowed to lapse. This table emphasizes that cost to the man is a very important part of any recreational program that is devised. When a man is barely making ends meet, even a dime can be a large sum.

Summary and implications. The recreational facilities that are provided on Skid Row are used almost to capacity. The hotel lobbies are filled with TV-watchers and card-players; the Reading Room is filled and has a long waiting-line during the winter; the missions have nearly full houses every night during the winter. Actually, the taverns have more spare capacity than other facilities, and several taverns on Skid Row are not doing well.

Yet all of the taverns together reach fifty per cent more men than do the missions combined. Even though it is filled to capacity, the Reading Room can serve only a small fraction of the men, even on a part-time basis. Many men on Skid Row have almost no recreation. This is especially true of the elderly and handicapped men.

When asked what kinds of recreation they wanted, the men mentioned types of recreation that would permit them to be more active. The things they mentioned are of the same sort that welfare workers have found to be conspicuously successful in assisting elderly people who do not live on Skid Row. It is entirely possible that a rather conventional program for elderly and handicapped persons would do much to relieve the monotony of life for these men and would start many on the road back to rehabilitation from drinking.

The information assembled concerning recreation also makes it clear that the tavern, as a friendly meeting-place for workingmen, provides important recreation for men who are only light drinkers or moderate drinkers. In mapping out the plans for a future residence for homeless men, the tavern should be reformed, subjected to very strict law enforcement, and forced to "have a conscience and a heart" -- but it cannot be abolished.

TABLE 5-1

PER CENT OF HOMELESS MEN ON SKID ROW WHO PARTICIPATE
IN SELECTED TYPES OF RECREATION

All homeless men

Frequency	Movies	Taverns and bars	Bur- lesque	Penny arcades	Playing checkers	Playing cards	Horses, lottery	Watch- ing TV	Reading Room	Church services
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
None	41.2	27.3	90.7	90.5	75.6	58.8	88.3	24.8	65.6	50.6
1-3 times per month. .	13.0	6.8	2.6	1.2	4.8	6.6	1.8	2.4	6.5	12.0
4 times per month (once a week)	10.3	9.8	0.9	1.3	4.3	6.9	1.5	2.8	3.8	10.0
5-8 times per month. .	1.7	1.7	-	-	0.7	0.7	-	0.9	-	1.2
9 times per month (twice a week)	14.6	7.7	0.4	1.1	2.7	6.2	0.5	4.2	3.9	6.0
10-29 times per month.	12.9	8.5	-	0.8	3.1	4.7	1.2	8.6	6.1	7.1
30 or more times per month (one or more per day)	1.3	31.7	-	0.2	3.2	10.0	1.1	50.9	8.1	7.2
No information	4.5	6.6	5.4	4.9	5.5	6.2	5.6	5.4	6.1	5.8

TABLE 5-2

PER CENT OF HOMELESS MEN ON SKID ROW WHO PARTICIPATE
IN SELECTED TYPES OF RECREATION

Elderly men who are severely or moderately handicapped

Frequency	Movies	Taverns and bars	Playing checkers	Playing cards	Watch- ing TV	Reading Room	Church services
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
None.	69.6	38.1	92.9	80.4	31.0	77.4	67.9
1-3 times per month	8.9	8.9	-	1.8	5.4	4.8	10.7
4 " "	7.1	5.4	-	1.8	3.6	1.8	3.6
5-8 " "	-	3.6	1.8	-	-	-	1.8
9 " "	7.1	10.7	-	-	-	1.8	1.8
10-29 " "	1.8	7.1	-	3.6	5.4	5.4	3.6
30 or more.	1.8	16.1	-	7.1	49.4	3.6	5.4
No information. . .	3.6	10.1	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4

TABLE 5-3

Elderly men only slightly handicapped or not handicapped at all

Frequency	Movies	Taverns and bars	Playing checkers	Playing cards	Watch- ing TV	Reading Room	Church services
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
None.	42.9	50.0	64.3	57.1	35.7	57.1	35.7
1-3 times per month	7.1	7.1	-	-	-	-	7.1
4 " "	-	7.1	7.1	7.1	-	-	14.3
5-8 " "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9 " "	21.4	-	7.1	7.1	-	7.1	7.1
10-29 " "	14.3	7.1	-	-	-	7.1	7.1
30 or more.	-	14.3	7.1	7.1	35.7	14.3	7.1
No information. . .	14.3	14.3	14.3	21.4	28.6	14.3	21.4

TABLE 5-4

Young and middle-aged men (20-64 years) who are severely or moderately
handicapped and who are teetotalers, light drinkers, or moderate drinkers

Frequency	Movies	Taverns and bars	Playing checkers	Playing cards	Watch- ing TV	Reading Room	Church services
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
None.	49.6	34.6	71.9	60.4	29.6	65.8	48.5
1-3 times per month	13.5	11.5	4.6	3.5	-	9.2	14.2
4 " "	10.4	11.2	5.8	5.8	1.9	3.5	12.3
5-8 " "	2.3	1.2	1.2	-	2.3	-	1.2
9 " "	9.2	9.2	-	3.5	9.2	4.6	5.8
10-29 " "	7.7	6.5	5.8	6.9	8.5	5.0	12.7
30 or more.	3.1	21.5	6.5	15.8	44.2	6.5	1.2
No information. . .	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	5.4	4.2

TABLE 5-5

Young and middle-aged men (20-64 years) who are slightly handicapped
or not handicapped at all, who are teetotalers,
light drinkers, or moderate drinkers

Frequency	Movies	Taverns and bars	Playing checkers	Playing cards	Watch- ing TV	Reading Room	Church services
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
None.	24.7	33.0	73.7	57.5	26.3	69.3	57.2
1-3 times per month	15.2	7.0	9.8	9.8	3.1	5.2	11.6
4 " " "	15.2	18.0	2.8	8.8	3.1	3.4	13.4
5-8 " " "	3.1	2.1	-	0.8	0.5	-	0.8
9 " " "	21.6	8.8	5.2	6.7	2.3	2.8	5.9
10-29 " " "	15.5	10.3	3.9	5.9	8.0	8.5	2.6
30 or more.	0.8	17.0	0.8	7.5	52.8	7.2	4.9
No information. . .	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.1	3.9	3.6	3.6

TABLE 5-6

Young and middle-aged men (20-64 years) who are severely or moderately
handicapped and who are heavy drinkers or alcoholic derelicts

Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
None.	50.0	10.6	76.5	52.4	15.3	58.2	40.6
1-3 times per month	12.4	4.7	4.1	6.5	5.3	5.9	15.3
4 " " "	10.0	4.7	8.2	6.5	1.8	7.1	7.6
5-8 " " "	1.2	-	-	-	1.8	-	1.8
9 " " "	8.8	2.9	-	8.2	4.1	3.5	5.9
10-29 " " "	12.9	6.5	1.8	3.5	9.4	6.5	8.8
30 or more.	-	64.1	2.9	13.5	57.6	11.2	13.5
No information. . .	4.7	6.5	6.5	9.4	4.7	7.6	6.5

TABLE 5-7

Young and middle-aged men (20-64 years) who are slightly handicapped
or not handicapped at all, who are heavy drinkers
or alcoholic derelicts

Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
None.	31.9	10.1	71.8	48.7	17.6	58.0	39.9
1-3 times per month	13.4	1.3	1.7	9.2	-	18.4	9.7
4 " " "	9.2	2.1	5.0	8.8	3.8	4.6	7.6
5-8 " " "	0.8	2.1	1.3	2.5	-	-	1.3
9 " " "	17.2	6.7	4.6	10.9	5.5	5.9	9.2
10-29 " " "	21.8	10.5	2.5	2.9	13.0	3.4	9.7
30 or more.	0.8	57.6	5.5	8.0	54.2	10.9	14.3
No information. . .	4.6	9.7	7.6	8.8	5.9	8.8	8.4

TABLE 5-8

PER CENT OF HOMELESS MEN ON SKID ROW WHO WOULD LIKE TO ENGAGE IN
RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES, BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY AND
REASON FOR NOT PERFORMING, BY DRINKING-
DISABILITY-AGE CLASSIFICATION

Activity	All homeless men	Elderly men (65 years and over)		Young and middle-aged men (20-64 years)			
		Severely and mod- erately handi- capped	Slightly and not at all handi- capped	Teetotalers, light and moderate drinkers		Heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts	
				Severely and mod- erately handi- capped	Slightly and not at all handi- capped	Severely and mod- erately handi- capped	Slightly and not at all handi- capped
Watching TV, listen- ing to radio, hi-fi	2.0	-	-	1.2	2.1	1.8	4.6
Attending sports events: baseball, football, etc. . .	16.3	7.1	-	13.8	16.0	18.8	26.9
Going to movies. .	16.0	11.9	-	19.6	14.4	23.5	15.1
Going to concerts, plays	3.6	8.9	14.3	1.2	1.3	1.8	5.9
Bowling, participa- tion in sports. .	20.5	12.5	-	18.5	22.9	20.0	28.6
Reading, studies, letter-writing. .	5.4	5.4	-	4.6	3.9	6.5	9.2
Hobbies: shopwork, handicrafts . . .	11.8	5.4	-	19.6	12.1	15.9	6.7
Painting, playing musical instruments	2.9	-	7.1	4.6	1.5	4.1	3.8
Going to other parts of city: better social contacts .	8.8	3.6	-	8.8	7.2	12.4	14.3
Had no spare time.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
None mentioned .	43.0	49.4	64.3	43.8	46.9	40.6	29.4
No answer given.	6.3	10.1	14.3	5.4	2.8	7.6	8.0
Reasons for not per- forming:							
Can't afford . .	45.6	35.1	14.3	48.5	46.4	47.1	52.9
No place to do them.	12.6	10.7	-	9.6	10.8	17.6	18.5
Old hobbies. . .	14.2	10.7	7.1	21.9	12.1	15.9	11.8

THE HOMELESS MAN ON SKID ROW: VOLUME II

Continuation Studies

Chapter 6

RELIGIOUS, POLITICAL, AND RACIAL ATTITUDES OF SKID ROW MEN

Many people who are interested in Skid Row have wondered about the religious and political attitudes of Skid Row men. Since these men are at the very bottom of the social scale, are they mutinous cynics and radicals? Would they tend to embrace a communistic philosophy toward private industry and religion because they hope for little from the present economic system? With respect to racial attitudes, it has sometimes been said that the white men on Skid Row, because they have lost all vestiges of status except race, tend to be most intolerant of Negroes and other dark-skinned people. Others have thought that the sharing of hardship and rejection by society, together with Skid Row's general tolerance of unconventional modes of behavior, might make the homeless men more unprejudiced on the subject of race. Although the social attitudes of the men have comparatively little immediate practical relevance, scientific curiosity led the research team to include in the interview schedules a few inquiries concerning religion, politics, and race relations. The present chapter summarizes briefly the information that was obtained.

Religious attitudes.

Church membership (Table 6-1). To the questions, "Were you ever a member of any church?" and "What church was that?", 79 per cent of the men reported the name of some religious group to which they had belonged. A total of 17 per cent reported that they had never had any religious affiliation. Although this is a much greater proportion of non-affiliation than among the general population, it must be noted that all but a small minority of the homeless men have at one time considered themselves to be church members. Lack of church membership was not associated with drinking status; chronic alcoholism was just as prevalent among church members as among those who did not belong to a church.

In terms of actual membership, the religious background of the men was as follows:

	Per cent of all homeless men
Roman Catholic.	38
Baptist	14
Methodist	8
Lutheran.	6
Presbyterian.	3
Episcopalian.	3
Greek or Roman Orthodox	1
Jewish.	1
Other	6.

There is no way of determining how typical or atypical this is of Chicago's religious composition, and especially the religious composition of Chicago's low-income groups, because statistics are completely lacking. It is evident, however, that all of the major religious groups are represented in the approximate order of their magnitude among Chicago's general population. Of people who claimed some religious membership, almost one-half were Roman Catholic and one-half were Protestant. It cannot be claimed that the disproportionately large share of Catholics is significant from a religious point of view because it has been shown that Skid Row contains a concentration of first- and second-generation members from nations of eastern and southern Europe, Puerto Rico, and Mexico, where Catholicism is the dominant religion. Also, the large concentration of Baptists reflects the large numbers of persons from the American South. The Methodist and Lutheran contingents reflect the contributions of the Midwest and Chicago's large German population, respectively. Perhaps the only definite statement that can be made is that the Jewish group definitely is under-represented. Upwards of five to eight per cent of Chicago's population is Jewish, yet less than one per cent of the men on Skid Row are Jewish.

In comparison with all men on Skid Row, a disproportionately large share of the never-married men are Roman Catholic, while a disproportionately large share of the separated and divorced men are Baptist. Except for these two findings, there were few, if any, differences in religious affiliation correlated with marital status.

A careful examination of the data, holding marital status constant, reveals that there is surprisingly little variation from one religious group to another in the percentage of the men who are chronic alcoholics. For example, among the single men who are Catholics, there is a slight deficit of heavy drinkers and chronic alcoholics in comparison with all single men of other faiths. But among separated and divorced Catholic men (35 per cent of all separated or divorced men on Skid Row are Catholics), there is a compensating slight excess of chronic alcoholics in comparison with separated and divorced men of other faiths. Although they are slight, a few other differences in drinking status, relative to religious affiliation, may be worthy of mention:

(a) Even though Episcopalian membership is very small on Skid Row (2.6 per cent), a very high percentage of the men with Episcopalian background are chronic alcoholics. In general, members of this religion tend to be from middle- or upper-class families, and when they appear on Skid Row, it is for reasons of drinking, not for economic reasons.

(b) No case of alcoholism was found among the very small contingent of Jewish men on Skid Row. It is known that the true size of the Jewish population on Skid Row is somewhat larger than that indicated by these statistics, for some of the refusals to be interviewed were received from men with Jewish names -- presumably they were self-conscious about being interviewed. Informal observation indicated that these refusals, like the Jewish men interviewed, were not chronic alcoholics. This deficiency of chronic alcoholism among Jewish persons has been observed in other studies.

(c) A disproportionately large share of Baptists tended to be alcoholics. Although the size of this excess is small, it was especially marked among single men. It reflects the substantial number of heavy drinkers from the South who are on Skid Row.

(d) Methodist and Presbyterian men who were single tended to have a slight deficit of chronic alcoholics.

(e) Lutheran men who were separated and divorced tended to be alcoholic in unusually large numbers. Like the Episcopalian group, the middle-class Lutheran man tends not to land on Skid Row unless he has a drinking problem.

It must be re-emphasized that all of these differences between religious groups in the extent of members who are chronic alcoholics are small and are not to be taken as measures of the efficacy of the various religious groups in preventing a man's descent onto Skid Row. Probably for the most part they merely reflect indirectly the economic, ethnic, and racial composition of the low-income groups in Chicago, the Midwest, and the South -- the areas from which the Skid Row population is predominantly drawn.

How religious are the homeless men? (Table 6-2). Three questions were asked the men in an effort to learn their religious attitudes at the time of the interview: "Do you believe in God?", "How do you feel about churches in general?", and "How often do you attend church services at one of the missions?". Table 6-2 summarizes the responses. Only three per cent of the men professed not to believe in God, while an additional five per cent expressed dislike for all churches even though they were believers. Thus, only a total of about eight per cent of all homeless men could be said to be currently inimical to organized religion, and more than 90 per cent are not only believers but are sympathetic to religious organizations generally. (Since these questions came late in the interview, when the men were fully aware that they could talk freely and frankly without shocking the interviewers, it can be presumed that they were being truthful and that there are comparatively few confirmed infidels on Skid Row.)

Only a small share (eight per cent) of the men, however, could be classified as "quite religious." The vast majority of them have a rather casual attitude toward religion. About 35 per cent of the men say they believe in God but never go to mission services, and an additional 46 per cent say they believe in God but go to mission services only occasionally. Actually, religious attendance probably is somewhat greater than the men indicated, because in dead of winter the sum of attendance each day at all mission services is about six to nine per cent of the Skid Row population. Also, a few of the Catholic men attend mass at churches off Skid Row. (Almost none of the Protestant men attend regular Protestant churches.) The mission is the only form of church attendance for all but a very small fraction of the men.

An analysis of the data shows that a disproportionately large share of the small group of men who claim not to believe in God were heavy drinkers. But of the men who did indicate a belief in God and who attended mission services at least occasionally, an above-average share also tended to be heavy

drinkers or alcoholic derelicts. The teetotalers and light drinkers on Skid Row tended to be men who believed in God but who seldom, if ever, attended mission services. This finding may reflect the fact that by going to a mission service a man who has spent all of his money for alcohol can get a free meal as well as a chance to worship.

How homeless men feel about the mission programs (Table 6-3). When asked how much they liked the mission programs held for homeless men by the Salvation Army, Pacific Garden Mission, Christian Industrial League, and other missions, 70 per cent of the men said either that they liked the programs or liked them very much. Only 12 per cent showed active dislike of these programs. However, the extent to which they liked these programs varied according to drinking status. Teetotalers or light drinkers liked the mission programs more than the chronic alcoholics did. Among the men who were classified as alcoholic derelicts, 20 per cent expressed dislike (14 per cent said "dislike very much") for the mission programs.

How religious were their parents? (Table 6-4). One-fourth (26 per cent) of the men reported that both their parents were very religious, and an even larger share (28 per cent) said both parents were "moderately religious." Most of the remainder reported that one parent was either very religious or moderately religious. Only nine per cent reported that neither parent was religious. Thus, more than one-half of the Skid Row men came from homes where religion was respected and taken seriously by both parents, and less than one-tenth of them came from homes where religion was completely absent.

The degree of religious interest shown by the parents seems to have some effect upon the drinking behavior of the man. A slightly larger percentage of the men who said both parents were very religious or moderately religious were teetotalers, and a slightly larger percentage of the men who stated that neither parent was religious, or that the mother was not religious, tended to be heavy drinkers. But in all cases the differences were small; the percentage of homeless men who were heavy drinkers was almost as high in the former group as in the latter. This, coupled with the fact that all but a small fraction of the men had religious parents, makes it clear that lack of adequate religious training in childhood could not be a very important cause of Skid Row alcoholism.

Church affiliation of parents (Tables 6-5 and 6-6). The religious affiliation of the parents tended to coincide very closely with that reported by the man for himself, and in a very high proportion of cases both father and mother belonged to the same religious group as the respondent. As a result, no new information is contributed by the tabulations of church affiliation of parents in addition to that already presented in Table 6-1.

Summary. From the evidence assembled here, it appears that every major religious group has members or ex-members on Skid Row, in approximate proportion to its membership size. None of the large major religious creeds can claim to have been conspicuously successful (except apparently the Jewish religion) in preventing Skid Row alcoholism from appearing among

its members. Sons who were on Skid Row but not alcoholic tended to have parents who took their religion seriously. But even this difference was small and may have been due to other indirect factors correlated with religion, such as interest in the welfare of the children.

Political attitudes.

What political party do you like best? (Table 6-7). When asked which of the political parties they preferred, 61 per cent of Chicago's Skid Row men said they were Democrats; only nine per cent expressed a preference for the Republican party. Almost none voiced any interest in the Socialist or other minority parties. About 20 per cent of the men declared they had no interest in politics (eight per cent) or were independents with no party preference (12 per cent).

There is only a small variation in party preference according to drinking behavior. The more alcoholic men on Skid Row showed even less preference for the Republican party than did the teetotalers and light drinkers. The teetotalers tended to be less interested in politics than the men who were heavy drinkers. But the fact is that the Democratic party has such a dominant majority on Skid Row that all of these differences are minor.

How do you feel about the Republican and Democratic parties? (Table 6-8). Regardless of their political preference, the men were asked to make a statement of what they thought of each of the two major parties. (The attitude toward each party was probed separately.) The responses, which were obtained through open-ended questions and which, therefore, reflect the extemporaneous thoughts of the respondents, are highly stereotyped versions of the political world as it is interpreted by Democrats. Specifically, the homeless men viewed the Democratic party as:

- (a) The party of the common people.
- (b) The party that maintains prosperity, takes action when depression strikes.
- (c) The party that rescued desperate people in the 1930's.

Many of the men had experienced the full wrath of the Great Depression and mentioned the effect which WPA, CCC, and other Democratic-sponsored emergency programs had had in their lives.

The men tended to view the Republican party as:

- (a) The party of wealth, power, the privileged few.
- (b) The party that gets the country into depressions.

In addition, there was much expression of preference for the Democratic party and opposition to the Republican party for rather vague reasons.

The very large part which employment and unemployment play in the lives of Skid Row men is clearly evident in their evaluation of the political parties. As men who are first to feel the pinch of a recession, they tend to view politics in terms of employment levels. It is also significant that all but a very small fraction of the men were able to verbalize a distinction between the parties and to state the reasons for their preferences in rather abstract terms.

One other significant fact which emerges from Table 6-8 is that most of these men do not give the Democratic party principal credit for Social Security and other social legislation. Instead, they tend to regard such arrangements as more or less permanent parts of the national life that are no longer matters for political credit.

How do you feel about the Socialist Party? (Table 6-9).

If America were to have a revolutionary proletariat that was disillusioned with the present economic system and felt it "had nothing to lose but its chains," one would certainly expect to find it among the perennially unemployed and underemployed men who haunt the Skid Row employment offices. It is true that during the first quarter of this century the Skid Rows of America were swept by various radical political ideologies that were a mixture of trade unionism, radical socialism, and anarchy. The I.W.W. was the most powerful of these, and at one time Chicago's Skid Row was a major capital of this semi-revolutionary group, whose members were largely itinerant agricultural and lumber workers. In order to determine how much, if any, of this tradition has survived, the men were asked, "How do you feel about the Socialist Party?". The results, shown in Table 6-9, indicate rather conclusively that socialism on Skid Row is all but dead. One-half of the men frankly confessed they knew too little to have an opinion, and all but a small fraction of the rest expressed disapproval. Only about two per cent were even able to mention in a tolerant or favorable way something specific about the Socialist party, and much of this was said in the past tense. Thus, in political preferences, in political ideology, and in political activity, Skid Row today is liberal but not radical. The men strongly support the Democratic party, primarily because they believe it best represents their economic interests. There is very little evidence of loss of faith in private business and wish for a socialistic economy. No evidence whatever was obtained that would indicate communistic inclinations.

Summary. A surprising aspect of these data is that they reveal a much higher degree of political awareness and sophistication among Skid Row men than might have been anticipated. Perhaps the explanation is that these are men with much time on their hands, for whom politics offers a perennially acceptable but impersonal topic of conversation; also, the daily newspaper is still the best buy in reading material, and daily newscasts on TV sets invade many Skid Row hotel lobbies. It is an impressive fact that substantial proportions of the men voluntarily undertook to approve or criticize the foreign policy, to evaluate socialism in terms of basic principles, to evaluate the abilities of the President or Vice-president, to state their political preferences in relation to the economics of their own situations, etc. Undoubtedly much apathy, ignorance, and uninformed prejudice underlie what political thinking most Skid Row men do; however, it is entirely possible that, on the average, homeless men are only a little less interested and qualified in this area, if at all, than are other low-income groups.

Racial and ethnic attitudes (Table 6-10). Each man was asked the question, "How do you feel about _____ (ethnic group)?", for those four of the following groups of which he was not a member:

Negro
Puerto Rican
American Indian
Mexican
Other (European-American).

The replies given with respect to each group were probed to bring out not only the level of acceptance or prejudice for each group, but also the basis for the dislike, if any. Table 6-10 summarizes the findings of these inquiries.

In general, all white residents of Skid Row exhibit a high degree of racial and ethnic prejudice, while non-white and other groups exhibit distrust but a low degree of prejudice. All but a small fraction of those with prejudice were able to state specific reasons or to give a basis for their attitudes. When the men tried to justify their feelings toward colored or other ethnic groups, they tended to emphasize two sets of traits: they expressed fear at the brutality, belligerence, lawlessness, and stealing of the groups, or (b) objected to ways that they thought were aggressive, demanding, or arrogant. As Chicago has absorbed large numbers of Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the men on Skid Row have felt the competition of these new groups for jobs. This resentment may be a significant element in explaining Skid Row prejudices.

Negroes have the lowest degree of acceptance; about 80 per cent of the white respondents (many of whom are from the South) who expressed an opinion admitted dislike for them. The basis for this dislike is general and vague, and much of it is tempered with admission that the rights of the Negro as a human being and citizen should be respected. It is important to note that there was comparatively little mention of belief in the biological or innate inferiority of Negroes while expressing this prejudice.

Puerto Ricans are disliked almost as much as Negroes, but the reasons given are more clear-cut. Homeless men fear the Puerto Ricans and suspect that they come to Skid Row to jackroll or rob. They think the Puerto Rican jackroller is even more likely to kill or brutalize his victim than other jackrollers. Also, they emphasized the clannishness and cultural differences between Puerto Ricans and other Americans; many asserted that Puerto Ricans are lazy or dirty.

Mexicans are disliked also, but considerably less than Puerto Ricans. The Skid Row men have lived adjacent to Chicago's large Mexican settlement for many years. In addition, they have worked with Mexicans who also ship out as gandy-dancers. Over the years the Mexicans have been gradually accepted by some men, but almost sixty percent still reject them for rather vague reasons or reasons similar to those stated for Puerto Ricans.

American Indians are accepted by 70 per cent of the men who expressed an opinion, and they have the highest rating of any of the minority ethnic groups. The major criticism of Indians is that they "go crazy" when they get drunk, and there were many humorous references to "firewater" and its effect upon Indian patrons in the taverns. When sober, however, the Indian is subject to comparatively little racial discrimination and is widely accepted as a real American by the Skid Row men.

TABLE 6-1

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP OF HOMELESS MEN, BY DRINKING CLASSIFICATION

Response	All home- less men	Drinking classification				
		Teeto- talers	Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers	Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Baptist	13.5	13.4	11.9	13.9	12.9	17.6
Catholic	37.9	46.1	38.8	32.3	40.2	33.8
Episcopalian	2.6	-	2.5	0.7	5.9	4.6
Jewish	0.7	1.2	1.8	-	-	-
Lutheran	5.5	5.5	4.3	7.7	4.7	5.6
Methodist	8.0	4.7	7.6	12.9	3.8	10.2
Orthodox Greek or Russian	1.4	3.1	1.2	1.4	1.2	-
Presbyterian	3.4	4.7	3.3	3.8	1.2	4.6
Other	6.2	3.9	7.4	5.3	7.6	5.6
Not a member of a church	17.1	16.1	19.9	12.9	20.8	13.9
No information	3.6	1.2	1.2	9.1	1.8	4.2

TABLE 6-2

HOW RELIGIOUS ARE THE HOMELESS MEN?

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Does not believe in God	3.2	2.4	3.5	0.7	6.2	3.7
Believes in God but does not like churches	4.6	2.4	4.3	5.5	6.7	2.8
Believes in God but does not go to mission services	35.2	48.4	40.7	31.1	27.6	27.3
Believes in God; goes occasionally to mission services	46.2	29.9	42.7	48.1	53.4	57.9
Quite religious; be- lieves in God; does not go to mission services	1.3	3.1	1.8	0.7	0.9	-
Quite religious; be- lieves in God; goes often to mission services	6.4	12.6	6.4	4.1	5.3	5.6
No information	3.4	1.2	1.2	9.8	0.9	2.8

TABLE 6-3

HOW HOMELESS MEN FEEL ABOUT THE MISSION PROGRAMS

Response	All home- less men	Drinking classification				
		Teeto- talers	Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers	Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
High degree of like. .	32.8	34.6	30.6	28.0	37.8	37.0
Some like.	39.0	36.2	41.1	40.4	38.7	35.2
Some dislike	6.8	5.5	7.2	6.5	7.6	6.5
High degree of dislike	5.8	3.1	3.1	4.8	7.6	14.4
Doesn't know program .	6.4	9.4	8.0	7.9	4.1	-
No information	9.2	11.0	10.1	12.4	4.1	6.9

TABLE 6-4

HOW RELIGIOUS WERE YOUR PARENTS?

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Both very religious. .	26.3	34.3	32.6	18.9	22.6	23.1
Mother very religious, father less religious	15.2	9.1	12.7	19.4	17.3	16.2
Mother very religious, father not religious.	3.0	2.8	1.8	2.2	6.2	2.3
Father very religious, mother less religious	2.3	3.5	2.3	3.6	0.9	0.9
Father very religious, mother not religious.	0.3	1.2	-	0.5	-	-
Both moderately reli- gious	27.6	34.6	27.5	24.4	26.7	26.9
Mother moderately re- ligious, father not religious	8.0	2.4	8.6	8.4	8.2	12.5
Father moderately re- ligious, mother not religious	0.7	-	-	-	1.8	2.8
Neither parent religious, not very religious. .	8.7	3.5	8.8	10.3	10.8	8.3
No parents	1.0	1.6	0.6	1.9	0.9	-
Had only one parent...	5.0	2.4	5.5	5.7	5.0	5.1
No information on one parent.	0.5	-	0.4	0.7	-	1.4
No information on either parent	6.8	7.1	4.9	10.5	4.7	6.9

TABLE 6-5

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP OF MOTHER

Response	All home- less men	Drinking classification				
		Teeto- talers	Light drinkers	Moderate drinkers	Heavy drinkers	Alcoholic derelicts
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Baptist.	16.8	16.5	13.6	17.7	19.1	19.0
Catholic	39.0	47.2	43.7	31.8	41.3	29.2
Episcopalian	1.7	-	0.6	0.7	5.0	3.2
Jewish	1.0	1.2	3.1	-	-	-
Lutheran	8.6	6.7	7.4	10.5	9.1	9.3
Methodist.	9.1	3.5	12.1	7.4	7.3	15.3
Orthodox Greek or Russian	1.7	3.1	1.2	2.2	2.1	-
Presbyterian	3.5	4.7	2.3	4.5	0.6	7.4
Other.	9.1	7.9	9.2	8.6	10.6	9.3
Mother not a member of a church.	2.2	4.7	1.8	1.2	2.1	1.9
No information	7.1	4.3	4.9	15.3	2.9	5.6

TABLE 6-6

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP OF FATHER

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Baptist.	15.2	18.5	12.9	15.1	15.2	16.2
Catholic	37.2	45.3	40.9	30.9	38.4	30.1
Episcopalian	1.6	-	0.6	0.7	4.1	3.2
Jewish	1.0	1.2	3.1	-	-	-
Lutheran	8.0	5.5	7.4	11.2	7.9	7.9
Methodist.	7.6	2.4	9.6	7.4	5.9	12.5
Orthodox Greek or Russian	2.1	3.1	1.8	2.9	2.1	-
Presbyterian	3.4	4.7	1.6	4.5	2.3	5.1
Other.	8.5	9.1	7.8	6.7	10.6	9.3
Father not a member of a church.	5.8	4.7	5.5	5.5	7.0	6.0
No information	9.4	5.5	8.6	15.1	6.5	9.7

TABLE 6-7

POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCE OF HOMELESS MEN

Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
None	12.4	14.3	12.6	7.5	16.1	12.7
Republican	9.2	11.8	11.3	8.5	7.1	5.1
Democratic	61.0	45.8	66.3	63.4	59.8	65.0
No interest in politics	8.3	21.7	5.0	6.5	7.1	4.5
No information	9.2	6.4	4.7	14.1	9.8	12.7

TABLE 6-8

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE (REPUBLICAN) (DEMOCRATIC) PARTY?

Opinion	All homeless men	
	Republican party	Democratic party
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Has a tolerant attitude but does not prefer.	21.8	10.3
Party represents wealth, power, privileged few	17.9	0.9
Party represents the common people, workingman, poor people.	0.2	20.5
Good domestic economic policy, runs the country well, maintains prosperity.	3.8	25.8
Poor domestic economic policy, gets us into a depression	20.8	1.6
They favor welfare, social security measures	-	4.1
They oppose welfare, social security measures.	1.5	0.2
Have a good foreign policy	1.7	0.5
Have a poor foreign policy	3.6	2.7
Loyal to party because parents (influential people) belong to it.	2.8	6.8
Party represents conservatism, maintaining status quo.	1.2	0.2
Party represents liberalism, favoring change	0.2	0.4
Respondent likes Ike	4.1	-
Respondent does not like Ike	4.0	-
Believes this party is a party of action, gets things done.	0.6	2.7
This party has better leadership than the other. . . .	0.6	2.8
This party has poor leadership	0.5	0.5
Likes this party because of New Deal, WPA, CCC, NRA, etc.	-	9.4
Likes this party -- reasons given are vague.	2.6	12.3
Dislikes this party -- reasons given are vague	9.5	2.5
No information, no response.	18.4	17.8

TABLE 6-9

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE SOCIALIST PARTY?

Opinion	Socialist party
Total	100.0%
Dislikes, identifies with communists	6.4
Considers inconsistent with freedom or democracy	1.2
Tolerant, nothing specific	9.1
Tolerant or favorable, mentions Swedish, other systems, or the economic theory	0.2
Tolerant or favorable, mentions Norman Thomas, American Socialist party	1.4
Tolerant or favorable, mentions Jeff Davis, Socialist Workers parties	0.5
Distrusts or dislikes, thinks impractical, won't work in U.S. .	3.5
Dislikes the principle, theories, basic ideas of socialism . . .	4.0
Replies that he does not know enough about it to judge	46.5
Dislikes, reasons vague or no reasons given.	14.0
No information, no response.	15.2

TABLE 6-10

RACIAL AND ETHNIC ATTITUDES OF HOMELESS MEN

Attitude	Negroes	Puerto Ricans	Indians	Mexicans	Whites
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Absence of dislike, or positive liking or preference.	19.8	23.4	59.9	38.5	65.9
Dislikes but tolerant of their rights as human beings	18.2	6.0	5.2	6.2	3.7
They are indolent, lazy, think the world owes them a living.	0.8	2.0	0.2	0.9	-
They are clannish, culturally different, unassimilable	1.9	7.1	0.6	4.8	-
They are belligerent, brutal, not law-abiding, steal, assault	6.2	14.9	2.4	7.7	1.8
They drink excessively	0.5	1.6	7.0	1.0	-
They are untidy, dirty, filthy in housekeeping and personal habits. .	0.4	2.1	0.6	1.6	-
They are aggressive, demanding, overbearing, arrogant	4.0	3.9	0.9	2.3	-
They are immoral, promiscuous. . . .	1.0	0.2	-	0.2	-
Believes their native intelligence, biological quality inferior	0.3	0.6	-	0.7	-
Dislikes: other reasons, vague dislike	41.2	27.8	10.2	26.2	18.3
No information or reaction stated. .	9.3	17.9	19.1	14.0	10.4

THE HOMELESS MAN ON SKID ROW: VOLUME II

Continuation Studies

Chapter 7

NEGROES AND INDIANS ON SKID ROW¹

Negroes and American Indians both are comparative newcomers to Chicago's Skid Row. The appearance of both groups on Skid Row is a by-product of recent migrations. The Federal Government recently has adopted a policy of urbanization for Indians, and as a result many hundreds of them have moved from reservations into Chicago, Minneapolis, and other major cities. In Chicago there is a large Indian settlement along North LaSalle Street just adjacent to the North Clark Street Skid Row. Since 1941 the traditional in-migration of Negroes from the South into Chicago and other northeastern cities has been greatly accelerated. As this flow became a flood, all of the inner slum areas formerly occupied by European immigrants and their children (Polish, Italian, Czech, Greek, etc.) became occupied by Negroes. Inasmuch as the same processes of poverty and personal disorganization that have selected individual white men for residence on Skid Row affect these newcomers also, the number of Negroes and Indians on Skid Row has suddenly increased. Because of intense race prejudice (see Chapter 6), the white homeless men have refused to share living space with Negroes, although Indians are able to live in almost any hotel they can afford. In addition to the segregated accommodations they now have on Skid Row, there is evidence that new Skid Rows (or slum areas serving the same functions) are being built for the use of Negroes at appropriate points in the city (see below). The effects upon Skid Row of these changes have been as follows:

- (a) Negroes (and Puerto Ricans) have inhabited all residential areas that lie adjacent to the three Skid Rows in Chicago, so that now each of Chicago's three Skid Rows is a small white island in a sea of Negro slums. (Chapter 1 of Volume I showed that this was a general process happening in many different cities.) Since many of the new recruits to the Skid Rows are Southern whites, racial antipathy has been heightened.
- (b) Negroes have flooded into Chicago in large numbers in search for work. They have invaded the "spot job" market and are daily competing with Skid Row men for work as dishwashers,

¹As was stated in Volume I, Chapter 2, the number of Negroes and Indians caught in the sample of homeless men in the Skid Row study was so small that detailed statistical analysis of these two groups was deemed to be generally inadvisable; however, certain inferences based on study directors' and field workers' rather intensive observations, checked wherever possible against the summary statistical results, are worth recording. The reader is cautioned against attributing a high degree of precision or dependability to specific percentage figures reported in this chapter. This does not mean, however, that the research team does not have a high degree of confidence in the trends set forth and in their eventual outcome.

freight loaders and unloaders, truck hands, bill peddlers, gardeners, etc. Many large companies that formerly used Skid Row employment agencies for emergency needs for unskilled labor now hire Negroes instead, often through other agencies. Negro workers tend to be younger and stronger than Skid Row whites, and they do not present so difficult a drinking problem. Also, all companies are under pressure to show that they do not discriminate against Negroes in their hiring policy, and one of the first ways to demonstrate this is to allow Negroes to do all possible unskilled work. As a result of this development, several casual-labor employment companies have set up employment offices in Negro neighborhoods off Skid Row. Employment offices on Skid Row have suffered from this competition, and unemployment has become an even more serious problem among the Skid Row population than it was before. Many employers who use white Skid Row labor now do it from charitable motives rather than because it is "good business." Even the missions have been forced to set up small "employment offices" in order to have jobs for men undergoing treatment for alcoholism.

- (c) Many Negro migrants to Chicago arrive with very little money or "go broke" after a few days of searching for work. The European immigrant groups solved this problem by developing mutual assistance societies that helped fellow-countrymen get started. Thus, the Italian, the Greek, and the Polish communities in Chicago served as small "hometowns" for newly arrived immigrants from those countries. The Negro community in Chicago has played no such role for Negroes, however. Mutual help comes in other ways in this group. Negroes have lent great assistance to their relatives and friends from down South who move, and a very high percentage of Negro homes contain a nephew, cousin, or other relative (or son of a friend) who is just getting started. However, the Negroes who arrive without family or friends to lean upon, and without money, must rely upon community agencies. In desperation, they show up in the soup-lines and apply for cheap beds at missions. Like so many other urban institutions, the missions have been faced with a problem of deciding whether to try to serve all those who come, irrespective of race, and run the risk of quickly switching to an all-Negro clientele, or to strike a compromise by establishing an informal quota. The Casual Labor Office of the State Employment Service, the Madison Street Reading Room, and other City agencies cannot refuse service to Negroes, even if they wished. As a result there has been a slow but steady rise in the percentage of Negroes in the audiences at the mission services, in the employment lines at the State Employment Office, and in the Reading Room. Because these are human beings and citizens, and because discriminatory behavior would bring adverse public and political reaction, there is no firm resistance to this growth, and probably there will be none.

- (d) As low-income Negro migrants have flocked in from the South, there has been a severe housing shortage for them. Rents in Negro areas have skyrocketed above those charged to whites for the same or even better accommodations. Many landlords in Chicago have found they could switch from white to Negro occupancy, raise rents as much as 25 to 35 per cent, meanwhile suspending maintenance of the building, and make a very quick and large profit -- in full assurance that the City and the Federal Government would "bail them out" with a redevelopment program when their property had become too slummy for further human occupancy. This inflation in rents for Negroes has placed a very severe burden upon the new migrant just struggling to get started. As a consequence they will eagerly accept cheap rental opportunities. The cubicle-hotel businesses on South State Street have responded, and three cubicle-type hotels have shifted from white to non-white occupancy. This was a sound business move because vacancy rates were running very high when hotels were for white men. The men who live in these places are similar in every respect to the generations of job-seeking rural migrants who preceded them and who lived "near the bottom" while they got started, except in one respect -- their race.

As a result of these changes, every Skid Row in Chicago now has people of both races living in segregated but adjoining areas. Gradually they are sharing the same establishments. Negroes are appearing far more frequently in Skid Row bars and restaurants. The stores that sell work clothes, day-old bread, groceries, and drugs on Skid Row are finding that more and more of their patrons are Negroes. Negro women now clean the rooms in the cubicle hotels instead of the job being done by residents who thus work out their room rent, as was formerly a fairly common practice. Already the homeless men have had the experience of having Negro judges preside over their cases and decide their fates at the Monroe Street Court. More and more Negro children play in the alleys and vacant lots around Skid Row. Young Negro jackrollers and Negro streetwalkers both patrol Skid Row streets, trying to earn a living from the white residents. These changes, added to what is happening at the missions, labor offices, and Reading Room, indicate just one thing: Skid Row is being invaded by Negroes and within twenty to twenty-five years probably will be either all-Negro or integrated. This change is taking place gradually enough so that many people on Skid Row seem not to notice it. An alternative might be that the Negroes will develop their own Skid Row type of area elsewhere. Recent developments at 63rd and Halsted, 47th and Indiana, Madison near Ogden, and on the Near North Side suggest that because of their large numbers and the very great disorganization to which many Negroes seem subject, this may materialize.

It is against this background of change that the results of the 1957-58 Skid Row survey must be interpreted.

Area of residence (Table 7-1). It was shown in Chapter 2 of Volume I that in the winter of 1957-58 there were an estimated 1,100 Negroes and 230 Indians on the three Skid Rows (9.2 per cent and 1.9 per cent, respectively, of all Skid Row population). Table 7-1 shows how these were distributed among the Skid Rows. Almost two-thirds of the Negroes lived on South State Street (where the three Negro cubicle hotels and one of the large missions that will serve Negroes are located). Roughly three-fourths of the Indians were found on West Madison Street. Although they live adjacent to the North Clark Street Skid Row, the Indian men prefer to go to West Madison Street when they go on a binge. There are two hotels in particular where they tend to stay when they live on West Madison Street. In general, they are well-treated by the other men who live on West Madison Street (see Chapter 6 for attitudes toward Indians) and apparently feel more secure there when they drink.

Type of residence (Table 7-2). More than three-fourths of the Negroes live in the three Negro cubicle-type hotels, and almost all of the rest were found in mission soup-lines and dormitories. Almost four per cent were sleeping out, in the dead of winter. Table 7-2 shows that the percentage of Negroes in the missions' emergency programs was about twice that of whites. Indians were concentrated in missions also, although a substantial percentage are able to afford a room in a hotel that is not a cubicle. Most Indian men can get excellent emergency care through the Indian Welfare Center on LaSalle Street but show up at the missions when they have been drinking.

Drinking classification (Table 7-3). In comparison with the general Skid Row population, there is a very large deficit of alcoholic derelicts and heavy drinkers among the Negro population. As already explained, this is due to the fact that many residents of the Negro cubicle hotels are merely workingmen searching for work who live here because the price of housing charged elsewhere is above their means. Nevertheless, the seeds of the Skid Row culture of alcoholism are present in the Negro cubicle hotels, and 13 per cent of the Negro men (estimated to be about 145 men) were chronic alcoholics.

In contrast to the Negroes, more than one-half of the Indians were classified as chronic alcoholics. This is a much higher proportion than for the white population also. There are two explanations for this. First, alcohol appears to have a very disorganizing effect upon many Indian men, and few Indians on Skid Row are moderate drinkers. Second, the welfare program for Indians in Chicago makes the economic institutions of Skid Row superfluous for most Indians, so that they tend to live on Skid Row only to drink or to escape from the Indian colony.

Drinking - disability - age classification (Table 7-4). Because they are younger, there are far fewer severely and moderately handicapped men among the Negroes and Indians than among the white men on Skid Row. Conversely, these newcomer groups have a higher percentage of non-handicapped men. Both in the handicapped and the non-handicapped groups, and especially at the younger ages, the percentage of chronic alcoholics is smaller for the Negroes and higher for Indians than for whites.

One interesting aspect of Table 7-4 is the disproportionately large number of severely or moderately disabled Negroes in the working ages -- 20-64 years -- who were moderate drinkers. There seems to be more of a tendency to assign Negro outpatients and charity patients to Skid Row hotels for recuperation, even though they do not have a drinking problem, than to assign low-income whites to cubicle hotels under the same circumstances.

Summary and conclusion. In comparison with white homeless men, the Negro residents are less inclined to be chronic alcoholics, and a smaller percentage are disabled. Instead, they tend merely to be migrant workmen who are attracted by mission emergency help and cheap living. Although there are a few Negro alcoholic derelicts in the Negro cubicles and in the mission soup-lines, they are at present the exception rather than the rule. The Indians, in contrast, tend to use Skid Row primarily for drinking and become residents when they go on a spree.

These differences should not be regarded as a permanent and enduring set of reflections of basic racial characteristics. The Negro population is now in the "ambitious young migrant" stage. As the years pass, as many of the men fail, as others turn to crime and gather criminal records, and as still others adopt drinking as a solution to their many troubles, it may be expected that the number of Negro alcoholics will increase rapidly.¹

Drinking among Indians, in contrast, tends to be even more of a male pastime than among whites. As the Indian population grows in the city, it may be expected to help feed the conventional male Skid Row.

¹The following conjecture is based entirely upon informal observation and not upon statistical evidence, but the writer doubts whether the Negroes will ever build organized Skid Rows after the pattern of the white man. On the one hand, the Negro community is far more heterogeneous and tolerant than the white community, so that deviant or nonconformist members are much less conspicuous and are not made to feel so unwelcome and ill at ease. Second, the Negro standards of sex and family behavior are sufficiently different from those of the white population that probably fewer Negro wives would force a man to make a choice between drinking and family, and fewer men would take to drinking if they were disappointed in marriage or found their wives enamored of others. In other words, if the Negro is to have a Skid Row, it is likely to be a community affair, with both sexes participating freely and with lively music, cheap recreation, vice, drug addiction, crime, and other sinful pastimes mixed together. The result, of course, would be areas even more undesirable and hard to control than Skid Rows. They would be simply the worst of the Negro slum communities instead of separate communities of unattached males. The interviewers who interviewed in the three Negro cubicle hotels had the very definite impression that these places were not really Skid Row units. It was as if the Negro occupants were more puzzled than impressed. After all, the cubicle hotel provides worse living conditions than the shanties down South and is not nearly so private and coeducational.

TABLE 7-1

AREA OF RESIDENCE OF NEGROES AND INDIANS ON SKID ROW

Classification	Total	Negroes	Indians
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
West Madison Street	63.1	31.0	75.0
South State Street.	14.1	62.7	5.0
North Clark Street.	5.8	-	7.5
South Clark Street, Van Buren Street, and others. . .	13.4	1.3	7.5
Hospital, jail, sleeping out.	3.6	5.1	5.0

TABLE 7-2

TYPE OF RESIDENCE OF NEGROES AND INDIANS ON SKID ROW

	Total	Negroes	Indians
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Living in cubicle hotels.	67.4	77.9	60.0
Large (300 or more)	38.8	1.9	37.5
Medium (200-300).	14.9	30.4	-
Small (less than 200)	13.7	45.6	22.5
Living in hotels with rooms	14.1	1.9	15.0
Living in rooming-houses.	6.8	-	-
Living in missions.	8.2	15.2	20.0
In Cook County Hospital	1.3	-	-
In House of Correction.	1.4	1.3	5.0
Sleeping out.	0.9	3.8	-

TABLE 7-3

DRINKING CLASSIFICATION OF NEGROES AND INDIANS
ON SKID ROW

	Total	Negroes	Indians
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Teetotalers	14.8	17.7	7.5
Light drinkers.	28.4	32.3	32.5
Moderate drinkers	24.4	36.1	7.5
Heavy drinkers.	19.9	6.3	25.0
Alcoholic derelicts	12.6	7.6	27.5

TABLE 7-4

DRINKING-DISABILITY-AGE CLASSIFICATION OF
NEGROES AND INDIANS ON SKID ROW

Classification	Total	Negroes	Indians
Total.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<u>Severely and Moderately handicapped</u>	<u>46.6</u>	<u>36.1</u>	<u>22.5</u>
Elderly (65 years of age or older).	14.0	3.8	-
Teetotalers and light drinkers.	9.7	3.8	-
Moderate and heavy drinkers	4.3	-	-
Young and middle-aged (20-64 years)	19.4	24.7	15.0
Teetotalers and light drinkers.	12.6	12.0	7.5
Moderate drinkers	6.8	12.7	7.5
Heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts.	13.2	7.6	7.5
20-44 years of age.	4.3	1.9	7.5
45-64 years of age.	8.9	5.7	-
<u>Slightly and Not handicapped.</u>	<u>53.5</u>	<u>64.0</u>	<u>77.5</u>
Elderly (65 years of age or older).	3.5	1.9	-
Teetotalers and light drinkers.	2.3	1.9	-
Moderate and heavy drinkers	1.2	-	-
Young and middle-aged (20-64 years)	31.9	55.1	32.5
Teetotalers and light drinkers.	18.6	32.9	32.5
Moderate drinkers	13.3	22.2	-
Heavy drinkers and alcoholic derelicts.	18.1	7.0	45.0
20-44 years of age.	10.4	5.1	32.5
45-64 years of age.	7.7	1.9	12.5

APPENDIX A

SKID ROW AND SKID ROW PROBLEMS:

A Selected Bibliography

INTRODUCTION:

In the course of the background research, an extensive review was made of the literature in selected problem areas which might contribute to a better understanding of the homeless man and Skid Row areas. The following list of materials is not exhaustive. It became clear in studying the works that much of the literature was duplicative or not directly pertinent to the subject of our research efforts. In the fields of gerontology or housing, for example, there is a voluminous body of material which might have been expanded indefinitely if the criterion of relevance to our Skid Row study were not adhered to. The items appearing on the following pages were selected in the belief that they would contribute directly to understanding the homeless man, as well as stimulate planning efforts toward solving the problems created by the existence of Skid Row areas.

We wish to acknowledge our indebtedness to the authors of the items listed, as well as to the local agencies and resource persons. Together, these sources generated most of the hypotheses which were explored in the interviews with the homeless men and in other phases of the study.

SKID ROW AND SKID ROW PROBLEMS:
A Selected Bibliography

I. INTRODUCTORY AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS

A. Homeless Men and Skid Row

Anderson, Nels. Men on the Move. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1940. 357 pp.

Beasley, Robert M. Men in the Crucible; A Report of the Clearing House for Men Operated Under the Authority of the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission. Chicago: Illinois Emergency Relief Commission, 1932. 77 pp.

Dunham, H. Warren. Homeless Men and Their Habitats: A Research Planning Report. Detroit: Wayne University, 1953. 55 pp.

Ellison, Earl Jerome. "Shame of Skid Row," The Saturday Evening Post, Vol. 225 (December 20, 1952), pp. 13-15.

Foote, Caleb. "Vagrancy-Type Law and its Administration," University of Pennsylvania Law Review, Vol. 104 (March, 1956), p. 603.

Homeless Men in New York. A Welfare Council Report. New York: Welfare Council of New York City, 1949.

Jackson, J. K., and Connor, R., "The Skid Row Alcoholic," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Vol. 14 (September, 1953), p. 468.

Larson, M. G. Skid Row Stopgap. Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press.

"New Hope for the Homeless Non-family Man," Public Administration Clearing House News Bulletin, Vol. 1935 (June 17, 1935), p. 1.

Ottenberg, Donald J. "TB on Skid Row," National Tuberculosis Association Bulletin, June, 1956.

"The Petty Offender: A Philadelphia Study of the Homeless Man," The Prison Journal, Vol. 36 (April, 1956), pp. 1-32.

Rose, Arnold M. "Living Arrangements of Unattached Persons," American Sociological Review, Vol. 12 (August, 1947), pp. 429-435.

Solenberger, Alice W. 1,000 Homeless Men; A Study of Original Records. New York: Survey Associates, Inc., 1914. 374 pp.

Straus, Robert. "Alcoholism and the Homeless Man," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Vol. 7 (1946), pp. 360-404.

Sutherland, Edwin H., and Locke, Harvey. Twenty Thousand Homeless Men. Chicago: Lippincott, 1936. 207 pp.

Wattenberg, W. W., and Moir, J. B. Counseling Homeless Alcoholics.

B. Hoboes, Tramps, and Vagrants

Anderson, Nels. The Milk and Honey Route; A Handbook for Hoboes. New York: Vanguard Press, 1931.

Augustin, J. Human Vagabond. London: Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., 1933.

Beck, Frank O. Hobohemia. Rindge, New Hampshire: R. R. Smith, 1956. 95 pp.

Benson, Ben. Hoboes of America: 500,000 Miles Without a Dollar. New York: Hobo News, 1942. 96 pp.

Booth, William. The Vagrants and the Unemployable. London: The Salvation Army, 1909.

"For Hoboes: Hobo News," Time, Vol. 29 (May 17, 1937), pp. 67-69.

Gape, W. A. Half a Million Tramps. London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1936.

Gray, F. Tramp. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1931.

Jennings, F. L. Tramping with Tramps. London: Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., 1932.

Laubach, F. Charles. Why There Are Vagrants. A thesis. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916. 128 pp.

"Men of the Road," National Review, Vol. 129 (September, 1947), pp. 244-247.

Phelan, J. L. Tramping the Toby. London: Burke Publications Co., Ltd., 1955.

_____. We Follow the Roads. London: Phoenix House, Ltd., 1949.

Rolph, C. H. "Vagrant Men," New Statesman, Vol. 44 (September 6, 1952), p. 259.

Schockman, C. S. We Turned Hobo. Columbus, Ohio: F. J. Heer, 1937.

Stuart, F. S. Vagabond. London: Stanley Paul & Co., Ltd., 1938.

Willard, Josiah Flynt. Tramping with Tramps. New York: Century Company, 1899. 308 pp.

C. Migratory Workers

Hathaway, Marion. Migratory Workers and Family Life. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934. 240 pp.

Los Angeles Bureau of Public Assistance, Department of Charities. A Study of Single Unattached Men in Los Angeles. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Bureau of Public Assistance, 1955. 29 pp.

Taylor, P. W. "Perspectives on Housing Migratory Agricultural Laborers," Land Economics, Vol. 27 (August, 1951), pp. 193-204.

Webb, John N. The Transient Unemployed. Research Monograph III. Washington: WPA Division of Social Research, 1935. 148 pp.

II. PROBLEM AREAS: SELECTED MATERIALS

A. Alcoholism

Bacon, Selden Daskam. Sociology and the Problems of Alcohol. 2nd ed. Foundation for the Sociological Study of Drinking Behavior. New Haven: Hillhouse Press, 1946.

Cushman, Jane F., and Landis, Carney, eds. Studies of Compulsive Drinkers. New Haven: Hillhouse Press, 1946. 90 pp.

Haggard, Howard W., and Jellinek, Elvin M. Alcohol Explored. Garden City: Doubleday, 1942. 297 pp.

Hampton, P. J. "Descriptive Portrait of the Drinker," Journal of Psychology, Vol. 25 (February-May, 1947), pp. 69-132, 151-170.

Harris, R. E., and Ives, V. M. "A Study of the Personality of Alcoholics," American Psychology, Vol. 2 (1947), p. 405.

Hirsh, J. "The Alcoholic -- A Public Responsibility," Social Forces, Vol. 25 (May, 1947), pp. 426-428.

Jellinek, Elvin M., ed. Alcohol Addiction and Chronic Alcoholism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. 336 pp.

Jellinek, Elvin M. Phases in the Drinking History of Alcoholics. New Haven: Hillhouse Press, 1946. 88 pp.

Keller, Mark, and Efron, Vera. "The Prevalence of Alcoholism (Trends in the United States Since 1910); Alcoholism in the Big Cities of the United States," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Vol. 16 (December, 1955), pp. 619-649, and Vol. 17 (March, 1956), pp. 63-72.

Knehr, C. A. "Problem-Action Responses and Emotion in Thematic Apperception Tests: Stories Recounted by Alcoholic Patients," Journal of Psychology, Vol. 35 (April, 1953), pp. 201-226.

- Lerner, A. "Interaction among Male Alcoholic Inmates," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 38 (May, 1954), pp. 313-319.
- Mason, Morse P. "Educational Characteristics of Alcoholics," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Vol. 11 (1950), pp. 30-50.
- Maxwell, M. A. "Interpersonal Factors in the Genesis and Treatment of Alcoholic Addiction," Social Forces, Vol. 29 (May, 1951), pp. 443-448.
- Mowrer, H. R. "Alcoholism and the Family," Journal of Criminal Psychopathology, Vol. 3 (1941), pp. 90-99.
- Patrick, Clarence H. Alcohol, Culture and Society. Sociological Series No. 8. Durham: Duke University Press, 1952. 176 pp.
- Peltenburg, C. M. "Casework with the Alcoholic Patient," Social Casework, Vol. 37 (February, 1956), pp. 81-85.
- Pitt, Don, et al. Salvation Army and the Alcoholic. New York: The Salvation Army.
- Rea, F. B. Alcoholism: Its Psychology and Cure. London: Epworth Press, 1956. 143 pp.
- Sapir, J. V. "Relationship Factors in the Treatment of the Alcoholic," Social Casework, Vol. 34 (July, 1953), pp. 297-303. See also "Reply," Vol. 34 (October, 1953), p. 355.
- Schneyer, Solomon. "The Marital Status of Alcoholics: A Note on an Analysis of the Marital Status of 2,008 Patients of Nine Clinics," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Vol. 15 (June, 1954), pp. 325-329.
- Scott, W. W. "Recorded Inebriacy in Wisconsin: An Analysis of Arrested Inebriates in Two Wisconsin Counties," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 39 (November, 1954), pp. 96-102.
- Seliger, Robert V., and Crawford, Victoria. Guide on Alcoholism for Social Workers. Baltimore: Alcoholism Publications, 1945. 94 pp.
- "Study of Arrests for Drunkenness in Salt Lake City," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Vol. 11 (1950), pp. 695-701.

B. Housing

Chicago Community Trust. Housing the Non-family Woman in Chicago. Chicago: Chicago Community Trust, 1921. 39 pp.

Kraus, Hertha. "Housing for Older Citizens: Factors in Unsatisfactory Housing; Foreign Developments; Proposals for the United States," Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science (January, 1952), pp. 126-138.

McCann, Charles W. Long Beach Senior Citizens Survey: A Community Study of the Living Conditions of the Persons 65 and Over in Long Beach (California), 1955. Long Beach: Community Welfare Council, 1955. 59 pp.

New York (City) Mayor's Committee for Better Housing. Subcommittee on Special Problems, such as Housing for the Aged and Large Families and Discrimination and Integration. Report. New York: New York Mayor's Committee for Better Housing, June 1955. 27 pp.

New York State Conference of Mayors and Other Municipal Officials. Lodging Facilities for Transients. Albany: Bureau of Municipal Information, Report No. 3125, April 18, 1950. 8 pp.

C. Problems of the Aging and Retired

American Journal of Sociology. Entire issue devoted to the subject of aging and retirement. Vol. 59, January, 1954.

American Public Welfare Association. Committee on Aging. Needs of Older People and Public Welfare Services to Meet Them. Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1953. 146 pp.

Canadian Welfare. Special issue of this magazine devoted to problems of old age. Ottawa, May 1, 1955.

Hawkins, Charles E. "Recipients of Old Age Assistance; Income and Resources (1953)," Social Security Bulletin (April, 1956), pp. 3-6.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Selected References on Aging, Annotated. Washington, 1955. 64 pp.

D. Psychological and Personality Problems

Adler, A. Guiding Human Misfits. rev. ed. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948. 114 pp.

Coleman, J. V. "Psychiatric Implications in Casework Service to the Male Migrant," Social Casework, Vol. 32 (October, 1951), pp. 333-337.

- Ford, John C. Depth Psychology, Morality and Alcoholism. Weston, Mass.: Weston College Press, 1951.
- Kreinherder, Albert. Objective Measurement of Reality-contact Weakness. Washington: American Psychological Association, 1952. 23 pp.
- Michaels, J. J. Disorders of Character. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1955.
- Wallin, John E. Personality Adjustments and Mental Hygiene. New York: McGraw, 1949. 581 pp.
- Weinberg, Samuel K. Society and Personality Disorders. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952. 536 pp.

E. Relief and Welfare Problems

- Chicago Relief Administration. Study of the 547 Transients Accepted for Shelter Service in June, 1937. An unpublished report.
- Clark, Donald Adams. Men on Relief in Lackawanna, New York, 1934-35; Social Pathology in a Satellite City. University of Buffalo Studies, Vol. 4, No. 4. Buffalo: University of Buffalo, August, 1937. 119 pp.
- Illinois Emergency Relief Commission. Cook County Service Bureau for Men. Characteristics of Unattached Men on Relief. Chicago: Illinois Emergency Relief Commission, February, 1935.
- Johnson, Glenn H. Relief and Health Problems of a Selected Group of Non-family Men. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937. 77 pp.
- King County (Washington) Board of County Commissioners. Advisory Committee on Social Security. Single Homeless Men, King County, Washington. Seattle: King County Board of County Commissioners, 1937. 79 pp.
- Locke, Harvey J. "Unemployed Men in Chicago Shelters," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 19 (1935), pp. 420-428.
- Minneapolis Division of Public Relief. A Study of Unattached Women on Relief in the City of Minneapolis in April, 1940. Minneapolis: Minneapolis Division of Public Relief, 1940. 10 pp.
- Rockmore, R. "Travelers Aid Service to Unattached Individuals," Journal of Social Casework, Vol. 30 (October, 1949), pp. 327-329.
- Roseman, Alvin. Shelter Care and the Local Homeless Man. Publication No. 46. Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1935. 56 pp.

St. Louis Bureau for Men. A Statistical Analysis of Non-family Men on Relief in St. Louis, 1925-36. St. Louis: St. Louis Bureau for Men, September, 1937. 41 pp.

Shimberg, Myra E., and Lockett, Alfred G. "Some Are Unable To Work," Public Welfare, Vol. 5 (July, 1947), pp. 154-156.

"Single Men on Relief," Social Welfare, January-March, 1942, pp. 1-10.

Stern, Max. "The Transfer of Single Men to Home Relief in Chicago," Social Service Review, Vol. 10 (June, 1936), pp. 277-287.

III. PLANNING, TREATMENT, AND REHABILITATION PROGRAMS

A. The Aged

Baltimore (Maryland) Commission of Aging and Problems of the Aged. Widening the Lengthened Path of Life. Report, 1955. Baltimore: Baltimore Commission of Aging and Problems of the Aged, 1955. 89 pp.

Eaves, Lucile, ed. Aged Clients of Boston Social Agencies. Boston: Women's Educational and Industrial Union, 1925. 152 pp.

"Living Costs of Oldsters; Annual Costs of Total Budget, Housing, and Other Goods and Services in 34 Cities (United States)," Conference Board Business Record, Vol. 8 (October, 1951), p. 398.

Welfare and Health Council of New York City. Bureau of Community Statistical Services. Research Department. Fact Book on the Aged in New York City: Some Characteristics of the Aged Population and Specialized Services for the Aged. New York: Welfare and Health Council, September, 1955. 83 pp.

B. Alcoholism and Personality Disorders

Community Research Associates, Inc. The Prevention and Control of Disordered Behavior in San Mateo County, California. Community Research Associates, Inc., July, 1954.

"Dealing with the Problem of Alcoholism in New York City," Mental Hygiene, Vol. 38 (September, 1954), pp. 334-336.

Hirshberg, Besse. "Alcoholism in the Case of the New York City Welfare Department: Statistical Analysis," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Vol. 15 (May, 1954), pp. 402-412.

Pearson, O. A. "Pioneer House -- Minneapolis Project for Rehabilitation of Alcoholics," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Vol. 11 (1950), pp. 353-359.

Shepherd, E. A. "Alcoholic Rehabilitation in Florida," State Government, Vol. 29 (June, 1956), pp. 110-111.

Wilkins, G. F. "Industry's Stake in the Rehabilitation of Problem Drinkers," Industrial Medicine and Surgery, Vol. 22 (January, 1953), pp. 29-33.

C. Community Redevelopment and Improvement

California University Bureau of Governmental Research. American Institute of Planners. Local Planning Research: Selected Resources of Information for California, 1955-1956. Los Angeles: Bureau of Governmental Research, University of California, 1956. 94 pp.

Cincinnati Bureau of Governmental Research. An Urban Re-development Study of 10 Cincinnati Blighted Areas with Related Economic, Population and Land Market Data. Report No. 109. Cincinnati: Bureau of Governmental Research, September, 1951.

Juster, Robert. "Rehabilitation in New Orleans," Town Planning Institute Journal, Vol. 42 (December, 1955), pp. 10-12.

New York (City) Mayor's Committee for Better Housing. Subcommittee on Urban Redevelopment Including Slum Clearance, Neighborhood Conservation, and Rehabilitation. Report. New York: New York Mayor's Committee for Better Housing, August, 1955. 19 pp.

D. Programs for Homeless Men

Adams, Frank Dawson. Day Shelter for Unemployed Men in Montreal; A Social Experiment. Montreal: McGill University, 1932. 29 pp.

Center of Alcohol Studies, Yale University. What To Do Before Skid Row Is Demolished. Philadelphia: Greater Philadelphia Movement, 1958. 21 pp.

Wilson, Robert S. Community Planning for the Homeless Men and Boys: The Experience of Sixteen Cities in the Winter of 1930-31. New York: Family Welfare Association of America, 1931. 144 pp.

United States Congress. Joint Committee on the Economic Report. A Program for the Low-Income Population of Substandard Levels of Living. 84th Congress, 2nd session, S. Report 1311. Washington, January 5, 1956. 14 pp.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Edge, William. Main Stem. New York: Vanguard Press, 1927.

Gilmore, Harlan Welch. The Beggar. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1940. 252 pp.

Hapgood, Hutchins. Types from City Streets. Reprinted from various periodicals. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1910. 379 pp.

Higgs, Mary. Down and Out. London: Student Christian Movement, 1924. 110 pp.

Irwin, Godfrey. American Tramp and Underworld Slang. New York: Sears Publishing Co., 1931. 263 pp.

McMillen, Wayne. "Single Blessedness," Survey, Vol. LXX (March, 1934), pp. 74-75.

Minehan, T. Lonesome Road. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson & Co., 1941.

Mullin, Glen H. "Sidewalks of New York," Century Magazine, Vol. 110 (1925), pp. 50-57.

Rose, Arnold M. "The Problem of Mass Society," Antioch Review, Vol. 10 (Fall, 1950), pp. 378-394.

Schnore, Leo F., and Varley, David W. "Some Concomitants of Metropolitan Size," American Sociological Review, Vol. 20 (August, 1955), pp. 408-414.

Stamper, J. Less Than the Dust. London: Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., 1933.

APPENDIX B

Information Concerning

Skid Rows in

American Cities

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1)

Item	All cities, average			Akron, Ohio		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
POPULATION STATISTICS						
1 Population, total (000)						
2 1950.....	19.6	765.8	-746.2	31.0	274.6	-243.6
3 1940.....	21.5	823.1	-801.6	29.6	244.8	-215.2
4 Change, 1940-50.....	1.0	92.5	-91.5	1.4	29.8	-28.4
5 Pop., pct. change, 1940-50...	2.9	15.0	-12.1	4.9	12.2	-7.3
6 Homeless pers., 1950 (000)...	4.7	31.0	-26.3	2.7	4.9	-2.2
7 Pct. of pop. homeless, 1950	32.1	4.5	27.6	8.8	1.8	7.0
8 Living in:						
9 Reg. households, pct., 1950	64.7	94.7	-30.0	90.5	98.0	-7.5
10 Different house than 1949.	27.2	18.5	8.7	19.3	15.8	3.5
11 Sex ratio (males \div females)						
12 1950.....	172.2	94.1	78.1	106.7	95.6	11.1
13 1940.....	180.6	97.2	83.4	109.9	98.6	11.3
14 Change, 1940-50.....	-2.2	-1.4	-0.8	-3.2	-3.0	-0.2
15 Percent nonwhite						
16 1950.....	22.1	13.7	8.4	27.1	8.7	18.4
17 1940.....	16.3	11.4	4.9	15.8	5.0	10.8
18 Change, 1940-50.....	5.7	2.7	3.0	11.3	3.7	7.6
19 Pct. foreign born white						
20 1950.....	10.1	7.9	2.2	6.9	7.7	-0.8
21 1940.....	15.6	11.2	4.4	11.7	7.7	4.0
22 Change, 1940-50.....	-5.1	-2.7	-2.4	-4.8	0.0	-4.8
23 Pct. 6 yrs. or less of school						
24 1950.....	30.3	17.3	13.0	23.1	14.3	8.8
25 1940.....	34.2	21.0	13.2	26.2	16.6	9.6
26 Change, 1940-50.....	-3.3	-3.3	0.0	-3.1	-2.3	-0.8
27 Pct. 65 years or over						
28 1950.....	11.7	8.4	3.3	7.4	6.7	0.7
29 1940.....	9.7	7.2	2.5	5.7	4.8	0.9
30 Change, 1940-50.....	2.3	1.6	0.7	1.7	1.9	-0.2

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2)

Item	All cities, average			Akron, Ohio		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31 Percent unemployed						
32 1950.....	14.7	5.7	9.0	11.9	6.9	5.0
33 1940.....	29.2	15.9	13.3	32.2	20.2	12.0
34 Change, 1940-50.....	-13.8	-10.1	-3.7	-20.3	-13.3	-7.0
35 Laborers, pct. of employed						
36 1950.....	12.7	6.3	6.4	8.1	4.4	3.7
37 1940.....	10.3	6.6	3.7	8.3	5.9	2.4
38 Change, 1940-50.....	3.0	-0.3	3.3	-0.2	-1.5	1.3
39 Pct. earning income less						
40 than \$1,500 in 1949.....	48.7	26.9	21.8	30.8	18.8	12.0
41 HOUSING STATISTICS						
42 Dwelling units:						
43 Number (hundreds)						
44 1950.....	53.0	2365.0	-2312.0	86.0	829.0	-743.0
45 1940.....	62.0	2440.0	-2378.0	78.0	679.0	-601.0
46 Change, 1940-50.....	-2.0	386.0	-388.0	8.0	150.0	-142.0
47 Percent change, 1940-50....	1.2	19.5	-18.3	10.1	22.0	-11.9
48 Occupied by owner, pct.						
49 1950.....	12.1	45.9	-33.8	39.4	62.7	-23.3
50 1940.....	8.3	34.0	-25.7	29.2	47.8	-18.6
51 Change, 1940-50.....	3.5	12.0	-8.5	10.2	14.9	-4.7
52 Occupied by nonwhites, pct.						
53 1950.....	22.6	11.6	11.0	21.3	6.4	14.9
54 1940.....	16.9	10.7	6.2	15.1	4.3	10.8
55 Change, 1940-50.....	5.6	1.3	4.3	6.2	2.1	4.1
56 Vacant, percent						
57 1950.....	2.4	1.6	0.8	1.8	1.1	0.7
58 1940.....	8.0	4.6	3.4	2.5	2.0	0.5
59 Change, 1940-50.....	-4.5	-3.0	-1.5	-0.7	-0.9	0.2
60 Substandard, pct. of total						
61 1950.....	54.2	19.2	35.0	33.2	16.0	17.2
62 Built prior to 1920, pct...	83.8	50.9	32.9	77.6	45.9	31.7
63 Pct. with 1.51 pers./room						
64 1950.....	13.0	4.7	8.3	4.7	2.1	2.6
65 1940.....	13.9	6.2	7.7	4.7	2.5	2.2
66 Change, 1940-50.....	-0.2	-0.8	0.6	0.0	-0.4	0.4

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1, continued)

Baltimore, Maryland			Birmingham, Alabama			Boston, Massachusetts			
Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	
1									
2	50.6	949.7	-899.1	9.7	326.0	-316.3	21.5	801.4	-779.9
3	47.4	859.1	-811.7	9.5	267.6	-258.1	20.6	770.8	-750.2
4	3.2	90.6	-87.4	0.2	58.4	-58.2	0.9	30.6	-29.7
5	6.7	10.5	-3.8	2.4	21.8	-19.4	4.7	4.0	0.7
6	2.9	27.6	-24.7	1.8	7.6	-5.8	6.3	52.2	-45.9
7	5.8	2.9	2.9	18.1	2.3	15.8	29.1	6.5	22.6
8									
9	94.1	96.4	-2.3	79.8	97.4	-17.6	70.2	92.2	-22.0
10	18.7	13.7	5.0	29.7	21.5	8.2	17.3	11.0	6.3
11									
12	103.8	94.5	9.3	98.1	89.2	8.9	143.0	93.9	49.1
13	114.2	97.0	17.2	115.9	90.9	25.0	140.9	93.8	47.1
14	-10.4	-2.5	-7.9	-17.8	-1.7	-16.1	2.1	0.1	2.0
15									
16	55.2	23.8	31.4	46.1	39.9	6.2	14.2	5.3	8.9
17	43.3	19.4	23.9	55.8	40.7	15.1	8.3	3.3	5.0
18	11.9	4.4	7.5	-9.7	-0.8	-8.9	5.9	2.0	3.9
19									
20	5.9	5.4	0.5	1.1	1.2	-0.1	23.6	18.0	5.6
21	11.6	7.1	4.5	1.9	1.7	0.2	32.1	23.5	8.6
22	-5.7	-1.7	-4.0	-0.8	-0.5	-0.3	-8.5	-5.5	-3.0
23									
24	55.4	29.1	26.3	37.6	27.4	10.2	31.2	15.5	15.7
25	65.3	35.1	30.2	47.4	32.3	15.1	35.9	18.8	17.1
26	-9.9	-6.0	-3.9	-9.8	-4.9	-4.9	-4.7	-3.3	-1.4
27									
28	5.4	7.4	-2.0	8.5	6.3	2.2	13.2	9.7	3.5
29	5.7	6.4	-0.7	4.5	4.3	0.2	11.8	8.0	3.8
30	-0.3	1.0	-1.3	4.0	2.0	2.0	1.4	1.7	-0.3

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2, continued)

Baltimore, Maryland			Birmingham, Alabama			Boston, Massachusetts		
Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31								
32	13.9	5.8	8.1	4.8	3.3	15.7	7.4	8.3
33	21.0	10.3	17.9	15.6	2.3	27.4	19.9	7.5
34	-7.1	-4.5	-9.8	-10.8	1.0	-11.7	-12.5	0.8
35								
36	22.2	8.3	16.2	10.0	6.2	8.6	5.8	2.8
37	24.1	9.8	12.2	9.4	2.8	7.3	5.3	2.0
38	-1.9	-1.5	4.0	0.6	3.4	1.3	0.5	0.8
39								
40	52.0	26.2	45.7	30.0	15.7	49.4	28.2	21.2
41								
42								
43								
44	135.0	2779.0	26.0	955.0	-929.0	55.0	2221.0	-2166.0
45	134.0	2364.0	24.0	737.0	-713.0	60.0	2115.0	-2055.0
46	1.0	415.0	2.0	218.0	-216.0	-5.0	106.0	-111.0
47	0.3	17.5	10.2	29.6	-19.4	-7.6	5.0	-12.6
48								
49	14.8	50.0	4.0	45.4	-41.4	8.5	24.4	-15.9
50	14.1	39.3	3.3	28.9	-25.6	8.8	19.5	-10.7
51	0.7	10.7	0.7	16.5	-15.8	-0.3	4.9	-5.2
52								
53	49.6	18.8	41.0	35.0	6.0	15.5	5.1	10.4
54	40.8	16.6	59.9	40.0	19.9	10.7	3.7	7.0
55	8.8	2.2	-18.9	-5.0	-13.9	4.8	1.4	3.4
56								
57	1.6	1.8	0.8	1.9	-1.1	2.3	0.9	1.4
58	6.2	3.6	5.0	2.4	2.6	14.4	6.5	7.9
59	-4.6	-1.8	-4.2	-0.5	-3.7	-12.1	-5.6	-6.5
60								
61	60.2	16.8	48.7	38.5	10.2	47.6	15.4	32.2
62	87.7	61.6	28.4	39.2	-10.8	98.8	77.5	21.3
63								
64	11.3	3.5	15.8	10.3	5.5	6.6	3.2	3.4
65	7.3	3.4	26.9	13.6	13.3	6.7	3.9	2.8
66	4.0	0.1	-11.1	-3.3	-7.8	-0.1	-0.7	0.6

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1)

Item	Buffalo, New York			Chatanooga, Tennessee		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
POPULATION STATISTICS						
1 Population, total (000)						
2 1950.....	10.7	580.1	-569.4	13.9	131.0	-117.1
3 1940.....	10.3	575.9	-565.6
4 Change, 1940-50.....	0.4	4.2	-3.8
5 Pop., pct. change, 1940-50...	4.1	0.7	3.4
6 Homeless pers., 1950 (000)...	4.2	20.7	-16.5	1.2	3.5	-2.3
7 Pct. of pop. homeless, 1950	39.1	3.6	35.5	8.3	2.7	5.6
8 Living in:						
9 Reg. households, pct., 1950	60.9	95.6	-34.7	91.1	97.0	-5.9
10 Different house than 1949.	20.6	11.0	9.6	17.1	20.3	-3.2
11 Sex ratio (males : females)						
12 1950.....	178.2	94.6	83.6	95.1	87.9	7.2
13 1940.....	207.2	97.1	110.1
14 Change, 1940-50.....	-29.0	-2.5	26.5
15 Percent nonwhite						
16 1950.....	25.2	6.5	18.7	71.7	30.0	41.7
17 1940.....	8.3	3.2	5.1
18 Change, 1940-50.....	16.9	3.3	13.6
19 Pct. foreign born white						
20 1950.....	17.0	12.1	4.9	0.5	0.8	-0.3
21 1940.....	29.4	15.9	13.5
22 Change, 1940-50.....	-12.4	-3.8	-8.6
23 Pct. 6 yrs. or less of school						
24 1950.....	38.3	17.8	20.5	54.3	31.6	22.7
25 1940.....	48.9	21.0	27.9
26 Change, 1940-50.....	-10.6	-3.2	-7.4
27 Pct. 65 years or over						
28 1950.....	9.5	8.4	1.1	5.6	6.7	-1.1
29 1940.....	6.9	6.5	0.4
30 Change, 1940-50.....	2.6	1.9	0.7

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2)

Item	Buffalo, New York			Chatanooga, Tennessee		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31 Percent unemployed						
32 1950.....	27.3	6.8	20.5	8.3	5.2	3.1
33 1940.....	56.4	20.7	35.7
34 Change, 1940-50.....	-29.1	-13.9	-15.2
35 Laborers, pct. of employed						
36 1950.....	24.1	7.4	16.7	14.7	7.1	7.6
37 1940.....	22.1	7.2	14.9
38 Change, 1940-50	2.0	0.2	1.8
39 Pct. earning income less						
40 than \$1,500 in 1949.....	55.3	23.1	32.2	56.7	34.9	21.8
41 HOUSING STATISTICS						
42 Dwelling units:						
43 Number (hundreds)						
44 1950.....	18.0	1667.0	-1649.0	38.0	390.0	-352.0
45 1940.....	19.0	1578.0	-1559.0
46 Change, 1940-50.....	-1.0	89.0	-90.0
47 Percent change, 1940-50.....	-4.6	5.7	-10.3
48 Occupied by owner, pct.						
49 1950.....	18.3	43.0	-24.7	11.2	39.4	-28.2
50 1940.....	17.0	31.0	-14.0
51 Change, 1940-50.....	1.3	12.0	-10.7
52 Occupied by nonwhite, pct.						
53 1950.....	23.7	5.0	18.7	72.7	28.0	44.7
54 1940.....	11.3	3.1	8.2
55 Change, 1940-50.....	12.4	1.9	10.5
56 Vacant, percent						
57 1950.....	0.4	0.5	-0.1	1.5	1.3	0.2
58 1940.....	4.4	3.4	1.0
59 Change, 1940-50.....	-4.0	-2.9	-1.1
60 Substandard, pct. of total						
61 1950.....	44.5	12.5	32.0	77.6	38.4	39.2
62 Built prior to 1920, pct...	92.6	67.8	24.8	72.6	52.9	19.7
63 Pct. with 1.51 pers./room						
64 1950.....	4.7	1.4	3.3	19.9	9.9	10.0
65 1940.....	4.4	2.0	2.4
66 Change, 1940-50.....	0.3	-0.6	0.9

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1, continued)

Chicago, Illinois			Cincinnati, Ohio			Cleveland, Ohio			
Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	
1									
2	46.5	3621.0	-3574.5	38.2	504.0	-465.8	15.0	914.8	-899.8
3	36.4	3396.8	-3360.4	35.4	455.6	-420.2	15.6	878.3	-862.7
4	10.1	224.2	-214.1	2.8	48.4	-45.6	-0.6	36.5	-37.1
5	27.8	6.6	21.2	7.9	10.6	-2.7	-3.7	4.2	-7.9
6	20.8	152.0	-131.2	5.4	16.2	-10.8	2.4	34.9	-32.5
7	44.9	4.2	40.7	14.1	3.2	10.9	15.8	3.8	12.0
8									
9	54.6	95.5	-40.9	85.1	95.3	-10.2	84.2	95.6	-11.4
10	29.8	12.9	16.9	21.0	16.0	5.0	16.5	13.7	2.8
11									
12	221.9	96.4	125.5	109.1	90.1	19.0	126.1	96.1	30.0
13	267.2	98.0	169.2	108.4	91.0	17.4	118.6	99.6	19.0
14	-45.3	-1.6	-43.7	0.7	-0.9	1.6	7.5	-3.5	11.0
15									
16	21.2	14.1	7.1	34.7	15.6	19.1	0.2	16.3	-16.1
17	2.8	8.3	-5.5	34.5	12.2	22.3	0.2	9.7	-9.5
18	18.4	5.8	12.6	0.2	3.4	-3.2	0.0	6.6	-6.6
19									
20	15.3	14.5	0.8	2.7	4.1	-1.4	18.5	14.5	4.0
21	25.5	19.8	5.7	4.2	5.7	-1.5	26.0	20.4	5.6
22	-10.2	-5.3	-4.9	-1.5	-1.6	0.1	-7.5	-5.9	-1.6
23									
24	30.3	17.1	13.2	37.3	20.0	17.3	25.7	23.3	2.4
25	30.5	20.3	10.2	41.6	23.3	18.3	37.9	29.6	8.3
26	-0.2	-3.2	3.0	-4.3	-3.3	-1.0	-12.2	-6.3	-5.9
27									
28	11.0	7.6	3.4	10.2	10.0	0.2	9.6	7.8	1.8
29	10.8	8.5	2.3	8.2	8.5	-0.3	6.0	5.4	0.6
30	0.2	-0.9	1.1	2.0	1.5	0.5	3.6	2.4	1.2

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2, continued)

Chicago, Illinois			Cincinnati, Ohio			Cleveland, Ohio			
Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	
31									
32	16.6	4.8	11.8	12.9	5.8	7.1	8.3	5.5	2.8
33	33.6	15.2	18.4	28.4	14.5	13.9	25.9	20.1	5.8
34	-17.0	-10.4	-6.6	-15.5	-8.7	-6.8	-17.6	-14.6	-3.0
35									
36	16.6	5.7	10.9	11.4	5.9	5.5	9.4	7.3	2.1
37	9.0	6.6	2.4	10.4	5.8	4.6	10.3	8.1	2.2
38	7.6	-0.9	8.5	1.0	0.1	0.9	-0.9	-0.8	-0.1
39									
40	43.8	19.5	24.3	48.4	29.8	18.6	28.5	21.5	7.0
41									
42									
43									
44	105.0	11061.0	-10956.0	132.0	1626.0	-1494.0	42.0	2709.0	-2667.0
45	108.0	9895.0	-9787.0	125.0	1443.0	-1318.0	41.0	2499.0	-2458.0
46	-3.0	1166.0	-1169.0	7.0	183.0	-176.0	1.0	210.0	-209.0
47	-2.3	11.8	-14.1	5.1	12.7	-7.6	1.2	8.4	-7.2
48									
49	5.8	29.8	-24.0	3.9	37.1	-33.2	32.4	41.9	-9.5
50	3.2	23.3	-20.1	2.2	31.3	-29.1	25.1	32.2	-7.1
51	2.6	6.5	-3.9	1.7	5.8	-4.1	7.3	9.7	-2.4
52									
53	26.8	11.9	14.9	35.4	14.5	20.9	0.1	12.9	-12.8
54	2.4	7.7	-5.3	33.0	11.7	21.3	0.2	8.8	-8.6
55	24.4	4.2	20.2	2.4	2.8	-0.4	-0.1	4.1	-4.2
56									
57	2.5	0.8	1.7	1.9	1.1	0.8	1.1	0.9	0.2
58	8.7	3.8	4.9	10.2	5.7	4.5	2.8	2.9	-0.1
59	-6.2	-3.0	-3.2	-8.3	-4.6	-3.7	-1.7	-2.0	0.3
60									
61	77.6	19.6	58.0	83.4	30.5	52.9	20.2	13.7	6.5
62	94.8	62.8	32.0	96.4	65.7	30.7	96.0	65.1	30.9
63									
64	29.8	6.4	23.4	20.3	8.0	12.3	2.4	2.7	-0.3
65	13.7	5.8	7.9	22.0	9.5	12.5	4.1	3.1	1.0
66	16.1	0.6	15.5	-1.7	-1.5	-0.2	-1.7	-0.4	-1.3

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1)

Item	Columbus, Ohio			Dallas, Texas		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
POPULATION STATISTICS						
1 Population, total (000)						
2 1950.....	17.9	375.9	-358.0	3.3	434.5	-431.2
3 1940.....	15.5	306.1	-290.6	4.0	294.7	-290.7
4 Change, 1940-50.....	2.4	69.8	-67.4	-0.7	139.8	-140.5
5 Pop., pct. change, 1940-50...	15.9	22.8	-6.9	-18.7	47.4	-66.1
6 Homeless pers., 1950 (000)...	2.1	16.5	-14.4	0.5	12.3	-11.8
7 Pct. of pop. homeless, 1950.	11.7	4.4	7.3	15.2	2.8	12.4
8 Living in:						
9 Reg. households, pct., 1950	85.5	92.6	-7.1	84.8	96.7	-11.9
10 Different house than 1949..	28.0	21.6	6.4	40.4	29.8	10.6
11 Sex ratio (males \div females)						
12 1950.....	98.3	96.4	1.9	137.9	91.0	46.9
13 1940.....	96.4	94.8	1.6	120.0	90.2	29.8
14 Change, 1940-50.....	1.9	1.6	0.3	17.9	0.8	17.1
15 Percent nonwhite						
16 1950.....	19.1	12.5	6.6	12.3	13.2	-0.9
17 1940.....	16.2	11.7	4.5	9.9	17.1	-7.2
18 Change, 1940-50.....	2.9	0.8	2.1	2.4	-3.9	6.3
19 Pct. foreign born white						
20 1950.....	2.5	2.9	-0.4	3.2	1.9	1.3
21 1940.....	3.4	3.9	-0.5	3.4	2.5	0.9
22 Change, 1940-50.....	-0.9	-1.0	0.1	-0.2	-0.6	0.4
23 Pct. 6 yrs. or less of school						
24 1950.....	25.5	12.7	12.8	34.3	15.2	19.1
25 1940.....	27.1	16.5	10.6	38.3	20.2	18.1
26 Change, 1940-50.....	-1.6	-3.8	2.2	-4.0	-5.0	1.0
27 Pct. 65 years or over						
28 1950.....	10.7	8.7	2.0	10.5	6.1	4.4
29 1940.....	9.8	7.7	2.1	7.0	5.2	1.8
30 Change, 1940-50.....	0.9	1.0	-0.1	3.5	0.9	2.6

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2)

Item	Columbus, Ohio			Dallas, Texas		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31 Percent unemployed						
32 1950.....	10.1	5.4	4.7	7.4	2.9	4.5
33 1940.....	23.3	13.5	9.7	28.3	12.4	15.9
34 Change, 1940-50.....	-13.2	-8.2	-5.0	-20.9	-9.5	-11.4
35 Laborers, pct. of employed						
36 1950.....	9.7	5.2	4.5	10.7	4.4	6.3
37 1940.....	6.7	5.0	1.7	5.4	4.2	1.2
38 Change, 1940-50.....	3.0	0.2	2.8	5.3	0.2	5.1
39 Pct. earning income less						
40 than \$1,500 in 1949.....	38.7	23.1	15.6	49.6	22.6	27.0
41 HOUSING STATISTICS						
42 Dwelling units:						
43 Number (hundreds)						
44 1950.....	60.0	1117.0	-1057.0	12.0	1412.0	-1400.0
45 1940.....	47.0	868.0	-821.0	12.0	895.0	-883.0
46 Change, 1940-50.....	13.0	249.0	-236.0	0.0	517.0	-517.0
47 Percent change, 1940-50....	27.1	28.8	-1.7	-1.0	57.8	-58.8
48 Occupied by owner, pct.						
49 1950.....	10.1	46.5	-36.4	8.5	50.8	-42.3
50 1940.....	7.6	35.7	-28.1	6.0	32.8	-26.8
51 Change, 1940-50.....	2.5	10.8	-8.3	2.5	18.0	-15.5
52 Occupied by nonwhite, pct.						
53 1950.....	13.9	10.5	3.4	12.5	11.2	1.3
54 1940.....	13.2	9.8	3.4	12.8	15.5	-2.7
55 Change, 1940-50.....	0.7	0.7	0.0	-0.3	-4.3	4.0
56 Vacant, percent						
57 1950.....	1.0	0.7	0.3	2.6	2.5	0.1
58 1940.....	5.1	3.3	1.8	9.9	5.8	4.1
59 Change, 1940-50.....	-4.1	-2.6	-1.5	-7.3	-3.3	-4.0
60 Substandard, pct. of total						
61 1950.....	57.0	18.0	39.0	75.0	17.4	57.6
62 Built prior to 1920, pct...	75.4	47.0	28.4	84.5	22.0	62.5
63 Pct. with 1.51 pers./room						
64 1950.....	13.1	3.6	9.5	24.6	5.4	19.2
65 1940.....	14.5	3.6	10.9	39.1	11.3	27.8
66 Change, 1940-50.....	-1.4	0.0	-1.4	-14.5	-5.9	-8.6

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1, continued)

Denver, Colorado			Detroit, Michigan			Fort Worth, Texas		
Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
1								
2 14.3	415.8	-401.5	29.0	1849.6	-1820.6	6.4	278.8	-272.4
3 16.4	322.4	-306.0	27.9	1623.5	-1595.6
4 -2.1	93.4	-95.5	1.1	226.1	-225.0
5 -12.6	29.0	-41.6	3.3	13.9	-10.6
6 7.3	24.4	-17.1	13.0	83.2	-70.2	2.9	10.4	-7.5
7 51.0	5.9	45.1	44.9	4.5	40.4	46.2	3.7	42.5
8								
9 49.0	93.5	-44.5	52.1	95.3	-43.2	41.8	95.6	-53.8
10 33.6	24.1	9.5	25.5	15.8	9.7	39.2	28.5	10.7
11								
12 173.4	93.2	80.2	207.1	100.4	106.7	196.7	95.0	101.7
13 170.5	93.3	77.2	211.6	104.0	107.6
14 2.9	-0.1	3.0	-4.5	-3.6	-0.9
15								
16 7.4	4.4	3.0	20.5	16.4	4.1	24.6	13.3	11.3
17 3.2	2.7	0.5	16.0	9.3	6.7
18 4.2	1.7	2.5	4.5	7.1	-2.6
19								
20 7.3	5.4	1.9	17.1	14.9	2.2	1.8	1.5	0.3
21 11.6	7.7	3.9	24.0	19.8	4.2
22 -4.3	-2.3	-2.0	-6.9	-4.9	-2.0
23								
24 25.1	10.2	14.9	32.7	18.7	14.0	26.1	16.4	9.7
25 24.4	12.4	12.0	35.9	22.8	13.1
26 0.7	-2.2	2.9	-3.2	-4.1	0.9
27								
28 15.7	9.4	6.3	9.8	5.7	4.1	10.7	6.6	4.1
29 13.6	8.8	4.8	5.5	4.0	1.5
30 2.1	0.6	1.5	4.3	1.7	2.6

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Row, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2, continued)

Denver, Colorado			Detroit, Michigan			Fort Worth, Texas			
Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	
31									
32	17.4	3.9	13.5	13.4	7.3	6.1	6.7	3.0	3.7
33	30.7	15.1	15.6	33.4	14.7	18.7
34	-13.3	-11.2	-2.1	-20.0	-7.4	-12.6
35									
36	12.5	5.2	7.3	12.3	5.2	7.1	9.3	6.0	3.3
37	8.0	4.9	3.1	11.4	6.3	5.1
38	4.5	0.3	4.2	0.9	-1.1	2.0
39									
40	55.2	27.5	27.7	44.9	17.6	27.3	50.6	26.0	24.6
41									
42									
43	24.0	1337.0	-1307.0	48.0	5524.0	-5476.0	10.0	894.0	-884.0
44	30.0	1011.0	-970.0	58.0	4415.0	-4357.0
45	41.0	326.0	-337.0	-10.0	1109.0	-1119.0
46	-11.0								
47	-26.0	32.2	-58.2	-17.1	18.3	-35.4
48									
49	6.4	50.4	-44.0	9.9	52.9	-43.0	13.6	56.8	-43.2
50	2.1	36.8	-34.7	6.2	37.8	-31.6
51	4.3	13.6	-9.3	3.7	15.1	11.4
52									
53	8.8	3.5	5.3	20.9	12.3	8.6	35.5	11.9	23.6
54	4.0	2.8	1.2	15.2	7.9	7.3
55	4.8	0.7	4.1	5.7	4.4	1.3
56									
57	1.1	1.3	-0.2	0.9	1.0	-0.1	2.9	2.5	0.4
58	10.0	4.1	5.9	7.4	3.5	3.9
59	-8.9	-2.8	-6.1	-6.5	-2.5	-4.0
60									
61	70.1	21.2	48.9	47.8	8.9	38.9	62.3	24.3	38.0
62	84.4	51.6	32.8	83.6	33.8	49.8	55.8	22.7	33.1
63									
64	22.5	4.8	17.7	13.0	2.7	10.3	17.2	7.3	9.9
65	23.4	6.6	16.8	10.9	3.6	7.3
66	-0.9	-1.8	0.9	2.1	-0.9	3.0

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1)

Item	Houston, Texas			Indianapolis, Indiana		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
POPULATION STATISTICS						
1 Population, total (000)						
2 1950.....	8.8	596.2	-587.4	8.5	427.2	-418.7
3 1940.....	14.6	384.5	-369.9	10.5	387.0	-376.5
4 Change, 1940-50.....	-5.8	211.7	-217.5	-2.0	40.2	-42.2
5 Pop., pct. change, 1940-50...	-40.1	55.0	95.1	-18.7	10.4	-29.1
6 Homeless pers., 1950 (000)...	3.8	16.6	-12.8	2.5	10.6	-8.1
7 Pct. of pop. homeless, 1950	43.9	2.8	41.1	29.4	2.5	26.9
8 Living in:						
9 Reg. households, pct., 1950	49.0	96.9	-47.9	70.6	96.7	-26.1
10 Different house than 1949..	44.8	27.1	17.7	27.2	19.4	7.8
11 Sex ratio (males ÷ females)						
12 1950.....	165.4	95.9	69.5	121.2	90.8	30.4
13 1940.....	132.8	96.0	36.8	114.9	92.0	22.9
14 Change, 1940-50.....	32.6	-0.1	32.7	6.3	-1.2	7.5
15 Percent nonwhite						
16 1950.....	4.6	21.1	-16.5	21.5	15.0	6.5
17 1940.....	4.4	22.5	-18.1	17.1	13.2	3.9
18 Change, 1940-50.....	0.2	-1.4	1.6	4.4	1.8	2.6
19 Pct. foreign born white						
20 1950.....	4.2	2.9	1.3	2.7	2.1	0.6
21 1940.....	5.1	4.0	1.1	4.3	2.7	1.6
22 Change, 1940-50.....	-0.9	-1.1	0.2	-1.6	-0.6	-1.0
23 Pct. 6 yrs. or less of school						
24 1950.....	19.7	20.8	-1.1	20.1	12.7	7.4
25 1940.....	18.1	24.2	-6.1	19.5	14.8	4.7
26 Change, 1940-50.....	1.6	-3.4	5.0	0.6	-2.1	2.7
27 Pct. 65 years or over						
28 1950.....	10.2	5.0	5.2	12.1	8.7	3.4
29 1940.....	6.3	4.3	2.0	9.8	7.4	2.4
30 Change, 1940-50.....	3.9	0.7	3.2	2.3	1.3	1.0

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2)

Item	Houston, Texas			Indianapolis, Indiana		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31 Percent unemployed						
32 1950.....	8.3	3.6	4.7	5.6	3.8	1.8
33 1940.....	14.7	10.0	4.7	14.0	13.6	0.4
34 Change, 1940-50.....	-6.4	-6.4	0.0	-8.4	-9.8	1.4
35 Laborers, pct. of employed						
36 1950.....	5.3	8.0	-2.7	8.7	5.6	3.1
37 1940.....	3.4	8.2	-4.8	5.7	6.7	-1.0
38 Change, 1940-50.....	1.9	-0.2	2.1	3.0	-1.1	4.1
39 Pct. earning income less						
40 than \$1.500 in 1949.....	46.5	24.2	22.3	37.1	21.8	15.3
41 HOUSING STATISTICS						
42 Dwelling units:						
43 Number (hundreds)						
44 1950.....	21.0	1917.0	-1896.0	26.0	1347.0	-1321.0
45 1940.....	34.0	1133.0	-1099.0	33.0	1166.0	-1133.0
46 Change, 1940-50.....	-13.0	784.0	-797.0	-7.0	181.0	-188.0
47 Percent change, 1940-50....	-38.5	69.1	-107.6	-20.7	15.5	-36.2
48 Occupied by owner, pct.						
49 1950.....	5.6	47.3	-41.7	7.2	51.7	-44.5
50 1940.....	3.7	32.1	-28.4	2.9	35.0	-32.1
51 Change, 1940-50.....	1.9	15.2	-13.3	4.3	16.7	-12.4
52 Occupied by nonwhites, pct.						
53 1950.....	2.9	18.5	-15.6	19.9	12.9	7.0
54 1940.....	4.3	21.6	-17.3	17.1	12.4	4.7
55 Change, 1940-50.....	-1.4	-3.1	1.7	2.8	0.5	2.3
56 Vacant, percent						
57 1950.....	8.8	3.6	5.2	0.9	1.1	-0.2
58 1940.....	5.3	5.0	0.3	6.0	3.6	2.4
59 Change, 1940-50.....	3.5	-1.4	4.9	-5.1	-2.5	-2.6
60 Substandard, pct. of total						
61 1950.....	50.3	18.4	31.9	50.6	25.9	24.7
62 Built prior to 1920, pct...	69.1	15.6	53.5	83.7	58.9	24.8
63 Pct. with 1.51 pers./room						
64 1950.....	14.8	6.6	8.2	12.3	4.8	7.5
65 1940.....	30.7	10.8	19.9	12.5	4.5	8.0
66 Change, 1940-50.....	-15.9	-4.2	-11.7	-0.2	0.3	-0.5

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1, continued)

Kansas City, Missouri				Los Angeles, California			Louisville, Kentucky		
Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence		Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence
1									
2	2.5	456.6	-454.1	40.2	1970.4	-1930.2	6.8	369.1	-362.3
3	2.3	399.2	-396.9	39.7	1504.3	-1464.6	7.0	319.1	-312.1
4	0.2	57.4	57.2	0.5	466.1	-465.6	-0.2	50.0	-50.2
5	5.9	14.4	-8.5	1.4	31.0	-29.6	-1.8	15.7	-17.5
6	2.0	20.9	-18.9	16.0	79.2	-63.2	1.9	10.3	-8.4
7	81.0	4.6	76.4	39.7	4.0	35.7	28.0	2.8	25.2
8									
9	19.0	95.1	-76.1	60.3	95.3	-35.0	67.0	96.6	-29.6
10	35.1	19.3	15.8	34.1	24.3	9.8	26.7	19.5	7.2
11									
12	287.5	90.3	197.2	177.8	91.9	85.9	130.4	90.8	39.6
13	310.0	90.9	219.1	200.0	95.3	104.7	128.5	91.3	37.2
14	-22.5	-0.6	-21.9	-22.2	-3.4	-18.8	1.9	-0.5	2.4
15									
16	1.6	12.2	-10.7	20.9	10.7	10.2	24.2	15.6	8.6
17	2.7	10.5	-7.8	8.8	6.5	2.3	24.6	14.8	9.8
18	-1.1	1.8	-2.9	12.1	4.2	7.9	-0.4	0.8	-1.2
19									
20	4.2	3.5	0.7	13.4	12.5	0.9	2.4	1.3	1.1
21	8.1	4.8	3.3	15.4	14.3	1.1	4.0	1.9	2.1
22	-3.9	-1.3	-2.6	-2.0	-1.8	-0.2	-1.6	-0.6	-1.0
23									
24	30.0	12.8	17.2	23.5	12.6	10.9	33.4	19.3	14.1
25	21.0	15.0	6.0	20.6	13.5	7.1	30.9	22.6	8.3
26	9.0	-2.2	11.2	2.9	-0.9	3.8	2.5	-3.3	5.8
27									
28	17.5	9.2	8.3	17.3	9.6	7.7	9.1	8.3	0.8
29	13.4	7.9	5.5	16.4	8.5	7.9	8.2	7.3	0.9
30	4.1	1.3	2.8	0.9	1.1	-0.2	0.9	1.0	-0.1

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2, continued)

Kansas City, Missouri			Los Angeles, California			Louisville, Kentucky		
Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31								
32	13.0	3.5	24.5	8.5	16.0	8.8	4.7	4.1
33	25.3	15.9	32.3	14.5	17.8	16.5	14.1	2.4
34	-12.3	-12.4	-7.8	-6.0	-1.8	-7.7	-9.4	1.7
35								
36	11.0	6.2	9.1	5.2	3.9	9.6	7.7	1.9
37	5.0	5.0	5.7	5.7	0.0	7.8	8.6	-0.8
38	6.0	1.2	3.4	-0.5	3.9	1.8	-0.9	2.7
39								
40	60.7	26.0	57.8	27.5	30.3	47.7	26.5	21.2
41								
42								
43								
44	2.0	1513.0	143.0	6980.0	-6837.0	16.0	1112.0	-1096.0
45	2.0	1332.0	143.0	5293.0	-5150.0	23.0	942.0	-919.0
46	0.0	181.0	0.0	1687.0	-1687.0	-7.0	170.0	-177.0
47	26.4	13.6	0.1	31.9	-31.8	-28.6	18.6	-46.6
48								
49	7.8	48.0	3.6	43.8	-40.2	7.0	46.7	-39.7
50	0.6	28.4	2.1	31.4	-29.3	1.9	34.2	-32.3
51	7.2	19.6	1.5	12.4	-10.9	5.1	12.5	-7.4
52								
53	1.0	11.7	12.0	8.0	4.0	24.5	15.2	9.3
54	9.8	10.0	4.3	5.2	-0.9	29.4	15.5	13.9
55	-8.8	1.7	7.7	2.8	4.9	-4.9	-0.3	-4.6
56								
57	7.8	1.1	5.5	2.7	2.8	0.5	1.1	-0.6
58	3.7	8.1	9.0	6.4	2.6	8.1	4.3	3.8
59	4.1	-7.0	-3.5	-3.7	0.2	-7.6	-3.2	-4.4
60								
61	78.8	25.5	61.1	9.2	51.9	66.0	31.1	34.9
62	89.7	56.8	89.4	23.1	66.3	84.7	56.9	27.8
63								
64	32.9	5.7	13.8	3.6	10.2	21.4	9.1	12.3
65	13.2	5.6	9.9	3.9	6.0	17.5	10.8	6.7
66	19.7	0.1	3.9	-0.3	4.2	3.9	-1.7	5.6

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1)

Item	Miami, Florida			Milwaukee, Wisconsin		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
POPULATION STATISTICS						
1 Population, total (000)						
2 1950.....	19.2	249.3	-230.1	41.3	637.4	-596.1
3 1940.....	38.2	587.5	-549.3
4 Change, 1940-50.....	3.1	49.9	-46.8
5 Pop., pct. change, 1940-50...	8.1	8.5	-0.4
6 Homeless pers., 1950 (000)...	4.3	15.2	-10.9	6.0	25.5	-19.5
7 Pct. of pop. homeless, 1950	22.3	6.1	16.2	14.6	4.0	10.6
8 Living in:						
9 Reg. households, pct., 1950	76.4	93.6	-17.2	84.8	95.4	-10.6
10 Different house than 1949..	33.3	30.0	3.3	23.4	16.0	7.4
11 Sex ratio (Males ÷ females)						
12 1950.....	112.1	94.2	17.9	109.0	95.7	13.3
13 1940.....	109.9	96.9	13.0
14 Change, 1940-50.....	-0.9	-1.2	0.3
15 Percent nonwhite						
16 1950.....	0.9	16.3	-15.4	14.7	3.6	11.1
17 1940.....	8.7	1.6	7.1
18 Change, 1940-50.....	6.0	2.0	4.0
19 Pct. foreign born white						
20 1950.....	18.4	10.8	7.6	10.3	10.0	0.3
21 1940.....	17.2	14.3	2.9
22 Change, 1940-50.....	-6.9	-4.3	-2.6
23 Pct. 6 yrs. or less of school						
24 1950.....	12.7	16.4	-3.7	22.7	15.8	6.9
25 1940.....	26.1	20.8	5.3
26 Change, 1940-50.....	-3.4	-5.0	1.6
27 Pct. 65 years or over						
28 1950.....	13.0	8.5	4.5	8.6	8.1	0.5
29 1940.....	6.9	6.4	0.5
30 Change, 1940-50.....	1.7	1.7	0.0

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2)

Item	Miami, Florida			Milwaukee, Wisconsin		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31 Percent unemployed						
32 1950.....	8.0	6.5	1.5	6.1	2.9	3.2
33 1940.....	30.8	17.8	13.0
34 Change, 1940-50.....	-24.7	-14.9	-9.8
35 Laborers, pct. of employed						
36 1950.....	1.7	6.4	-4.7	11.4	5.8	5.6
37 1940.....	7.6	5.7	1.9
38 Change, 1940-50.....	3.8	0.1	3.7
39 Pct. earning income less						
40 than \$1,500 in 1949.....	40.6	33.0	7.6	33.0	19.5	13.5
41 HOUSING STATISTICS						
42 Dwelling units:						
43 Number (hundreds)						
44 1950.....	66.0	875.0	-809.0	122.0	1889.0	-1767.0
45 1940.....	127.0	1699.0	-1572.0
46 Change, 1940-50.....	-5.0	190.0	-195.0
47 Percent change, 1940-50.....	-3.8	11.2	-15.0
48 Occupied by owner, pct.						
49 1950.....	30.1	43.3	13.2	13.4	42.3	-28.9
50 1940.....	9.2	31.2	-22.0
51 Change, 1940-50.....	4.2	11.1	-6.9
52 Occupied by nonwhites, pct.						
53 1950.....	0.3	10.1	-9.8	10.7	2.5	8.2
54 1940.....	7.8	1.6	6.2
55 Change, 1940-50.....	2.9	0.9	2.0
56 Vacant, percent						
57 1950.....	9.9	6.7	3.2	0.8	0.9	-0.1
58 1940.....	8.0	3.1	4.9
59 Change, 1940-50.....	-7.2	-2.2	-5.0
60 Substandard, pct. of total						
61 1950.....	9.9	11.0	-1.1	41.6	16.4	25.2
62 Built prior to 1920, pct...	14.8	6.1	8.7	82.8	62.0	20.8
63 Pct. with 1.51 pers./room						
64 1950.....	3.6	4.2	-0.6	10.8	3.1	7.7
65 1940.....	9.0	3.5	5.5
66 Change, 1940-50.....	1.8	-0.4	2.2

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1, continued)

Minneapolis, Minnesota				Nashville, Tennessee			New Orleans, Louisiana		
Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence		Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence
1									
2	10.2	521.7	-511.5	1.8	174.3	-172.5	11.4	570.4	-559.0
3	10.1	492.4	-482.3	2.5	167.4	-164.9	13.6	494.5	-480.9
4	0.1	29.3	-29.2	-0.7	6.9	-7.6	-2.2	75.9	-78.1
5	1.4	6.0	-4.6	-26.7	4.1	-30.8	-16.1	15.3	-31.4
6	6.1	29.1	-2.3	0.8	9.8	-9.0	2.2	19.2	-17.0
7	60.3	5.6	54.7	45.7	5.6	40.1	18.9	3.4	15.5
8									
9	36.0	93.8	-57.8	47.0	93.8	-46.8	80.7	96.1	-15.4
10	26.7	18.6	8.1	32.5	22.6	9.9	25.9	16.9	9.0
11									
12	301.2	91.0	210.2	165.7	86.7	79.0	111.6	90.4	21.2
13	284.8	91.0	193.8	118.4	86.2	32.2	119.5	90.0	29.5
14	16.4	0.0	16.4	47.3	0.5	46.8	-7.9	0.4	-8.3
15									
16	3.0	1.6	1.4	38.8	31.4	7.4	19.7	32.0	-12.3
17	1.8	1.1	0.7	35.2	28.3	6.9	23.3	30.3	-7.0
18	1.2	0.5	0.7	3.6	3.1	0.5	-3.6	1.7	-5.3
19									
20	20.4	9.4	11.0	1.1	0.8	0.3	7.8	2.5	5.3
21	28.6	13.0	15.6	3.8	0.9	2.9	9.1	3.0	6.1
22	-8.2	-3.6	-4.6	-2.7	-0.1	-2.6	-1.3	-0.5	-0.8
23									
24	26.7	9.3	17.4	31.3	26.1	5.2	31.4	32.3	-0.9
25	30.8	11.3	19.5	34.8	29.7	5.1	43.1	38.9	4.2
26	-4.1	-2.0	-2.1	-3.5	-3.6	0.1	-11.7	-6.6	-5.1
27									
28	19.8	9.6	10.2	11.6	8.4	3.2	10.6	7.1	3.5
29	14.9	7.6	7.3	9.1	6.6	2.5	8.1	5.9	2.2
30	4.9	2.0	2.9	2.5	1.8	0.7	2.5	1.2	1.3

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2, continued)

Minneapolis, Minnesota			Nashville, Tennessee			New Orleans, Louisiana		
Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31								
32 24.1	4.2	19.9	4.4	3.8	0.6	11.4	6.1	5.3
33 42.7	16.4	26.3	15.2	14.2	1.0	21.0	19.0	2.0
34 -18.6	-12.2	-6.4	-10.8	-10.4	-0.4	-9.6	-12.9	3.3
35								
36 15.3	4.3	11.0	8.6	7.1	1.5	6.3	9.3	-3.0
37 13.5	4.2	9.3	4.5	7.6	-3.1	8.4	10.1	-1.7
38 1.8	0.1	1.7	4.1	-0.5	4.6	-2.1	-0.8	-1.3
39								
40 60.4	24.3	36.1	56.9	40.8	16.1	45.8	34.0	11.8
41								
42								
43								
44 13.0	1620.0	-1607.0	4.0	510.0	-506.0	46.0	1736.0	-1690.0
45 19.0	1476.0	-1457.0	8.0	475.0	-467.0	44.0	1372.0	-1328.0
46 -6.0	144.0	-150.0	-4.0	35.0	-3.9	2.0	364.0	-362.0
47 -32.0	9.7	-41.7	-52.9	7.3	-60.2	3.6	26.6	-23.0
48								
49 16.2	51.7	-35.5	3.0	41.2	-38.2	10.5	32.3	-21.8
50 7.7	39.8	-32.1	4.6	29.8	-25.2	7.5	23.0	-15.5
51 8.5	11.9	-3.4	-1.6	11.4	-13.0	3.0	9.3	-6.3
52								
53 20.1	1.4	18.7	55.6	29.8	25.8	14.8	28.6	-13.8
54 3.0	1.2	1.8	37.1	28.8	8.3	22.1	30.3	-8.2
55 17.1	0.2	16.9	18.5	1.0	17.5	-7.3	-1.7	-5.6
56								
57 0.5	0.8	-0.3	0.5	1.0	-0.5	5.8	2.1	3.7
58 6.0	3.0	3.0	7.1	3.4	3.7	8.6	2.7	5.9
59 -5.5	-2.2	-3.3	-6.6	-2.4	-4.2	-2.8	-0.6	-2.2
60								
61 52.4	20.2	32.2	80.7	48.4	32.3	31.3	25.7	5.6
62 97.6	63.6	34.0	95.0	51.7	43.3	97.2	54.1	43.1
63								
64 9.0	4.1	4.9	20.2	9.5	10.7	8.3	9.9	-1.6
65 9.0	4.8	4.2	25.1	17.9	7.2	19.4	13.0	6.4
66 0.0	-0.7	0.7	-4.9	-8.4	3.5	-11.1	-3.1	-8.0

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1)

Item	New York, New York			Norfolk, Virginia		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
POPULATION STATISTICS						
1 Population, total (000)						
2 1950.....	72.2	7892.0	-7819.8	6.5	213.5	-207.0
3 1940.....	77.0	7455.0	-7378.0
4 Change, 1940-50.....	-4.8	437.0	-441.8
5 Pop., pct. change, 1940-50	-6.1	5.9	-12.0
6 Homeless pers., 1950 (000)...	11.4	293.2	-281.8	1.5	36.9	-35.4
7 Pct. of pop. homeless, 1950	15.7	3.7	12.0	22.5	17.3	5.2
8 Living in:						
9 Reg. households, pct., 1950	83.4	95.7	-12.3	76.5	82.6	-6.1
10 Different house than 1949..	9.0	7.8	1.2	20.6	27.7	-7.1
11 Sex ratio (males : females)						
12 1950.....	146.7	93.9	52.8	108.6	124.7	-16.1
13 1940.....	148.5	97.3	51.2
14 Change, 1940-50.....	-1.8	-3.4	1.6
15 Percent nonwhite						
16 1950.....	7.2	9.8	-2.6	66.2	29.7	36.5
17 1940.....	3.8	6.4	-2.6
18 Change, 1940-50.....	3.4	3.4	0.0
19 Pct. foreign born white						
20 1950.....	33.5	22.6	10.9	3.1	2.1	1.0
21 1940.....	46.1	27.9	18.2
22 Change, 1940-50.....	-12.6	-5.3	-7.3
23 Pct. 6 yrs. or less of school						
24 1950.....	42.8	19.8	23.0	49.0	23.1	25.9
25 1940.....
26 Change, 1940-50.....
27 Pct. 65 years or over						
28 1950.....	10.3	7.7	2.6	6.3	5.1	1.2
29 1940.....	6.5	5.6	0.9
30 Change, 1940-50.....	3.8	2.1	1.7

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2)

Item	New York, New York			Norfolk, Virginia		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31 Percent unemployed						
32 1950.....	15.6	6.9	8.7	14.0	7.1	6.9
33 1940.....
34 Change, 1940-50.....
35 Laborers, pct. of employed						
36 1950.....	7.4	4.0	3.4	16.5	9.3	7.2
37 1940.....
38 Change, 1940-50.....
39 Pct. earning income less						
40 than \$1,500 in 1949.....	43.9	55.6	-11.7	54.5	39.9	14.6
41 HOUSING STATISTICS						
42 Dwelling units:						
43 Number (hundreds)						
44 1950.....	216.0	24335.0	-24119.0	15.0	561.0	-546.0
45 1940.....	246.0	22184.0	-21938.0
46 Change, 1940-50.....	-30.0	2151.0	-2181.0
47 Percent change, 1940-50.....	-12.2	9.7	-21.9
48 Occupied by owner, pct.						
49 1950.....	1.3	18.5	-17.2	7.7	34.4	-26.7
50 1940.....	0.4	14.6	-14.2
51 Change, 1940-50.....	0.9	3.9	-3.0
52 Occupied by nonwhites, pct.						
53 1950.....	8.1	8.1	0.0	64.4	29.2	35.2
54 1940.....
55 Change, 1940-50.....
56 Vacant, percent						
57 1950.....	0.6	1.1	-0.5	1.7	2.0	-0.3
58 1940.....	19.6	7.3	12.3
59 Change, 1940-50.....	-19.0	-6.2	-12.8
60 Substandard, pct. of total						
61 1950.....	32.6	9.6	23.0	58.7	29.5	29.2
62 Built prior to 1920, pct...	90.9	49.1	41.8	92.3	50.8	41.5
63 Pct. with 1.51 pers./room						
64 1950.....	6.3	4.6	1.7	14.8	5.6	9.2
65 1940.....	9.0	4.5	4.5
66 Change, 1940-50.....	-2.7	0.1	-2.8

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1, continued)

Oakland, California				Oklahoma City, Oklahoma			Omaha, Nebraska		
Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence		Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence
1									
2	33.4	384.6	-351.2	9.9	243.5	-233.6	10.6	251.1	-240.5
3	23.8	302.2	-278.3	13.9	204.4	-190.5
4	9.6	82.4	-72.8	4.0	39.1	-43.1
5	40.5	27.3	13.2	-52.3	19.1	-71.4
6	5.8	17.0	-11.2	2.9	7.0	-4.1	4.1	12.8	-8.7
7	17.5	4.4	13.1	29.4	2.9	26.5	38.7	5.1	33.6
8									
9	82.5	95.1	-12.6	70.0	96.9	-26.9	59.6	94.2	-34.6
10	27.9	20.7	7.2	44.2	30.5	13.7	27.2	18.0	9.2
11									
12	132.3	95.8	36.5	137.8	91.4	46.4	157.2	94.3	62.9
13	43.6	97.6	46.0	142.1	93.5	48.6
14	-11.3	-1.8	-9.5	-4.3	-2.1	-2.2
15									
16	49.2	14.5	34.7	5.6	9.3	-3.7	3.5	6.7	-3.2
17	15.5	4.7	10.8	3.9	9.6	-5.7
18	33.7	9.8	23.9	1.7	-0.3	2.0
19									
20	8.5	9.9	-1.4	2.0	1.1	0.9	6.4	6.9	-0.5
21	17.5	14.1	3.4	2.4	1.4	1.0
22	-9.0	-4.2	-4.8	-0.4	-0.3	-0.1
23									
24	32.0	13.7	18.3	29.3	12.1	17.2	18.3	10.9	7.4
25	31.2	13.8	17.4	25.2	13.9	11.3
26	0.8	-0.1	0.9	4.1	-1.8	5.9
27									
28	8.0	9.5	-1.5	11.5	7.0	4.5	14.2	8.6	5.6
29	10.0	8.5	1.5	7.8	5.3	2.5
30	-2.0	1.0	-3.0	3.7	1.7	2.0

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2, continued)

Oakland, California			Oklahoma City, Oklahoma			Omaha, Nebraska		
Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31								
32 23.5	9.6	13.9	7.2	3.1	4.1	7.1	2.6	4.5
33 34.9	15.4	19.5	25.1	14.6	10.5
34 -11.4	-5.8	-5.6	-17.9	-11.5	-6.4
35								
36 21.6	7.4	14.2	9.8	5.1	4.7	12.1	8.2	3.9
37 14.8	7.2	7.6	6.3	4.3	2.0
38 6.8	0.2	6.6	3.5	0.8	2.7
39								
40 43.7	24.4	19.3	52.4	25.4	27.0	43.2	24.2	19.0
42								
42								
43								
44 104.0	1333.0	-1229.0	28.0	830.0	-802.0	27.0	737.0	-710.0
45 83.0	1037.0	-954.0	35.0	646.0	-611.0
46 21.0	296.0	-275.0	-7.0	184.0	-191.0
47 26.1	28.5	-2.4	-21.9	28.6	-50.5
48								
49 16.6	47.5	-30.9	14.2	53.0	-38.8	6.4	59.2	-52.8
50 13.0	41.1	-28.1	8.3	34.1	-25.8
51 3.6	6.4	-2.8	5.9	18.9	-13.0
52								
53 43.3	10.8	32.5	4.4	7.9	-3.5	2.5	5.9	-3.4
54 12.4	3.8	8.6	2.8	8.4	-5.6
55 30.9	7.0	23.9	1.6	-0.5	2.1
56								
57 3.9	2.0	1.9	2.5	3.2	-0.7	2.0	0.7	1.3
58 3.5	3.9	-0.4	9.3	7.6	1.7
59 0.4	-1.9	-1.5	-6.8	-4.4	-2.4
60								
61 45.9	11.6	34.3	67.9	20.7	47.2	50.9	16.6	34.3
62 80.0	44.5	35.5	70.3	21.0	49.3	83.1	56.1	27.0
63								
64 12.6	3.2	9.4	17.2	6.0	11.2	11.6	3.6	8.0
65 7.4	2.1	5.3	28.8	11.9	16.9
66 5.2	1.1	4.1	-11.6	-5.9	-5.7

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1)

Item	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania			Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
POPULATION STATISTICS						
1 Population, total (000)						
2 1950.....	9.1	2071.6	-2062.5	78.8	676.8	-598.0
3 1940.....	9.2	1931.3	-1922.1	80.2	671.7	-591.5
4 Change, 1940-50.....	-0.1	140.3	-140.4	-1.4	5.1	-6.5
5 Pop., pct. change, 1940-50...	-1.2	7.3	-8.5	-5.6	0.8	-6.4
6 Homeless pers., 1950 (000)...	3.7	58.8	-55.1	5.9	23.1	-17.2
7 Pct. of pop. homeless, 1950.	40.3	2.8	37.5	7.5	3.4	4.1
8 Living in:						
9 Reg. households, pct., 1950.	59.7	96.1	-36.4	91.9	95.7	-3.8
10 Different house than 1949..	21.2	10.0	11.2	13.9	12.2	1.7
11 Sex ratio (males \div females)						
12 1950.....	182.4	93.7	88.7	99.4	94.3	5.1
13 1940.....	202.4	95.3	107.1	106.1	96.6	9.5
14 Change, 1940-50.....	-20.0	-1.6	-18.4	-6.7	-2.3	-4.4
15 Percent nonwhite						
16 1950.....	35.3	18.3	17.0	36.7	12.3	24.4
17 1940.....	21.6	13.1	8.5	25.5	9.3	16.2
18 Change, 1940-50.....	13.7	5.2	8.5	11.2	3.0	8.2
19 Pct. foreign born white						
20 1950.....	10.7	11.2	-0.5	8.4	9.6	-1.2
21 1940.....	16.0	15.0	1.0	14.4	12.6	1.8
22 Change, 1940-50.....	-5.3	-3.8	-1.5	-6.0	-3.0	-3.0
23 Pct. 6 yrs. or less of school						
24 1950.....	38.8	22.0	16.8	34.5	20.7	13.8
25 1940.....	45.0	25.9	19.1	43.1	24.4	18.7
26 Change, 1940-50.....	-6.2	-3.9	-2.3	-8.6	-3.7	-4.9
27 Pct. 65 years or over						
28 1950.....	12.2	8.3	3.9	8.0	8.3	-0.3
29 1940.....	10.5	7.0	3.5	5.7	6.3	-0.6
30 Change, 1940-50.....	1.7	1.3	0.4	2.3	2.0	0.3

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2)

Item	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania			Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31 Percent unemployed						
32 1950.....	22.6	6.4	16.2	12.3	6.9	5.4
33 1940.....	36.0	19.7	16.3	37.0	22.2	14.8
34 Change, 1940-50.....	-13.4	-13.3	-0.1	-24.7	-15.3	-9.4
35 Laborers, pct. of employed						
36 1950.....	11.9	5.9	6.0	19.0	10.0	9.0
37 1940.....	7.7	5.8	1.9	19.2	11.5	7.7
38 Change, 1940-50.....	4.2	0.1	4.1	-0.2	-1.5	1.3
39 Pct. earning income less						
40 than \$1,500 in 1949.....	65.9	26.1	39.8	42.2	26.5	15.7
41 HOUSING STATISTICS						
42 Dwelling units:						
43 Number (hundreds)						
44 1950.....	18.0	5995.0	-5977.0	230.0	1939.0	-1709.0
45 1940.....	24.0	5333.0	-5309.0	224.0	1799.0	-1575.0
46 Change, 1940-50.....	-6.0	662.0	-668.0	6.0	140.0	-134.0
47 Percent change, 1940-50.....	-25.4	12.4	-37.8	2.6	7.8	-5.2
48 Occupied by owner, pct.						
49 1950.....	14.2	54.7	-40.5	18.5	41.8	-23.3
50 1940.....	6.4	36.9	-30.5	15.0	31.3	-16.3
51 Change, 1940-50.....	7.8	17.8	-10.0	3.5	10.5	-7.0
52 Occupied by nonwhites, pct.						
53 1950.....	48.1	16.8	31.3	31.8	10.7	21.1
54 1940.....	23.6	12.3	11.3	24.0	8.6	15.4
55 Change, 1940-50.....	24.5	4.5	20.0	7.8	2.1	5.7
56 Vacant, percent						
57 1950.....	2.7	1.3	1.4	0.7	0.8	-0.1
58 1940.....	12.5	4.7	7.8	2.3	2.4	-0.1
59 Change, 1940-50.....	-9.8	-3.4	-6.4	-1.6	-1.6	0.0
60 Substandard, pct. of total						
61 1950.....	59.2	12.4	46.8	59.5	33.0	26.5
62 Built prior to 1920, pct....	99.1	71.1	28.0	83.1	72.0	11.1
63 Pct. with 1.51 pers./room						
64 1950.....	13.8	2.9	10.9	11.2	5.4	5.8
65 1940.....	8.5	3.1	5.4	17.1	9.4	7.7
66 Change, 1940-50.....	5.3	-0.2	5.5	-5.9	-4.0	-1.9

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1, continued)

Portland, Oregon			Providence, Rhode Island			Richmond, Virginia		
Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
1								
2	13.5	373.6	45.0	248.7	-203.7	7.1	230.3	-223.2
3	15.5	305.4	20.9	253.5	-232.6	6.6	193.0	-186.4
4	-2.0	68.2	24.1	-4.8	28.9	0.5	37.3	-36.8
5	-12.6	18.3	114.9	-1.9	116.8	7.7	19.3	-11.6
6	6.8	15.6	2.9	11.6	-8.7	1.7	10.9	-9.2
7	50.5	4.2	6.4	4.7	1.7	24.0	4.7	19.3
8								
9	46.9	95.4	93.5	94.8	-1.3	42.9	93.6	-50.7
10	34.0	23.7	14.6	11.8	2.8	27.9	17.3	10.6
11								
12	253.0	93.3	95.5	92.1	3.4	176.4	87.1	89.3
13	220.7	95.4	90.1	92.5	-2.4	142.4	87.7	54.7
14	32.3	-2.1	5.4	-0.4	5.8	34.0	-0.6	34.6
15								
16	11.5	3.5	9.9	3.5	6.4	46.6	31.7	14.9
17	12.6	1.9	2.1	2.6	-0.5	42.1	31.8	10.3
18	-1.1	1.6	7.8	0.9	6.9	4.5	-0.1	4.6
19								
20	16.8	9.2	15.2	15.6	-0.4	0.8	1.6	-0.8
21	20.3	12.6	18.0	20.2	-2.2	2.6	1.8	0.8
22	-3.5	-3.4	-2.8	-4.6	1.8	-1.8	-0.2	-1.6
23								
24	23.2	8.7	24.9	20.1	4.8	42.9	24.9	18.0
25	23.2	9.6	17.8	24.7	-6.9	42.0	29.6	12.4
26	0.0	-0.9	7.1	-4.6	11.7	0.9	-4.7	5.6
27								
28	19.9	11.0	9.5	9.8	-0.3	5.4	8.0	-2.6
29	14.4	9.4	8.8	7.8	1.0	4.8	5.9	-1.1
30	5.5	1.6	0.7	2.0	-1.3	0.6	2.1	-1.5

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2, continued)

Portland, Oregon			Providence, Rhode Island			Richmond, Virginia		
Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31								
32	23.4	8.2	15.1	9.4	5.7	11.4	4.9	6.5
33	32.2	15.1	16.2	20.1	-3.9	18.6	11.4	7.2
34	-8.8	-6.9	-1.1	-10.7	9.6	-7.2	-6.5	-0.7
35								
36	17.4	6.0	5.9	4.3	1.6	9.4	6.6	2.8
37	10.4	6.3	3.1	4.3	-1.2	6.9	7.0	-0.1
38	7.0	-0.3	2.8	0.0	2.8	2.5	-0.4	2.9
39								
40	59.0	26.8	39.5	32.0	7.5	61.9	28.9	33.0
41								
42								
43								
44	36.0	1311.0	137.0	742.0	-605.0	10.0	664.0	-654.0
45	55.0	1087.0	60.0	697.0	-637.0	12.0	524.0	-512.0
46	-19.0	227.0	77.0	45.0	32.0	-2.0	140.0	-142.0
47	34.5	20.8	128.4	6.4	122.0	-21.2	26.7	-47.9
48								
49	7.9	56.8	16.7	30.9	-14.2	10.8	45.9	-35.1
50	4.1	45.3	27.3	26.9	0.4	7.8	28.2	-20.4
51	3.8	11.5	-10.6	4.0	-14.6	3.0	17.7	-14.7
52								
53	7.9	2.5	8.7	3.0	5.7	36.6	27.4	9.2
54	8.7	1.5	2.3	2.7	-0.4	40.4	29.8	10.6
55	-0.8	1.0	6.4	0.3	6.1	-3.8	-2.4	-1.4
56								
57	3.3	2.3	1.7	1.4	0.3	1.6	1.2	0.4
58	11.4	5.8	3.1	3.0	0.1	4.7	2.7	2.0
59	-8.1	-3.5	-1.4	-1.6	0.2	-3.1	-1.5	-1.6
60								
61	61.5	11.4	36.0	20.0	16.0	62.6	27.6	35.0
62	89.5	45.0	96.2	77.3	18.9	87.2	53.0	34.2
63								
64	6.4	2.4	4.3	2.5	1.8	15.3	5.4	9.9
65	8.0	2.3	3.1	4.7	-1.6	14.5	7.5	7.0
66	-1.6	0.1	1.2	-2.2	3.4	0.8	-2.1	2.9

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1)

Item	Rochester, New York			Sacramento, California		
	Skid row tracts	City Total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
POPULATION STATISTICS						
1 Population, total(000)						
2 1950.....	1.2	332.5	-331.3	7.2	137.6	-130.4
3 1940.....	1.2	325.0	-323.8
4 Change, 1940-50.....	0.0	7.5	-7.5
5 Pop., pct. change, 1940-50...	4.9	2.3	2.6
6 Homeless pers., 1950 (000)...	0.8	10.4	-9.6	5.4	9.5	-4.1
7 Pct. of pop. homeless, 1950	66.6	3.1	63.5	75.2	6.9	68.3
8 Living in:						
9 Reg. households, pct. 1950.	33.4	95.1	-61.7	21.5	92.5	-71.0
10 Different house than 1949..	25.5	12.1	13.4	34.5	21.2	13.3
11 Sex ratio (males \div females)						
12 1950.....	297.4	91.3	206.1	359.1	98.0	261.1
13 1940.....	319.2	94.1	225.1
14 Change, 1940-50.....	-21.8	-2.8	-19.0
15 Percent nonwhite						
16 1950.....	6.8	2.4	4.4	18.7	7.8	10.9
17 1940.....	2.6	1.1	1.5
18 Change, 1940-50.....	4.2	1.3	2.9
19 Pct. foreign born white						
20 1950.....	15.8	14.8	1.0	15.9	8.9	7.0
21 1940.....	19.0	18.5	0.5
22 Change, 1940-50.....	-3.2	-3.7	0.5
23 Pct. 6 yrs. or less of school						
24 1950.....	25.0	18.8	6.2	33.7	12.4	21.3
25 1940.....	39.2	20.8	18.4
26 Change, 1940-50.....	-14.2	-2.0	-12.2
27 Pct. 65 years or over						
28 1950.....	21.1	11.0	10.1	15.3	9.8	5.5
29 1940.....	15.5	8.2	7.3
30 Change, 1940-50.....	5.6	2.8	2.8

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2)

Item	Rochester, New York			Sacramento, California		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31 Percent unemployed						
32 1950.....	20.6	5.7	14.9	32.8	7.1	25.7
33 1940.....	24.6	14.7	9.9
34 Change, 1940-50.....	-4.0	-9.0	5.0
35 Laborers, pct. of employed						
36 1950.....	18.9	3.9	15.0	18.9	5.8	13.1
37 1940.....	13.9	4.1	9.8
38 Change, 1940-50.....	5.0	-0.2	5.2
39 Pct. earning income less						
40 than \$1,500 in 1949.....	64.2	23.2	41.0	58.1	23.9	34.2
41 HOUSING STATISTICS						
42 Dwelling units:						
43 Number (hundreds)						
44 1950.....	2.0	1012.0	-1010.0	6.0	447.0	-441.0
45 1940.....	2.0	939.0	-937.0
46 Change, 1940-50.....	0.0	73.0	-73.0
47 Percent change, 1940-50.....	8.5	7.8	0.7
48 Occupied by owner, pct.						
49 1950.....	12.4	50.6	-38.2	9.6	55.4	-45.8
50 1940.....	9.8	38.1	-28.3
51 Change, 1940-50.....	2.6	12.5	-9.9
52 Occupied by nonwhites, pct.						
53 1950.....	10.7	1.8	8.9	32.1	5.2	26.9
54 1940.....	3.7	1.1	2.6
55 Change, 1940-50.....	7.0	0.7	6.3
56 Vacant, percent						
57 1950.....	1.1	0.8	0.3	3.3	1.8	1.5
58 1940.....
59 Change, 1940-50.....
60 Substandard, pct. of total						
61 1950.....	53.3	9.2	44.1	51.7	9.2	42.5
62 Built prior to 1920, pct...	100.0	72.4	27.6	86.8	33.4	53.4
63 Pct. with 1.51 pers./room						
64 1950.....	4.9	1.5	3.4	15.0	2.2	12.8
65 1940.....	4.6	1.3	3.3
66 Change, 1940-50.....	0.3	0.2	0.1

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1, continued)

St. Louis, Missouri			St. Paul, Minnesota			San Francisco, California		
Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
1								
2	6.9	856.8	5.9	311.3	-305.4	28.2	775.4	-747.2
3	7.1	816.0	6.3	287.7	-281.4	20.6	634.5	-613.9
4	-0.2	40.8	-0.4	23.6	-24.0	7.6	140.9	-133.3
5	-3.5	5.0	0.2	8.2	-8.0	36.9	22.2	-14.7
6	4.6	40.6	0.7	10.4	-9.7	18.5	72.5	-54.0
7	67.1	4.7	12.4	3.3	9.1	65.5	9.4	56.1
8								
9	27.7	94.2	85.9	96.2	-10.3	34.5	90.0	-55.5
10	29.0	13.1	18.8	14.9	3.9	33.9	19.6	14.3
11								
12	331.2	90.1	120.5	91.5	29.0	389.2	101.1	288.1
13	412.3	92.4	114.2	91.6	52.6	418.4	103.3	315.1
14	-81.1	-2.3	-23.7	-0.1	-23.6	-29.2	-2.2	-27.0
15								
16	16.5	18.0	2.9	2.0	0.9	14.8	10.5	4.3
17	15.8	13.4	2.5	1.5	1.0	4.7	5.0	-0.3
18	0.7	4.6	0.4	0.5	-0.1	10.1	5.5	4.6
19								
20	6.5	4.9	14.2	7.8	6.4	16.6	15.5	1.1
21	12.8	7.3	22.3	11.7	10.6	31.6	20.5	11.1
22	-6.3	-2.4	-8.1	-3.9	-4.2	-15.0	-5.0	-10.0
23								
24	27.1	19.8	28.1	9.9	18.2	28.9	13.3	15.6
25	34.6	23.4	36.9	12.3	24.6	32.9	14.4	18.5
26	-7.5	-3.6	-8.8	-2.4	-6.4	-4.0	-1.1	-2.9
27								
28	17.6	9.4	11.2	8.8	2.4	12.3	9.6	2.7
29	15.1	7.6	9.5	7.4	2.1	13.8	8.1	5.7
30	2.5	1.8	1.7	1.4	0.3	-1.5	1.5	-3.0

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2, continued)

St. Louis, Missouri			St. Paul, Minnesota			San Francisco, California		
Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31								
32 14.7	4.5	10.2	14.5	3.5	11.0	30.3	7.9	22.4
33 27.2	15.3	11.9	49.1	16.9	32.2	38.5	14.3	24.2
34 -12.5	-10.8	-1.7	-34.6	-13.4	-21.2	-8.2	-6.4	-1.8
35								
36 12.8	7.1	5.7	19.2	5.6	13.6	17.5	5.5	12.0
37 8.2	7.0	1.2	15.7	5.6	10.1	12.5	5.8	6.7
38 4.6	0.1	4.5	3.5	0.0	3.5	5.0	-0.3	5.3
39								
40 56.1	27.2	28.9	44.4	22.3	22.1	58.1	26.1	32.0
41								
42								
43								
44 7.0	2630.0	-2623.0	14.0	934.0	-920.0	40.0	2657.0	-2617.0
45 8.0	2516.0	-2508.0	17.0	833.0	-816.0	44.0	2222.0	-2178.0
46 -1.0	114.0	-115.0	-3.0	101.0	-104.0	-4.0	435.0	-439.0
47 -15.3	4.5	-19.8	-15.8	12.1	-27.9	-9.4	19.6	-29.0
48								
49 5.4	34.1	-28.7	26.5	55.1	-28.6	7.8	35.6	-27.8
50 1.3	25.0	-23.7	14.9	45.5	-30.6	4.9	29.0	-24.1
51 4.1	9.1	-5.0	11.6	9.6	2.0	2.9	6.6	-3.7
52								
53 41.2	15.3	25.9	3.2	1.9	1.3	19.9	8.1	11.8
54 33.7	11.7	22.0	4.6	1.6	3.0	5.8	4.0	1.8
55 7.5	3.6	3.9	-1.4	0.3	-1.7	14.1	4.1	10.0
56								
57 0.9	0.7	0.2	0.8	0.6	0.2	2.4	1.5	0.9
58 13.3	6.5	6.8	4.4	3.0	1.4	11.9	6.9	5.0
59 -12.4	-5.8	-6.6	-3.6	-2.4	-1.2	-9.5	-5.4	-4.1
60								
61 87.8	28.5	59.3	51.3	19.8	31.5	45.5	10.2	35.3
62 96.9	70.5	26.4	99.3	64.4	34.9	90.2	50.0	40.2
63								
64 27.8	9.4	18.4	10.7	6.4	4.3	8.3	2.5	5.8
65 15.3	9.9	5.4	9.8	4.1	5.7	3.2	2.5	0.7
66 12.5	-0.5	13.0	0.9	2.3	-1.4	5.1	0.0	5.1

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1)

Item	San Jose, California			Seattle, Washington		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
POPULATION STATISTICS						
1 Population, total (000)						
2 1950.....	4.7	95.3	-90.6	11.9	467.6	-455.7
3 1940.....	11.8	368.3	-356.5
4 Change, 1940-50.....	0.1	99.3	-99.2
5 Pop., pct. change, 1940-50...	1.4	27.0	-25.6
6 Homeless pers., 1950 (000)...	0.8	4.9	4.1	7.4	34.2	-26.8
7 Pct. of pop, homeless, 1950	16.9	5.1	11.8	62.3	7.3	55.0
8 Living in:						
9 Reg. households, pct., 1950	80.0	94.6	-14.6	30.8	92.1	-61.3
10 Different house than 1949..	22.6	22.8	-0.2	40.6	24.4	16.2
11 Sex ratio (males ÷ females)						
12 1950.....	121.7	92.6	29.1	428.9	99.9	329.0
13 1940.....	338.4	99.3	239.1
14 Change, 1940-50.....	90.5	0.6	89.9
15 Percent nonwhite						
16 1950.....	2.6	2.2	0.4	14.6	5.8	8.8
17 1940.....	12.5	3.9	8.6
18 Change, 1940-50.....	2.1	1.9	0.2
19 Pct. foreign born white						
20 1950.....	17.4	11.0	6.4	19.1	11.9	7.2
21 1940.....	25.4	16.2	9.2
22 Change, 1940-50.....	-6.3	-4.3	-2.0
23 Pct. 6 yrs. or less of school						
24 1950.....	26.2	16.5	9.7	22.1	8.4	13.7
25 1940.....	23.2	9.8	13.4
26 Change, 1940-50.....	-1.1	-1.4	0.3
27 Pct. 65 years or over						
28 1950.....	14.4	10.1	4.3	18.0	10.2	7.8
29 1940.....	14.9	8.8	6.1
30 Change, 1940-50.....	3.1	1.4	1.7

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2)

Item	San Jose, California			Seattle, Washington		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31 Percent unemployed						
32 1950.....	16.5	9.7	6.8	34.6	8.0	26.6
33 1940.....	31.0	3.5	27.5
34 Change, 1940-50.....	3.6	4.5	-0.9
35 Laborers, pct. of employed						
36 1950.....	10.3	7.4	2.9	17.1	5.7	11.4
37 1940.....	13.6	6.4	7.2
38 Change, 1940-50.....	3.5	-0.7	4.2
39 Pct. earning income less						
40 than \$1,500 in 1949.....	43.4	29.1	14.3	51.9	26.5	25.4
41 HOUSING STATISTICS						
42 Dwelling units:						
43 Number (hundreds)						
44 1950.....	14.0	309.0	-295.0	27.0	1609.0	-1582.0
45 1940.....	52.0	1348.0	-1296.0
46 Change, 1940-50.....	-25.0	261.0	-286.0
47 Percent change, 1940-50....	-49.0	19.3	-68.3
48 Occupied by owner, pct.						
49 1950.....	35.0	60.5	-255.0	2.9	54.3	-51.4
50 1940.....	0.5	41.6	-41.1
51 Change, 1940-50.....	2.4	12.7	-10.3
52 Occupied by nonwhites, pct.						
53 1950.....	1.4	1.3	0.1	16.0	4.6	11.4
54 1940.....	7.8	3.1	4.7
55 Change, 1940-50.....	8.2	1.5	6.7
56 Vacant, percent						
57 1950.....	1.5	2.0	-0.5	6.0	2.2	3.8
58 1940.....	11.3	5.8	5.5
59 Change, 1940-50.....	-5.3	-3.6	-1.7
60 Substandard, pct. of total						
61 1950.....	16.5	8.4	8.1	78.0	11.6	66.4
62 Built prior to 1920, pct...	73.9	37.5	36.4	92.7	42.0	50.7
63 Pct. with 1.51 pers./room						
64 1950.....	3.4	2.8	0.6	10.1	1.9	8.2
65 1940.....	8.1	2.7	5.4
66 Change, 1940-50.....	2.0	-0.8	2.8

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1, continued)

Syracuse, New York			Tacoma, Washington			Toledo, Ohio		
Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
1								
2	12.8	220.6	6.1	143.7	-137.6	10.7	303.6	-292.9
3	12.5	206.0	9.9	2823.0	-272.4
4	0.3	14.6	0.8	21.3	-20.5
5	2.3	7.1	8.4	7.5	0.9
6	2.1	13.0	1.5	3.7	-2.2	2.8	9.4	-6.6
7	16.2	5.9	25.0	2.6	22.4	26.1	3.1	23.0
8								
9	83.8	93.3	73.3	97.0	-23.7	72.9	95.2	-22.3
10	23.1	17.2	41.2	24.8	16.4	26.2	13.6	12.6
11								
12	113.6	95.2	165.8	97.1	68.7	155.0	96.3	58.7
13	115.5	94.9	152.1	98.4	53.7
14	-1.9	0.3	2.9	-2.1	5.0
15								
16	20.7	2.3	14.4	3.1	11.3	4.4	8.3	-3.9
17	11.7	1.1	4.1	5.2	-1.1
18	9.0	1.2	0.3	3.1	-2.8
19								
20	9.5	10.7	14.7	9.9	4.8	9.3	6.6	2.7
21	14.9	13.4	12.2	8.8	3.4
22	-5.4	-2.7	-2.9	-2.2	-0.7
23								
24	25.7	14.5	19.7	10.3	9.4	26.1	15.6	10.5
25	30.1	16.3	29.2	19.4	9.8
26	-4.4	-1.8	-3.1	-3.8	0.7
27								
28	10.5	9.5	14.6	10.2	4.4	12.8	9.4	3.4
29	9.1	8.0	10.1	7.3	2.8
30	1.4	4.5	2.7	2.1	0.6

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2, continued)

Syracuse, New York			Tacoma, Washington			Toledo, Ohio			
Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	Skid row tracts	City total	Differ- ence	
31									
32	13.6	5.9	7.7	15.9	6.3	9.6	16.8	6.4	10.4
33	28.6	15.9	12.7	30.7	19.4	11.3
34	-15.0	-10.0	-5.0	-13.9	-13.0	-0.9
35									
36	10.9	4.2	6.7	14.9	8.4	6.5	9.0	5.9	3.1
37	8.8	5.6	3.2	6.4	5.9	0.5
38	2.1	-1.4	3.5	2.6	0.0	2.6
39									
40	46.3	30.7	15.6	45.8	25.3	20.5	37.7	18.9	18.8
41									
42									
43									
44	35.0	645.0	-610.0	28.0	501.0	-473.0	31.0	919.0	-888.0
45	40.0	596.0	-556.0	32.0	826.0	-794.0
46	-5.0	49.0	-54.0	-1.0	93.0	-94.0
47	-12.1	8.1	-20.2	-3.3	11.2	-14.5
48									
49	10.2	46.6	-36.4	6.4	61.6	-55.2	13.5	59.3	-45.8
50	5.8	32.4	-26.6	6.6	44.4	-37.8
51	4.4	14.2	-9.8	6.9	14.9	-8.0
52									
53	16.7	1.6	15.1	8.4	2.3	6.1	2.9	6.1	-3.2
54	10.8	1.1	9.7	3.5	4.6	-1.1
55	5.9	0.5	5.4	-0.6	1.5	-2.1
56									
57	1.4	0.9	0.5	4.0	2.2	1.8	2.1	0.7	1.4
58	12.2	4.1	8.1	7.2	3.7	3.5
59	-10.8	-3.2	-7.6	-5.1	-3.0	-2.1
60									
61	31.6	15.6	16.0	66.0	14.3	51.7	48.5	10.6	37.9
62	68.3	67.6	0.7	76.8	45.9	30.9	94.4	63.4	31.0
63									
64	3.8	1.5	2.3	6.3	2.1	4.2	8.3	1.8	6.5
65	3.4	1.6	1.8	9.4	2.1	7.3
66	0.4	-0.1	0.5	-1.1	-0.3	-0.8

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 1)

Item	Washington, D.C.		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
POPULATION STATISTICS			
1 Population, total (000)			
2 1950.....	44.4	802.2	-757.8
3 1940.....	50.3	663.1	-612.8
4 Change, 1940-50.....	-5.9	139.1	-145.0
5 Pop., pct. change, 1940-50...	11.8	21.0	-9.2
6 Homeless pers., 1950 (000)...	8.7	73.2	-64.5
7 Pct. of pop. homeless, 1950	19.7	9.1	10.6
8 Living in:			
9 Reg. households, pct., 1950	80.2	89.2	-9.0
10 Different house than 1949..	20.4	20.8	-0.4
11 Sex ratio (males : females)			
12 1950.....	99.8	89.1	10.7
13 1940.....	105.6	91.9	13.7
14 Change, 1940-50.....	-5.8	-2.8	-3.0
15 Percent nonwhite			
16 1950.....	74.9	35.4	39.5
17 1940.....	64.4	28.5	35.9
18 Change, 1940-50.....	10.5	6.9	3.6
19 Pct. foreign born white			
20 1950.....	2.5	4.9	-2.4
21 1940.....	4.6	5.1	-0.5
22 Change, 1940-50.....	-2.1	-0.2	-1.9
23 Pct. 6 yrs. or less of school			
24 1950.....	39.1	15.2	23.9
25 1940.....	40.5	18.0	22.5
26 Change, 1940-50.....	-1.4	-2.8	1.4
27 Pct. 65 years or over			
28 1950.....	6.3	7.1	-0.8
29 1940.....	4.9	6.2	-1.3
30 Change, 1940-50.....	1.4	0.9	0.5

Appendix Table B: Statistics of Population and Housing for Census Tracts Containing Skid Row Communities and for Cities Containing Skid Rows, 1940 and 1950, and Change, 1940-50 (Part 2)

Item	Washington, D.C.		
	Skid row tracts	City total	Difference
31 Percent unemployed			
32 1950.....	7.0	3.9	3.1
33 1940.....	20.1	10.2	9.9
34 Change, 1940-50.....	-13.1	-6.3	-6.8
35 Laborers, pct. of employed			
36 1950.....	17.4	5.6	11.8
37 1940.....	15.4	5.4	10.0
38 Change, 1940-50.....	2.0	0.2	1.8
39 Pct. earning income less			
40 than \$1,500 in 1949.....	41.8	23.3	18.5
41 HOUSING STATISTICS			
42 Dwelling units:			
43 Number (hundreds)			
44 1950.....	107.0	2297.0	-2190.0
45 1940.....	124.0	1851.0	-1727.0
46 Change, 1940-50.....	-17.0	446.0	-463.0
47 Percent change, 1940-50....	-13.5	24.1	-37.6
48 Occupied by owner, pct.			
49 1950.....	11.5	31.5	-20.0
50 1940.....	9.1	28.1	-19.0
51 Change, 1940-50.....	2.4	3.4	-1.0
52 Occupied by nonwhites, pct.			
53 1950.....	67.3	27.2	40.1
54 1940.....	54.8	21.6	33.2
55 Change, 1940-50.....	12.5	5.6	6.9
56 Vacant, percent			
57 1950.....	1.6	1.2	0.4
58 1940.....	5.2	5.4	-0.2
59 Change, 1940-50.....	-3.6	-4.2	0.6
60 Substandard, pct. of total			
61 1950.....	45.6	12.4	33.2
62 Built prior to 1920, pct...	86.3	38.9	47.4
63 Pct. with 1.51 pers./room			
64 1950.....	17.9	5.3	12.6
65 1940.....	25.0	8.5	16.5
66 Change, 1940-50.....	-7.1	-3.2	-3.9

APPENDIX C

**Schedule Used for
Reconnaissance of Resource Persons**

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago
5711 Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago 37
Tel.: FAirfax 4-7354

CONFIDENTIAL
SURVEY 395
JULY 1957
Form A

RECONNAISSANCE OF RESOURCE PERSONS*

Study of Homeless Men Areas in Metropolises

Name: _____ Position: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

This study deals with low-income men who do not live with a family but stay in hotels, missions, or rooming-houses. Our principal areas of study are the so-called "skid row" or "homeless men" areas of the city.

One part of this study is to interview persons who have had experience with the problems of these areas and the men who live there. You have been chosen as one of the persons to be interviewed because your work has brought you into contact with the homeless men areas. The object of this interview is to learn from the knowledge, insights, impressions, and conclusions you have developed out of your experience. By interviewing several persons like you and pooling the information they give us, we hope to arrive at a better understanding of these areas and the problems they present. THE INFORMATION YOU GIVE WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL IN THAT YOUR NAME AND THE NAME OF YOUR ORGANIZATION WILL NEVER BE LINKED WITH ANY OF THE ANSWERS YOU GIVE. We will analyze all of the interviews we take and make an integrated report without identifying or revealing the source of any particular item of information.

The following questions are intended to take the inventory of your knowledge described above; however, please do not let the questions be a straightjacket. If one of these questions causes you to think of another question that may not be asked, please "take time out" to discuss the question you think is important. (If you are filling out this interview without an interviewer, you may add extra comments on the backs of the sheets or attach extra sheets at the end.) We are not sure that we have listed all of the questions we should ask and want you to volunteer as much additional information as you can.

*NOTE: This schedule is designed to be completed either by direct interview or by an individual "interviewing himself" and recording his own answers. The questions are worded as if they were being asked by an interviewer. It is suggested, if you are filling out the schedule without an interviewer, that you read all of the questions, then begin to write your answers.

PART I. THE GENERAL PROBLEM

1. First, I'd like to know a bit about your job and how it causes you to be familiar with the problems of homeless men and of homeless men areas.
(What are your duties with respect to the problems of these men?) (About how many do you talk to directly during an average month?)

2. How long have you been working with homeless men? _____ years

3. Some people say that all the men on skid row are pretty much alike. How do you feel about this--do you agree or disagree? (What makes you say that?)

4. What are the main types or kinds of men one finds in the homeless men areas? The yellow page which follows presents a classification of homeless men found in homeless men areas. Please rip it out to refer to, for we will use your classification throughout this interview and we will be asking several questions based on this classification.

My first question is: What proportion of the men in the homeless men areas do you think belong in each category? We realize that no one knows the precise answer, but we want your best guess. If we have missed any types or kinds of men, please enter a brief description of the group /in one of the spaces marked "Other." (Enter percentage figures in the right-hand column below. If no men fall into a given category, please enter a "0." Be sure to include percentage figures for each group you add as well as for those already on the list.)

Type or kind of homeless men	Proportion of all homeless men who are of this type
a. Elderly or physically disabled men	
b. Semi-settled or settled workingmen	
c. Migratory workers	
d. Transient "bums"	
e. Resident "bums"	
f. Criminals and workers in illegal enterprises	
g-1. Chronic alcoholics--unable to work--not rehabilitable.	
g-2. Chronic alcoholics--physically rehabilitable, but mentally ill	
g-3. Chronic alcoholics--physically rehabilitable, no serious mental illness	
h. Other (SPECIFY)	
i. Other (SPECIFY)	
j. Other (SPECIFY)	
TOTAL HOMELESS MEN	100 per cent

A CLASSIFICATION OF HOMELESS MEN

- =====
- a. Elderly or physically disabled men--unable to work or retired--living on pensions, public assistance, or private aid. May drink, but are not chronic alcoholics as defined below (see g-1, g-2, g-3).
-
- b. Semi-settled or settled workingmen--employed or employable--seeking work. Usually work at unskilled or low-paying jobs. Reside in the area rather permanently, although frequently may change residence from one hotel or rooming-house to another. May drink, but are not chronic alcoholics as defined below (see g-1, g-2, g-3).
-
- c. Migratory workers--seasonal or temporary workers on railroad gangs, farm harvest laborers, or other migratory workers who come to the city between jobs, to spend the winter, or to get a temporary job here before "moving on" to another place. May drink, but are not chronic alcoholics as defined below (see g-1, g-2, g-3).
-
- d. Transient "bums"--men who just wander from one place to another, who make a living by begging and seeking help from charitable organizations in preference to work. They stay in town for only a short time. May drink, but are not chronic alcoholics as defined below (see g-1, g-2, g-3).
-
- e. Resident "bums"--semi-settled or settled panhandlers or other shiftless men who are physically able to work but choose not to work. May drink, but are not chronic alcoholics as defined below (see g-1, g-2, g-3).
-
- f. Criminals and workers in illegal enterprises--professional thieves, gamblers, "pimps," confidence men, etc. May drink, but are not chronic alcoholics as defined below (see g-1, g-2, g-3).
-
- g. Chronic alcoholics--men who have passed beyond the "excessive drinking" stage and who cannot control their drinking enough to hold a job or take care of themselves. These men are arrested repeatedly for drunkenness or disorderly conduct and spend a sizable proportion of their time in jail or in other places for detaining drunks. The following three sub-classes of alcoholics may be recognized:
- (1) Chronic alcoholics--unable to work--elderly or physically disabled men, including derelicts with irreparable alcoholic deterioration;
 - (2) Physically rehabilitable alcoholics, mentally ill--without major physical handicaps or poor health that would prevent working, but with symptoms of mental illness;
 - (3) Physically rehabilitable alcoholics, no serious mental illness--without major physical handicaps or poor health that would prevent working, no apparent serious mental illness.
-
- h. Other (SPECIFY)
-
- i. Other (SPECIFY)
-
- j. Other (SPECIFY)
-

5. What brings each kind of men to the homeless men areas? For each group, describe the social or economic forces which attract the men. (Enter in right-hand column, opposite the name of each group.)

Type of homeless men	Reasons for being on skid row or in homeless men area
a. Elderly or physically disabled men	
b. Semi-settled or settled workmen	
c. Migratory workers	
d. Transient "bums"	
e. Resident "bums"	
f. Criminals and workers in illegal enterprises	
g-1. Chronic alcoholics--unable to work--not rehabilitable	
g-2. Chronic alcoholics--physically rehabilitable, mentally ill	
g-3. Chronic alcoholics--physically rehabilitable, no serious mental illness	
h. Other (SPECIFY)	
i. Other (SPECIFY)	
j. Other (SPECIFY)	

6. A. Do you think the character or personality structure of homeless men is "different" from just ordinary people who live in other parts of town? For example, how does the personality makeup of elderly or physically disabled men on Skid Row compare with that of elderly or physically disabled men who live elsewhere in the city?

☐ No real difference ☐ Different in the following ways:

- B. How about the personality of semi-settled or settled workingmen on Skid Row--how does it compare with the personality of semi-settled or settled workingmen in other parts of town?

☐ No real difference ☐ Different in the following ways:

- C. And how do migratory workers on Skid Row compare with migratory workers in other parts of the city--as far as personality goes?

☐ No real difference ☐ Different in the following ways:

- D. And how about the character or personality structure of transient "bums"? In what ways, if any, do they differ from transient "bums" in other parts of town?

☐ No real difference ☐ Different in the following ways:

- E. And how about the character or personality structure of resident "bums"? In what ways, if any, do they differ from resident "bums" who live in other parts of town?

☐ No real difference ☐ Different in the following ways:

- F. Does the character or personality of criminals and workers in illegal enterprises on Skid Row differ from the character and personality of comparable groups found in other parts of town?

☐ No real difference

☐ Different in the following ways:

- G.(1) And now let's compare the personality of the Skid Row alcoholics who are unable to work and are not rehabilitable with the corresponding group of alcoholics who live in other parts of town. How does the Skid Row group compare personality-wise with the others?

☐ No real difference

☐ Different in the following ways:

- G.(2) How about the mentally ill chronic alcoholic on Skid Row and the mentally ill chronic alcoholic in other parts of town? In what ways, if any, are the ones on Skid Row different?

☐ No real difference

☐ Different in the following ways:

- G.(3) And last, let's look at the chronic alcoholics who are physically rehabilitable and who have no serious mental illness. In what ways, if any, are the ones on Skid Row different from the ones in other parts of town--as far as personality goes?

☐ No real difference

☐ Different in the following ways:

- H. Other group (SPECIFY) _____

☐ No real difference

☐ Different in the following ways:

(PLEASE USE BACK OF PAGE IF YOU HAVE ADDED GROUPS I. OR J.)

7. UNLESS PREVIOUSLY ANSWERED, ASK: What proportion of the men on skid row do you think are heavy drinkers? Percentage or proportion _____
-

8. ASK EVERYONE: In general, what do you think are the main causes of heavy drinking among homeless men?
-

9. A. Do you think the "skid row" environment makes chronic alcoholics out of many homeless men who would be able to control their drinking if they lived in a community where heavy drinking was not customary? Or do you think the homeless men area is simply a collecting-place for men who would become chronic alcoholics even in a normal community? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE CODE.)

In more cases, Skid Row makes chronic alcoholics out of men who would not be alcoholics if they lived elsewhere	1
In more cases, Skid Row simply collects alcoholics	2
Both statements are important explanations. Skid Row makes chronic alcoholics out of a significant proportion but it also collects a significant proportion of alcoholics	3

- B. Why do you feel this way?

-
10. Do you think anything might be done to help the homeless men who cannot control their drinking? What can be done?

11. What other action do you think the city, state, and federal governments might take to rehabilitate the different kinds of men you named earlier? Let's take each group separately:

Type or kind of homeless men =====	Action which city, state or federal government should take to rehabilitate each group =====
a. Elderly or physically disabled men	
b. Semi-settled or settled workingmen	
c. Migratory workers	
d. Transient "bums"	
e. Resident "bums"	
f. Other (SPECIFY)	
g. Other (SPECIFY)	
h. Other (SPECIFY)	

12. What do you think the city, state, and federal governments should do for those men who can't be rehabilitated?

12X. So far, we've been talking about the homeless men areas that have been in existence for some time. What are the physical boundaries of the area or areas you've been discussing in previous questions? (Please give approximate locations, using street intersections, if possible.)

12Y. Do you feel that any other areas of this type have been developing in recent years?

Yes. 1*

No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B.

A. Where (are these)(is this)? (Please give approximate locations, using street intersections, if possible.)

B. How do you explain this new development -- what has caused it?

13. Now, getting back to the homeless men areas we were discussing earlier -- those that have been in existence for some time -- do you think that there are now more or less homeless men in these areas than there were in 1950?

More	1*
Less	2*
Fluctuating.	3*
No change.	4

*ASK A AND B UNLESS "NO CHANGE":

A. When did the increase or decrease come?

B. What do you think is responsible for this change?

-
14. Do you think that the proportions in each of the groups we discussed earlier (on the yellow page) have changed appreciably since 1950?

Yes.	1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B.

A. Which types have increased? (Why is that?)

B. Which types have decreased? (And why is that?)

- 14X. Of course, one could classify the men in these areas by race, nationality, or by the part of the country they come from. Have you noticed any increase or decrease in any groups like that?

Yes. 1*

No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B.

A. Which groups have increased (are increasing)?

B. Which groups have decreased (are decreasing)?

C. Do you think these changes have affected the kinds of problems that exist here (in homeless men areas)? (In what way?)

-
15. Do you expect the number of homeless men in these areas to get larger or smaller in the next ten years?

Larger 1*

Smaller. 2*

No change. 3

*A. (UNLESS "NO CHANGE"): Why will that happen, do you think?

16. We want to interview all the people who have had relevant experience with these men. Could you tell me some people whom you feel we should interview?

-
17. And now I'd like to know whether there are any other questions we should be asking or any other areas you feel we should explore in this study. In other words, what haven't I asked you that I should have? (Is there anything at all that we should cover in order to develop a better understanding of the problem of homeless men areas in large cities?)

PART II. WHAT SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT HOUSING?

City planners and urban renewal experts are trying to rebuild the slum neighborhoods that adjoin homeless men areas. If the skid row is allowed to remain, the rebuilt areas will not attract the types of residents desired and may quickly revert to slums. Also, many observers believe that at least some types of the homeless men would respond favorably to a well-designed and sustained program of rehabilitation. THE BIG QUESTION IS: "WHAT SHOULD BE DONE THAT WILL BE EFFECTIVE IN THE LONG RUN?"

Suppose we use the categories you developed earlier to classify the homeless men for purposes of planning for their housing and welfare.

I'd like to know what kind of housing should be provided for each group of men, who should provide it, and where it should be. Let's take these questions one by one.

18. The pink page which follows lists six possible types of housing. (Please rip out this page to refer to.) What type of housing would you suggest for each class of homeless person? Feel free to suggest some other type of housing if none of these seems right to you. (Record appropriate code letter in Column 1 below.)
19. Who should provide new housing for each group of homeless men? The top of the blue page which follows (rip out for convenience) lists four possibilities or you can add your own idea if you don't like these. (Record appropriate code letters in Column 2 below.)
20. Where should this housing be located? The bottom half of the blue page lists three kinds of sites that have been suggested. Which would you favor for each group of men? Again, feel free to suggest your own alternative if you don't agree with any of these. (Record by code letter in Column 3 below.)

Type or kind of homeless men	Preferred type of housing (1)	By whom should housing be provided (2)	Preferred location of housing (3)
a. Elderly or physically disabled men			
b. Semi-settled or settled workmen			
c. Migratory workers			
d. Transient "bums"			
e. Residential "bums"			
f. Criminals and workers in illegal enterprises			
g-1. Chronic alcoholics--unable to work--not rehabilitable . . .			
g-2. Chronic alcoholics--physically rehabilitable, but mentally ill			
g-3. Chronic alcoholics--physically rehabilitable, no serious mental illness			
h. Other (SPECIFY)			
i. Other (SPECIFY)			
j. Other (SPECIFY)			

POSSIBLE TYPES OF HOUSING
FOR HOMELESS MEN

- a. Apartments, in which two or three congenial persons could live.
- b. Single-room units of hotel-type accommodation, with eating and recreational facilities (somewhat like a typical YMCA). No liquor served on the premises. Bath and toilet facilities shared.
- c. Single-room units of hotel-type accommodation, without other facilities. Units to be maintained at the level of cleanliness and comfort of typical YMCA. Rooms of about 100 square feet in size. Bath and toilet facilities shared.
- d. Single-room units of hotel-type accommodation, without other facilities. Units to furnish bare necessities of decency and comfort, but to be clean and livable. Rooms of about 70 square feet.
- e. Cubicle-type units (large rooms subdivided into sleeping units by fireproof wallboard extending up from the floor about 7-8 feet, open at the top, with protective mesh covering the enclosure). Minimum adequate light, ventilation. Each room with facilities for storing clothes and for sitting.
- f. Open dormitory-type units. Beds located in open barracks-type arrangement, with a metal locker and chair for each bed.
- g. A suitable public institution, such as an old-folks' home or hospital for indigent persons, where physical or mental ailments would be treated.
- h. NONE. No public funds should be spent on housing for this group.
- i. Other. (SPECIFY.)

NOTE: Each of the above types presupposes adequate fireproof construction and fire protection, as well as adequate facilities for heating and ventilation. Where bath and toilet facilities are shared, the number of persons per unit would not be excessive.

WHO SHOULD PROVIDE NEW HOUSING FOR HOMELESS MEN?

SOME POSSIBILITIES TO CONSIDER

- a. Private hotel and rooming house owners should provide housing which is regulated only by our existing zoning and building codes. This would not involve public subsidies or special government funds.
- b. Private hotel and rooming house owners should provide new or converted buildings in places specified by the city plan commission and regulated by a special health, welfare, and rehabilitation ordinance that would specify the minimum facilities that must be provided, and that would require the management to participate in a possible federal-state-local program of rehabilitation and treatment of chronic alcoholism by providing space for certain rehabilitation programs.
- c. The City should provide new or converted buildings at rates which make such public shelters as nearly self-sustaining as possible. This would be an integral part of a program to rehabilitate present residents of skid row areas and to prevent the development of new crops of homeless men, insofar as possible. The principal objective would be to rehabilitate or cure rather than to recover costs.
- d. The City should provide new or converted buildings owned and operated on a self-supporting basis by the City. These hotels would be required to charge rates sufficient to pay their expenses without subsidy.
- e. Other (SPECIFY):

NOTE: Assume that this housing would be of a type suitable to the groups involved.

POSSIBLE LOCATION OF HOUSING

- a. At approximately the same sites as homeless men areas are now located.
- b. Scattered throughout the city in small units but located in such a way that they are readily accessible to the principal industries that offer employment.
- c. Located in a rural or semi-rural setting (applies only to the groups classed as unable to work or in need of rehabilitation).
- d. Other (SPECIFY.)

21. It has been proposed that the Federal Government, as a part of its housing program, provide funds (matched with local funds) with which to provide low-cost public housing for elderly persons. Assume that this housing would be of a type suitable to the way of life of the groups involved. Under these conditions, WOULD YOU FAVOR THE EXTENSION OF THIS PROGRAM TO COVER ELDERLY HOMELESS MEN (65 years of age and over)?

Strongly approve . . . 1
Approve. 2
Don't know 3
Disapprove 4
Strongly disapprove. 5

-
22. (IF NOT ALREADY ANSWERED) Do you think a program of public shelters should be a part of the City's homeless men program?

Approve. 1
Disapprove 2

A. Why do you think this way?

B. For whom (what types of men) should they be used?

C. Do you think public shelters would attract "bums" and derelicts from other cities?

Yes. 1
No 2
Undecided. 3

-
- 22X. How strictly do you think existing housing codes are being enforced in the homeless men areas?

Very strict enforcement . . . 1
Generally strict, some laxity 2*
Enforcement quite lax 3*
Don't know. 4

*IF "SOME LAXITY" OR "QUITE LAX," ASK:

In what way is it lax?

23. What other ideas or suggestions can you give us about "What should be done about housing"?

PART III. WHAT SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT HEALTH, REHABILITATION, WELFARE?

It is frequently said that prevention of degeneracy and rehabilitation of homeless men must accompany a major housing attack on the problem of homeless men if long-run success is to be accomplished. THIS MEANS THAT A WELFARE PROGRAM AND A HOUSING PROGRAM MUST BE INTEGRATED WITH EACH OTHER. The preceding section has inventoried your judgments about the housing program. This section undertakes to inventory your ideas concerning the elements of a welfare program that would be both effective and practical.

We would like you, in answering these questions, to continue to think of the homeless men area as being comprised of the same principal types of men described in Sections I and II.

24. In your opinion, what should be the elements of a program of rehabilitation and prevention of degeneracy in homeless men areas? Here are some possible activities. We would like to know how you feel about including each of the following activities as part of a comprehensive program for homeless men areas. For each activity, we want to know whether you strongly approve, approve, disapprove, or strongly disapprove. (Circle the one appropriate code number for each activity. If you have any qualifications or comments, please use the space just left of the code categories.)

A. Nothing should be done in addition to present facilities available for all citizens.

Strongly approve . . . 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

B. A unit should screen homeless men applying at health, welfare, or charitable agencies for assistance. The men should be referred to the proper agency, with preliminary recommendations for a program of help or rehabilitation.

Strongly approve . . . 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

C. If the city has a municipal shelter program, the admission of persons to this shelter, the conditions under which they remain, and the standards of conduct they must maintain should be regulated by welfare authorities.

Strongly approve . . . 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

NOTE: If you do not approve of a public shelter program, indicate by placing an X in the box provided ☐

24. Continued

- D. Facilities should be provided to counsel and advise applicants concerning personal, financial, or other problems that may be contributing to their present condition.

Strongly approve . . .	1
Approve	2
Disapprove	3
Strongly disapprove .	4
Can't decide	5

- E. Facilities should be provided for obtaining clothing, and arranging for meals and essential expenses for non-alcoholic men in need of temporary assistance while finding work and getting their first pay.

Strongly approve . . .	1
Approve	2
Disapprove	3
Strongly disapprove .	4
Can't decide	5

- F. Facilities should be provided for helping applicants obtain employment, both regular and temporary.

Strongly approve . . .	1
Approve	2
Disapprove	3
Strongly disapprove .	4
Can't decide	5

- G. Facilities should be provided for helping applicants obtain needed medical, psychiatric, or health care.

Strongly approve . . .	1
Approve	2
Disapprove	3
Strongly disapprove .	4
Can't decide	5

- H. Facilities should be provided for inspecting and observing the living conditions and operating practices in hotels, lodging-houses, restaurants, taverns, and other business establishments serving these men, and to bring to the attention of police, health authorities, or others, instances of violations of municipal codes that affect the health, safety, or welfare of the homeless men.

Strongly approve . . .	1
Approve	2
Disapprove	3
Strongly disapprove .	4
Can't decide	5

24. Continued

- I. Facilities should be provided to seek the aid of the men's families in an effort to get financial support and assistance in effecting their rehabilitation.

Strongly approve . . .	1
Approve	2
Disapprove	3
Strongly disapprove .	4
Can't decide	5

- J. Facilities should be provided for a city-wide program of low-cost, all-season recreation for low-income homeless persons that would make it possible to find companionship and recreation without recourse to taverns. This could include recreation rooms, TV, clubs and interest groups, therapy classes.

Strongly approve . . .	1
Approve	2
Disapprove	3
Strongly disapprove .	4
Can't decide	5

- K. Facilities should be provided for occupational retraining and rehabilitation of non-alcoholic men with physical handicaps or low degrees of skill.

Strongly approve . . .	1
Approve	2
Disapprove	3
Strongly disapprove .	4
Can't decide	5

- L. Other (SPECIFY)

Strongly approve . . .	1
Approve	2
Disapprove	3
Strongly disapprove .	4
Can't decide	5

25. It has been proposed that a Bureau for Homeless and Transient Men should be established and operated by the City. Its possible functions are those we've just been discussing.

A. Do you approve of the establishment of a Bureau for Homeless and Transient Men and its operation by the City?

Strongly approve 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

B. For each activity listed (in Question 24), we would like to know whether you would strongly recommend turning the job of planning and organizing to the Bureau, whether you recommend it but not so strongly, whether you disapprove, or whether you strongly disapprove. (Record the code letter for each program listed in Question 24 on the appropriate line below.)

Strongly recommend the following _____
Recommend the following _____
Am uncertain about the following _____
Disapprove of the following as _____
functions of the Bureau _____
Strongly disapprove of the follow- _____
ing as functions of the Bureau _____

26. A. And now a question about recreational facilities. What recreational facilities, if any, do you think should be provided for elderly or physically disabled men?

B. And what recreational facilities should be provided for other homeless men?

27. In your opinion, what should be the elements of a program of rehabilitation and prevention for chronic alcoholism in homeless men areas? Below are listed some possible activities. Please indicate whether you approve or disapprove having each activity included as a part of a comprehensive program for homeless men areas.

- A. The first offense of drunkenness or disorderly conduct involving drunkenness should be regarded very seriously throughout the city, and a special program of prevention should be installed. Instead of being fined or sentenced to jail, each first offender should be sentenced to an alcoholism-prevention clinic for a period of three days. During this time he would be interviewed by psychiatric social workers, physicians and counselors. The reason for the occasion for acute alcoholism should be ascertained. After all tests and interviews, the patient should be counseled and advised. Social workers should help carry out the program planned for the individual.

Strongly approve 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

- B. All heavy drinkers should be considered to be persons afflicted with a chronic disease, not persons given to breaking the law. A program for chronic alcoholics would emphasize treatment and rehabilitation rather than punishment. A welfare unit should be operated in conjunction with the courts before which drunks are brought for sentencing.

Strongly approve 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

- C. Chronic alcoholics who are not also incorrigible should be sent (with the consent of the man) to a re-training center, instead of being sentenced to a jail term for drunkenness or disorderly conduct. This center would employ the most modern medical, psychiatric, and sociological techniques in attempting to initiate rehabilitation. This could be a single, municipally-operated center or could be a special facility of several hospitals.

Strongly approve 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

27. Continued

- D. Alcoholics who are discharged from a re-training center should be required to spend several weeks in a "halfway-house" or center where they can be employed at useful jobs and trained by experts in vocational rehabilitation. They have no access to alcohol on the premises but would have access to a normal community. This program is one of vocational and occupational rehabilitation and of reinforcing the re-training center's work. Needed psychiatric, counselling, or other assistance could be continued in this phase. Assistance is given in locating a job upon "graduation."

Strongly approve . . . 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

- E. Chronic alcoholics who will never be self-supporting again because of age or irreparable physical and mental deterioration should be institutionalized.

Strongly approve . . . 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

- F. The City should have an integrated program of Health Information for Citizens, one part of which would inform citizens about alcoholism, its dangers, and procedures for cure. This information should be a part of the formal training of all junior and senior high school students. It should be available without charge for adult education in factories or organizations desiring to inform their employees or members.

Strongly approve . . . 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

- G. The program of Alcoholics Anonymous should be made available as a part of the re-training program for those patients who wish to participate.

Strongly approve . . . 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

27. Continued.

H. The work facilities of the Salvation Army and other charitable organizations should be utilized as a part of the re-training program.

Strongly approve . . . 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

I. Other (SPECIFY)

Strongly approve . . . 1
Approve 2
Disapprove 3
Strongly disapprove . 4
Can't decide 5

28. Please give us any other observations, comments or advice you have about the health, welfare and rehabilitation of NON-ALCOHOLIC homeless men.

29. And now we'd like any observations, comments, or other advice you have to offer about the health, welfare and rehabilitation of the homeless men who are HEAVY DRINKERS BUT NOT CHRONIC ALCOHOLICS:

30. Any other comments or suggestions about the homeless men who are CHRONIC ALCOHOLICS, and their welfare, health and rehabilitation?

31. How strictly do you think the existing ordinances concerning the sale of alcoholic beverages are being enforced in this city?

Very strict enforcement	1
Generally strict, some laxity	2
Enforcement quite lax	3
Don't know	4

32. In your opinion, does strict enforcement of existing ordinances concerning the sale of alcoholic beverages make the problem of heavy drinking and chronic alcoholism become less acute and easier to handle in the homeless men areas?

Yes	1*
No	2

*IF "YES" ASK: In what ways would such enforcement assist in solving this problem?

33. In general do you think the following conditions are prevalent in "homeless men" areas?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
A. Owners and operators of flophouses offering less comfort and safety from fire than the income from their operation would permit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Restaurant owners and operators providing food of lower quality, and less adequately prepared, than the prices charged warrant?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Taverns and liquor stores selling liquor on credit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Selling cheap liquor at prices for better quality liquor?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Stores and taverns selling canned heat and other injurious alcoholic products with the knowledge that they will be taken internally?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Other (SPECIFY) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	

34. And now we would welcome any further comments, information or suggestions you can offer concerning the entire problem of homeless men areas and their residents, which we haven't already discussed. (Use additional pages if necessary.)

PART IV. A FEW ITEMS OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESPONDENT

- A. What is your major occupation at present? _____

- B. What was the highest grade of school you completed?
Grade school _____ High school _____ College, Bachelors _____
Masters _____
Doctors _____
- C. If you have college degrees, what was your major field of study for each degree?
Bachelors _____ Masters _____ Doctors _____
- D. How old are you? _____ (Age at last birthday)
- E. What is your religious affiliation? _____ (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Other)
- F. What is your marital status? _____ (Single, Married, Widowed, Divorced)
- G. In what state or country were you born? _____
- H. What was the nationality of your parents? Father was born in _____
Mother was born in _____
- I. In which of the following categories does your income (before taxes) fall?
- | | |
|------------------------|-------------|
| Under \$2,500 per year | . 1 |
| \$2,500 - \$5,000 | 2 |
| \$5,000 - \$7,500 | 3 |
| \$7,500 - \$10,000 | 4 |
| \$10,000 or over | 5 |
- J. In general, which of the political parties reflects best your ideas on domestic problems and policies?
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Republican party | 1 |
| Democratic party | 2 |
| Neither party - (am an independent) | . 3 |
- K. Do you own or rent your house or apartment?
- | | |
|------|-----------|
| Own | 1 |
| Rent | 2 |
- L. How many years of your life have you lived in this city or its environs?
_____ years.

APPENDIX D

Schedule Administered to
Homeless Men on Skid Row

Field control number _____

Hotel or Residence _____

Address _____

Room or bed number _____

Sampling weight _____

CONTENT:

I

II

III

IV

CONFIDENTIAL
Survey 395
January, 1953

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER

University of Chicago

RESPONDENT'S NAME

(First)

(Middle)

(Last)

ETHNIC TYPE

Interviewer

Date assigned

Date of interview

Callback record:

Call No.	Date	Time	Interviewer	Results	Remarks
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					

CARD V

Interview Number

(1- 3-)

I AM WORKING FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. WE ARE MAKING A PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF MEN WHO LIVE ON (WEST MADISON) (SOUTH STATE) (NORTH CLARK) STREET, AND I HAVE A FEW QUESTIONS TO ASK YOU. WE HOPE TO FIND WAYS TO HELP YOU MEN WHO LIVE IN THESE AREAS. IN ORDER TO DO THIS WE MUST LEARN A LITTLE ABOUT THE THINGS YOU LIKE AND NEED AND WANT. MY FIRST QUESTION IS:

1. How is your health? Would you say that it is excellent, good, fair, or poor?

Excellent 4- 1

Good 2

Fair 3

Poor 4

Question 2. (Continued)

Ailment Number	Question Number	Did you see a doctor?	Nature of ailment (ASK ONLY THE APPROPRIATE QUESTION TO CLARIFY EACH AILMENT)		IF NOT CLEAR, ASK: What part of body was affected (hurt)?	Did it cause you to cut down on your usual activities for 1 day or more?	Would you have worked except for ...?	Days work lost DUE TO ...:	When did you first notice ...? Which month?	Days in bed during past 12 months with
			(a) What did doctor say it was?	(b) What kind of trouble was it?						
1.		Yes No			X			Yes No	Last two weeks During last 3 mos. During last year More than year ago (SPECIFY)	
2.		Yes No			X			Yes No	Last two weeks During last 3 mos. During last year More than year ago (SPECIFY)	
3.		Yes No			X			Yes No	Last two weeks During last 3 mos. During last year More than year ago (SPECIFY)	
4.		Yes No			X			Yes No	Last two weeks During last 3 mos. During last year More than year ago (SPECIFY)	
5.		Yes No			X			Yes No	Last two weeks During last 3 mos. During last year More than year ago (SPECIFY)	

I-1. FOR EACH AILMENT LISTED ABOVE ASK:

A. What kind of treatment did you get for it during the past two weeks?

TREATMENT CODE

No medical treatment . . . 0# Talked to a doctor . . . 3##
 Self medication 1# Went to a clinic 4##
 Druggist prescribed . . . 2# Went to a hospital . . . 5##

#B. FOR ALL AILMENTS IN WHICH NO TREATMENT, SELF MEDICATION OR DRUGGIST PRESCRIBED ONLY: Why didn't you see a doctor or go to a clinic?

##C. FOR ALL AILMENTS IN WHICH DOCTOR, CLINIC OR HOSPITAL VISIT INVOLVED:
 How did you manage the cost? Were you able to pay it yourself, was it free, or did someone else pay for it? (How much did you pay?) (Who paid for it?) (How did you happen to get free care?)

Ail- ment No.	Treat- ment code	#B. Reasons for not seeing Doctor (If 0,1,2 in D)	#C. Payment of medical expenses		
			Paid by man Amt. (\$)	Who paid	How did you happen to get free care (if relevant)?
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					

I-2. During the past twelve months have you been a patient in a hospital?

No . . 0
Yes . 1*

* IF "YES," ASK:

A. How many times were you in the hospital? _____ times

FOR EACH TIME PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

B. When did you enter the hospital?

C. How many days were you in the hospital this time? (Count only days in the past year.)

D. What was the matter? (Anything else?)

E. Were any operations performed on you during this stay in the hospital? (What was the operation? Any other operation?)

F. What is the name of the hospital you were in? (Get location if not well-known.)

When did you enter the hospital? (Month and year)	How many days?	What was the matter?	Were operations performed?	Name and location of hospital

I-2a. How many teeth have you pulled or had knocked out?

How many teeth have you had replaced by dental work?

How long has it been since you went to a dentist?

ASK EVERYONE, EXCEPT THOSE WITH NO TEETH:

Are your teeth bothering you now or do you need to have dental work done? (Describe the trouble.)

3. How are your nerves? Are you inclined to be nervous or "on edge"? (How often do you feel this way?)

Almost never feel nervous	.30- 0
Occasionally	1
Frequently	2
Most of the time	3

4. AGE, HEIGHT, WEIGHT:

- A. What is the date of your birth?

____ Day ____ Month ____ Year (31-32)

- B. How tall are you? (Estimate if respondent DK)

____ Feet ____ Inches (33-34)

- C. How much do you weigh now? (Estimate if respondent DK)

____ lbs. (35-37)

- D. How much did you weigh when you were a young man--say 20-25 years old?

____ lbs. (38-40)

I-3. And now about strength. Most of your life have you felt that you were as strong, stronger, or not as strong as the average man your size?

Average strength	24- 1
Stronger than average	2
Below average strength	3

I-4. Do you have any tattoos on your body or arms? (How many different times have you had tattoos put on?)

Have no tattoos	25- 0
Number of different times tattooed	__*

*How old were you when you had your first one? _____ Years (26- 27)

5. How would you describe your typical day? Take an average day and think of how you spend it--what things do you do? You may start with getting up in the morning if you want.

(41-50)

(Probes: What time do you get up? Where do you eat breakfast? Where do you go after breakfast? What do you do then? Who do you see during the day? Where do you eat lunch usually? Where do you eat supper? What do you do in the evenings? Who do you spend the time with?)

Interview Number _____ (1-3)

III-1, A. How do you feel about living on (West Madison) (North Clark)
(South State) Street? In general do you like or dislike it?

Like	4- 1
Dislike	2
Dislike, but resigned	3
Don't know	Y

B. First, what don't you like (are there things you don't like)
about living here? (Anything else?) (5-6)

C. And what do you like (are there any things you do like)
about living here? (Anything else?) (7-8)

D. How long do you expect to stay here? (Do you expect to
move away from here? If so, when will it be?) (9)

6. A. How long have you lived in this neighborhood? _____ Months (51-)
(Refers only to present trip here.)

B. How did you happen to come to (West Madison) (South State) (North Clark) Street to live? Have there been any events or circumstances in your life that caused you to move here? Would you tell me what they were and what happened? (Well, you are living away from any family in a hotel where only men stay. Many people would consider it an unusual way to live. Is there any particular reason for being here in your case?) (52-61)

INTERVIEWER: AT THIS POINT, THE RESPONDENT IS TO BE ENCOURAGED TO "TELL HIS STORY" IN HIS OWN WORDS. RECORD IT VERBATIM AS NEARLY AS POSSIBLE. USE ONLY PROBES THAT STIMULATE HIM TO TALK, BUT NOT TO EXPLORE ANY PARTICULAR AREA. DO NOT ENCOURAGE HIM TO MAKE A LENGTHY STATEMENT--JUST GET HIS FIRST-THOUGHTS EXPLANATION. LATER QUESTIONS WILL EXPLORE SPECIFIC TOPICS.

REMEMBER WHAT HE SAYS, SO THAT IN ASKING SUBSEQUENT QUESTIONS YOU WILL AVOID MAKING HIM REPEAT ALL OF IT WHEN HE HAS GIVEN YOU SOME OF THE INFORMATION YOU NEED.7

III-2. How do you like living in this (place like this) (hotel) (lodging place) (mission)?

Like	1C-1
Dislike	2
Dislike, but like better than other area hotels	3
Don't know	Y

A. What things do you like about it? (Are there any things you do like about it?) (Anything else?)

(11-12-)

B. And what don't you like about it? (Are there any things you don't like about it?) (Anything else?)

(13-14-)

III-3. If you could live in the neighborhood you like best, where would you choose to live--in this hotel, someplace else in this neighborhood, in another neighborhood, or some other place?

In this hotel	15- 1
Elsewhere in this neighborhood	2*
In another neighborhood	
(WHAT KIND OF NEIGHBORHOOD?)	*
In another city (WHERE?)	
	*
On a farm	*

*IF OTHER THAN "THIS HOTEL": What kind of a place would you like to stay in--a men's hotel, an apartment of your own, in an apartment shared with someone else, in a rooming house for men, in a private home, or some other place?

Men's hotel	16- 1
Rooming house for men	2
Apartment of own	3
Apartment shared	4
Private home	5
Other (SPECIFY) _____	

7. Suppose some of the men's hotels on (West Madison) (South State) (North Clark) Street are torn down to make way for better housing. And suppose that new housing is to be built especially for you men who live here, to rent at a price you can afford to pay. WHAT KINDS OF PLACES TO LIVE SHOULD BE BUILT FOR YOU? (Suppose you could tell the builders what sort of places to put up. What would you like to see built for you to live in yourself?)

- A. (IF NOT ANSWERED SPONTANEOUSLY) Here is a list of different kinds of places: Open dormitories, cubicles or cages, single rooms for each man, like at a YMCA, apartments where two or three men could live together and do their own cooking and housekeeping. Which of these would you like best for yourself?

Open dormitories	62- 1
Cubicles or cages	2
Single rooms	3
Apartments for joint occupancy . . .	4
Apartments for sole occupancy . . .	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6

- B. If a place like that (the one chosen) could be built so that it is modern, clean and well run, how much a week would you be willing and able to pay to stay there?

\$ _____ (63- 64-)

- C. Who do you think should manage these places--private business men or a government housing agency run by the City of Chicago?

Private business men	65- 1*
City of Chicago	2*
Don't know	Y

*What are your reasons for saying that?

- D. Where do you think they should put new housing for men? - (West Madison) (South State) (North Clark), or some other place?

Here near (West Madison) (South State) (North Clark) . 66- 1
Other (SPECIFY) _____

CODE BOX:

Other content: _____

(67-)

473

III-4. A. What do you think of the other men that live on this street?
In thinking of where you would like to live, would you like
to have people like these men around you, or would you like
to have different people? (COPY RESPONSE VERBATIM)

Don't like them . 17- 0

Noncommittal . . . 1

Like them 2

B. What do you (is there anything that you) like about the men?
(Anything else?) (18-19)

C. What don't you (is there anything that you don't) like about
them? (Anything else?) (20-21)

D. How many close friends do you have here?

Have no close friends here 22-0*

Have a few close friends 1**

Have many close or good friends . . . 2**

*IF "NO CLOSE FRIENDS": Why do you suppose you have not found
any friends among them?

(23-24)

**IF HAS FRIENDS: Are your friends different from the other
men on the street? (In what way?)

(25-26)

III-5. How much have you lived in cubicle-type hotels (hotel rooms) (rooming
houses) such as this? (About how many years?) _____ years 27-

III-6. During the past year, what kinds of places have you lived in?
(How long in _____?)

Months in cubicles _____ (28-)

Months in rooming houses _____ (29-)

Months in labor camps _____ (30-)

Months living outdoors _____ (31-)

Other (SPECIFY) _____ (32-)

Total . . . 12 months

Interview Number _____ (1-3)

8. Now I'd like to ask you about any work you did during the past week.
Last week did you work at any job?

No . . . 4- X*

Yes . . . 1**

*IF "NO" SKIP TO QUESTION 9, Page 14.

**IF "YES" ASK SERIES A - J: Tell me about each job you had:

- A. What kind of work did you do? (occupation)
- B. Was it a spot job or a steady job?
- C. How did you get this job? (If employment office, name the office) (source)
- D. What's the name of the company (person) you worked for? (firm)
- E. Where is the company located? (address)
- F. What kind of place is that? (What do they do or make there?) (industry)
- G. How many hours did you work at this job last week? (hours)
- H. How much did you get paid per hour on this job? (pay)
- I. Where were you paid off? (specify exact place as follows:)

At place of work 1

At employment office 2

At a tavern (SPECIFY) _____

Other place (SPECIFY) _____

J. Who paid you?

Question	Job Number 1	Job Number 2	Job Number 3	Job Number 4
A. Occupation				
B. Steady or spot job				
C. Source				
D. Firm				
E. Address				
F. Industry				
G. Hours				
H. Pay--Amount	\$ per	\$ per	\$ per	\$ per
I. Places of pay				
J. Who paid				

CODE BOX: Number of jobs	5	Total hours worked	16-17
Jobs: Type	6	Total money earned	18-19
Occupations	7-10	Average rate of pay	20-21
Sources	11	Places of pay	22
Industries	12-15	Who paid	23

9. ASK ONLY IF NOT WORKING LAST WEEK: (IF EMPLOYED ONE OR MORE DAYS LAST WEEK, SKIP TO NEXT PAGE.)

Did you apply for work last week at any place? (Where?)

Did not apply for work last week 24- X**

Applied for work at _____ *

- *A. IF APPLIED: Why do you suppose you didn't get a job when you tried? (Is there any other reason?)

(25-)

- **B. IF NOT LOOKING: What kept you from working or looking for work, or didn't you want to work?

Unable to work (age, etc.) 26- 0

Temporary illness 1

Did not care to work 2

Other (SPECIFY) _____

III-7. Now I would like to know all of the cities you have been in during the past year, how long you stayed in each place, and the jobs you had while you were there.

(33-48)

Name of Place	Arrived Approx. Date (Month)	Left Approx. Date (Month)	Length of Stay (Weeks)	Jobs held while there		No. of Weeks on Each Job
				Occupation	Industry	
Chicago						

III-8. A. About how many times have you been to Chicago and then moved away? (Count present residence as a time.) _____ times

B. Since coming here this last time, have you lived any place but on West Madison, South State, or North Clark? Where?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

C. During how many weeks of the past year have you lived on one of Chicago's Skid Rows (West Madison, South State, or North Clark)?

CODE BOX: Number of intercity moves made _____
 Number of neighborhood moves in Chicago _____
 Where stayed in Chicago (neighborhoods) _____
 Average length of stay in each city _____
 Number of different jobs _____
 Types of jobs held _____
 Average length of time on one job _____
 Total months spent in Chicago _____
 General occupational classification for year _____
 Number of trips to Chicago _____
 Weeks on Skid Row this year _____

IV-1. ESTIMATED WAGES LAST YEAR.

Interview Number (1-3)

- A. During the past year, about how many weeks did you go without working even one day? _____ weeks (4-5)
- B. During the weeks that you did work, how many hours per week did you usually work? (I mean during the average week you worked.) _____ hours (6-7)
- C. Think of the best paying and the lowest paid jobs you had and how long you worked at them; what would you say was your average pay per hour last year? \$_____ per hour (8-9-10)

IV-2. Do you get a pension of any kind--because of disability (injury), retirement (Social Security), or because of age (Public Assistance) or did you get unemployment compensation at any time in the last year?

(11-14)

Do not receive a pension X

Receive a pension of \$_____ per _____ *

Type of pension (SPECIFY) _____ *

Number of months payment received during last 12 months _____ *

* IF PENSION, ASK A AND B.

- A. Where do you usually cash your pension check? (15)
- B. How do you arrange for room rent and meals for the month? (16)

INCOME FROM OTHER SOURCES:

IV-3. Last year did you receive money from rents or interest on property or savings you own? If so, how much did you receive from this source last year?

No such income 17- 0

Amount \$ _____

IV-4. Last year did you receive money as a gift from relatives or friends? About how much did you receive?

No money from this source . . . 18- 0

Amount \$ _____

10. On this card, I have some groupings of income. Which of these groupings most nearly matches the total income you had last year from all sources?

Income group (SPECIFY) _____ (27)

INTERVIEWER: CHECK INCOME AS FOLLOWS:

Questions:

IV-1-A-B-C: Weeks x hours x rate - estimated wages for the year \$ _____

IV-2: Income from pension (monthly rate x 12) . . . \$ _____

IV-3: Income from interest, rents, investments . . \$ _____

IV-4: Income from gifts of money \$ _____

TOTAL INCOME \$ _____ *

*(NOTE: If total income based on above computations does not coincide with total income group designated by respondent, please try to get respondent to reconcile difference. If not possible, please indicate below which figure you think is valid and why.)

III-9. Have you ever been in military service? (When did you serve?)

No military service	49- 0*
World War I	1**
World War II	2**
Korean War	3**
Other, Before World War II	4**
Other, After World War II	5**

*A. IF NO MILITARY SERVICE: Why didn't you get drafted? (What was the reason for being excused?)

(50)

**IF MILITARY SERVICE, ASK B - I.

B. What branch of service was that and what was your assignment?
What did you do in the (Army) (Navy) (Marine Corps)? Were you an infantryman, a gunner, a pilot, or what? (51-52)

Branch	Assignment
Army	
Navy	
Air Force	
Marine Corps	
Other (SPECIFY)	

C. What was the highest rate or rank you held? _____ 53-

D. How long were you in the service? _____ months 54-

E. Were you stationed overseas?

Not stationed overseas	55- 0
Yes, stationed overseas	1

F. Did you ever have combat service? If so, for how many months?

No combat service	56- 0
Yes, had combat service for _____ months	

III-9 (Continued)

- G. Did you receive any disciplinary action while you were in the service? What was the offense and what was the punishment? (Army--court martial, company punishment; Navy--court martial, captain's mast, were you ever in the brig?; Marine --court martial, captain's mast, brig)

No military discipline 57- 0

Yes, received military discipline. (SPECIFY) _____

Punishment received _____

- H. How did (Army) (Navy) (Marine Corps) (Air Force) life affect you? Did it change you in any way? In what ways? (In any other ways?)

Did not affect me 58- 0

Yes, it changed me (SPECIFY) 1

- I. What type of discharge did you get?

Honorable 59- 1

Dishonorable (SPECIFY CAUSE) _____ 2

Without honor (SPECIFY CAUSE--PROBE FOR HOMOSEXUAL) _____ 3

Medical (SPECIFY CAUSE--PROBE FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC) _____ 4

IV-5. A. What kinds of work have you done in your life? Have most of your jobs been pretty much like those you have done during the past year? Could you tell me which jobs you have held longest and how long you worked at each? (List jobs held one year or longer. If none in this category, list three "best" jobs.)

(19-38)

Job (Occupation)	Industry	Years	
		From	To
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			

B. Which of these jobs did you like best?

Job Number _____

C. Why did you happen to leave it?

IV-6. How well do you like the work you have been doing recently? What do you (dislike) (like) about it? (PROBE FOR BOTH LIKES AND DISLIKES.)

(39-42)

IV-7. Would you rather have "spot jobs" or a steady job?

Spot jobs 43- B*
Steady job 2**

*A. IF "SPOT JOBS": Why don't you want a steady job? (Any other reason?)

(44)

**B. IF PREFERS STEADY JOB (SEE ABOVE) BUT DOES NOT NOW HAVE A STEADY JOB: Do you think you could handle a steady job working five days a week, eight hours a day?

No 45- X*
Yes 1

*IF "NO": Why don't you think so?

(46)

IV-8. If you could get free training to prepare you for a better job, would you be interested in taking it?

No 47- 0*
Yes 1**

*A. IF "NO": Why is that?

(48)

**B. IF "YES": What kind of training would you want?

(49-50)

C. ASK ALL VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II OR KOREA: Did you try to get training under the G.I. bill? (If not, why not?)

(51)

I-5. A. How do you usually spend your spare time? Do you ever _____? (How often do you _____?)

- | | <u>Times</u> | |
|---|-----------------|------|
| a. Go to the movies? | _____ per _____ | (28) |
| b. Go to a tavern or bar? | _____ per _____ | (29) |
| c. Go to see a live burlesque show with girls? | _____ per _____ | (30) |
| d. Go to a tattoo palace, penny arcade, shooting gallery? | _____ per _____ | (31) |
| e. Play checkers? | _____ per _____ | (32) |
| f. Play cards? | _____ per _____ | (33) |
| g. Bet on horses, play numbers, buy a lottery ticket? | _____ per _____ | (34) |
| h. Watch TV in the hotel lobby of your hotel? | _____ per _____ | (35) |
| i. Go to the reading room? | _____ per _____ | (36) |
| j. Go to church services at Salvation Army or at a mission? | _____ per _____ | (37) |

B. In the last week, how many free meals have you had from the Salvation Army or from a mission? _____ meals (38)

C. In the last week, how many times have you had a free bed from the Salvation Army or from a mission? _____ times (39)

D. Did you get any free clothing or shoes this winter since it started to get cold? (40)

E. When the weather is warm and sunny, how much time do you spend on the street just talking to people or watching what's going on?

- | | |
|--|-------|
| Almost none | 41- 0 |
| Occasionally | 1 |
| An hour or two almost every day | 2 |
| Three or more hours almost every day | 3 |

F. When the weather is cold like it is now, how much of the time do you usually spend in your room during the day? _____ hours (42)

G. What do you do when you are in your room in the daytime? (43)

I-6. How would you like to spend your spare time? (RECORD ON BACK OF PAGE.)

- A. Are there any special things that you would enjoy that you can't afford? (44-46)
- B. Are there any things that you can't do because there's no place to do them?
- C. Have you ever had any hobbies that you'd like to take up again? What?

11. Have you ever been to a doctor or psychiatrist or been in the hospital because of a nervous condition? (Code all that apply.)

No 28- X
 Saw a medical doctor 1*
 Saw a psychiatrist 2*
 Was in a hospital 3*

*IF SAW "DOCTOR," "PSYCHIATRIST," OR "WAS IN THE HOSPITAL," ASK
 A, B, AND C.

A. When was that? (29)

B. Where was that? (30)

C. Do you know what the doctors said about your case? (31)

12. Where were you born? What was the name of the County and the State?

County _____ State _____ Nation _____ (32-35)

13. Where did you live during the time you were growing up? (Between the ages of 6 and 14)

- A. What was the name of the County, State, and Town? (RECORD BELOW.)
 B. Did you live on a farm, just outside town, or inside the town? (RECORD BELOW.)
 C. How long did you live there? (RECORD BELOW.)

Town	County	State	Location	Length of Stay

CODE BOX: Main place youth was spent _____ (36-40)
 Number of moves in youth _____ (41)
 Median length of stay _____ (42)

14. Where were your parents born? (STATE OR FOREIGN COUNTRY)

Father born _____ (43-44)

Mother born _____ (45-46)

15. ASK FOR EACH PARENT BORN IN THE U.S.:

What is the nationality of your parents? (E.G., French, German, Danish, etc.) (Where did your ancestors come from?)

Nationality of father _____ (47-48)

Nationality of mother _____ (49-50)

16. What kind of work did your father do at the time you were growing up? (What was his occupation?) (What kind of place did he work for?)

Job:

(51-52)

Industry:

17. A. What was your father's income like at that time? When you were growing up, was your family poor, very poor, comfortable, or well-to-do?

Very poor 53- 1

Poor 2

Comfortable 3

Well-to-do 4

B. Did you always have enough to eat at home when you were a boy?

No 54- 0*

Yes 1

* IF "NO": What was the trouble?

18. A. How old were you when you left home?

_____ years old (55-56)

B. How did you happen to leave home then? What happened to make you leave home? (Were there any other reasons?) (How come you didn't go back after you got out of the Army?) (How come you didn't go back after you got out of school?)

II-1. What kind of a person was your father?

(4-12)

- A. What did you like best about him? (Anything else?)

- B. And what did you dislike about him? (Anything else?) (Even though you liked him, what kinds of things about him bothered you?) (What did he do that got on your nerves?)

- C. (IF NOT ALREADY MENTIONED) Was he a heavy drinker? (Describe it.)

- D. Did he ever serve a jail sentence? (What was it for?)

II-2. What kind of a person was your mother?

(13-18)

- A. What did you like best about her? (Anything else?)

- B. And what did you dislike about her? (Anything else?) (What were some of the little things about her that got on your nerves?)

- C. Did she ever drink?

II-3. How did your father and mother get along with each other?

(19-23)

A. Did they see eye to eye on most things or did they quarrel a lot?

B. If they quarrelled a lot, why did they quarrel?

C. Taking everything into consideration, would you say they had a happy marriage during the time you were a boy?

II-4. Which of your parents helped you the most when you were growing up--your father or your mother?

Neither one very much	24- 0
Father	1
Mother	2
Equal	3

II-5. Which of your parents do you think you liked the most, your father or your mother? (Even though you loved both, you can't love two people exactly the same. Which did you like more?)

Loved both about the same . .	25- X
Loved father most	1*
Loved mother most	2*

*A. IF LOVED ONE PARENT MORE THAN THE OTHER: Why do you suppose you liked (her) (him) the most? (Any other reasons?)

(26-27)

II-6. How many children were there in your family altogether? Which child were you?

_____ boys (28)

_____ girls (29)

_____ order (Respondent) (30)

A. How well did you get along with your (brothers and sisters) (brothers) (sisters)? (What did you have trouble over?)

(31-32)

B. Did your parents treat all their children alike or was there a favorite? How did they treat you compared to the other kids?

(33-34)

II-7. A. Are either of your parents alive? How about your (father) (mother)--is (he) (she) living? (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE CODE IN COLUMN A: FOR EACH.)

B. (IF EITHER OR BOTH ARE DEAD, ASK:) When did (he) (she) die? (ENTER IN COLUMN B.)

A. Living?		B. Date of death of deceased parent
Yes	No	
Father .	1 0	
Mother .	1 0	

(35)

(36)

C. (IF BOTH PARENTS ARE STILL LIVING, ASK:) Are they living together, or are they divorced or separated?

Living together 37- 1

Divorced 2

Separated 3

D. (IF ONE PARENT DEAD, FOR THE SURVIVING PARENT, ASK:) Did (he) (she) remarry? If so, when?

Did not remarry 38- 0

Remarried _____ years after death of spouse *

* IF REMARRIED, ASK (1) AND (2).

(1) How old were you when (he) (she) remarried? _____ years (39)

(2) How did this marriage affect you? Did it change your plans any? (Did it have any other effects on you?)

(40)

19. What was the highest grade of school you attended? _____ grade (59-60)

Did you complete that grade? No 0
Yes 1

20. Here are some problems like they used to give you in school. See if you can still remember them. (Start at level you estimate, going up or down as indicated in Spex.)

- a. 3×3 _____ d. 11×11 _____
b. 9×9 _____ e. $56 \div 7$ _____
c. $6+4+9$ _____

(61)

21. And here are some words they used to teach you in reading. Do you still remember what they mean?

INTERVIEWER: TRY THE RESPONDENT AT THE LEVEL YOU ESTIMATE. IF HE PASSES IT GO A LEVEL HIGHER. IF HE MISSES ONE OR MORE, DESCEND A LEVEL. PROCEED UPWARD OR DOWNWARD UNTIL RESPONDENT DEFINES ALL WORDS IN A SET.

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|
| a. eyelash _____ |) <u>Level of ability</u> |
| roar _____ | |
| scorch _____ | |
| |) DEFICIENT |
| b. muzzle _____ |) BORDERLINE |
| haste _____ | |
| c. lecture _____ |) DULL |
| Mars _____ | |
| skill _____ | |
| d. juggler _____ |) AVERAGE |
| brunette _____ | |
| regard _____ | |
| e. lotus _____ |) SUPERIOR |
| incrustation _____ | |
| achromatic _____ | |

(62)

22. How were your grades in school--very good, good, average, poor, or very poor?

Very good 63- 1
Good 2
Average 3
Poor 4
Very poor 5

II-8. Did you enjoy going to school?

Yes 41- 1

No 2

A. What did you like about it? (Anything else?)

(42-43)

B. What did you dislike about it? (Anything else?)

(44-45)

C. What were your best subjects in school?

(46-47)

D. And what subjects were hardest for you or did you dislike most?

(48-49)

II-9. Why did you stop going to school? (Were there any other reasons?) (Did you ever think of going on to college? Why was that?)

(50-51)

II-10. After you left regular school, did you take any special training, like apprenticeship training, correspondence school, anything like that?

None 52- 0

Yes (SPECIFY) _____

II-11. What kind of a person were you when you were 15-20 years old?
(What other good and bad points did you have then?)

(53-54)

IF NOT ALREADY ANSWERED ABOVE, ASK A - K:

A. Were you happy or unhappy? (What kinds of things bothered you?)

(55-56)

B. Did you know then for sure what you wanted to be? (What were your ideas about what you wanted to be then?)

(57-58)

C. Were you a hard worker, or were you inclined to be easy-going on the job?

(59)

D. Were you restless and always wanting to be on the go? (In what way?)

(60)

E. Did you have a lot of friends, only a few friends, or were you more of a "lone wolf"?

Lone wolf	61- 0
Few friends	1
Lot of friends	2

F. How did you spend your free time?

(62)

G. Did you date girls before you were 20 years old?

No	63- X
Yes	1*

*IF "YES": How often did you date them?

(63)

II-11. (Continued)

H. Did you have any close friends who were boys?

No . . . 64- X
Yes . . . 1

I. Did you run around a lot with a gang of boys?

No . . . 65- X
Yes . . . 1

J. Did you have a reputation for having a quick temper?

No . . . 66- X
Yes . . . 1*

*IF "YES": What kinds of things made you flare up? (How angry did you get?)

K. Did you ever get into trouble with the police when you were young?

No . . . 67- X*
Yes . . . 1**

*IF "NO," ASK (3) ONLY.

**IF "YES," ASK (1), (2), AND (3).

(1) What kind of troubles did you have? (Could you tell me more about that? How did it happen?)

(2) Were you arrested?

No, was not arrested 68- X
Yes, was arrested . . 1#

#(a) IF ARRESTED: Were you sent to a reformatory or a prison?

No . . . 69- X
Yes . . . 1

(3) Did any of your brothers or sisters have trouble with the police?

No . . . 69- 2
Yes . . . 3

23. Do you ever see strange things like visions, fairies, ghosts, or things like that?
- | | |
|-----------|-------|
| No . . . | 64- X |
| Yes . . . | 1* |

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B.

A. Could you describe it a little more?

B. When do you see them?

-
24. Do you have any unusual powers or abilities most people don't have?
- | | |
|----------|-------|
| No . . . | 65- X |
| Yes . . | 1* |

*IF "YES": What are these powers or abilities?

-
25. Do you ever hear people talking to you or about you when there is no one around?
- | | |
|----------|-------|
| No . . . | 66- X |
| Yes . . | 1* |

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B.

A. What kinds of things do they say?

B. When do you usually hear them?

-
26. Are you now married, divorced, widowed, separated, or never married?
- | | |
|--------------------|--------|
| Never married . . | 67- 0* |
| Married | 1** |
| Separated | 2** |
| Widowed | 3** |
| Divorced | 4** |

*IF "NEVER MARRIED," ASK QUESTION I-7 (not included in Form I Questionnaires)

**IF "MARRIED," "SEPARATED," "WIDOWED," OR "DIVORCED," SKIP TO QUESTION I-8 (not included in Form I Questionnaires)

I-7. IF "NEVER MARRIED," ASK: Were you ever engaged to be married?

No . . . 48- X*
Yes . . . 1**

*IF "NEVER ENGAGED," ASK A.

**IF "YES," ASK B AND C.

A. Were you ever in love, or did you ever date steady with one girl?

No . . . 49- X
Yes . . . 1

B. What happened to break your engagement? Why was it broken?

(50)

(1) Who broke the engagement--you or the girl?

I broke the engagement 51- X
The girl broke the engagement 1

(2) Did you ever fall in love again after that?

No . . . 51- 2
Yes . . . 3

C. ASK ALL RESPONDENTS WHO NEVER MARRIED: Why do you suppose you never got married?

(52)

(1) Do (Did) women interest you much sexually?

No . . . 53- X
Yes . . . 1

I-8. IF "MARRIED," "SEPARATED," "WIDOWED," OR "DIVORCED," ASK: How long did you and your wife live together?

_____ years (54-55)

A. What kind of a wife was she?

(56-57)

(1) What things did you like best about her? (Anything else?)

(58)

(2) And what did you dislike about her? (Anything else you disliked about your wife?)

(59)

B. How was your home life? (Could you tell me a little more about that?)

(60-61)

C. UNLESS WIDOWED: What caused your separation? Whose idea was the separation, yours or your wife's? What were the reasons for your separation?

(62)

(1) Who do you think was most to blame?

My wife was most to blame . 63- 1

I was most to blame 2

I-9. UNLESS NEVER MARRIED, ASK: How many children do you have? Can you tell me how old each one of them is? Are they married, widowed, divorced or single? Are they working? What sort of work does each do? (ENTER ANSWERS IN APPROPRIATE COLUMNS BELOW.

(64-69)

Child (sex)	Age	Marital Status	Work Status	Occupation

CODE BOX: Number of children _____ Number married _____ Occupations
Number under 18 _____ Number working _____ of children _____

CARD I

I-10. Have you written to or visited with your relatives during the past two years?

Yes, have written to	70- 1
Yes, have visited with	2
Neither	0

I-11. How do you feel toward your relatives?

(71)

I-12. Suppose you were sick and down and out. Would your relatives give you help if they knew where you were and knew you needed help?

No, and I wouldn't want them to	72- 1
No	2
Yes	3

I-13. Have you ever had persons to support--people that were (when you were married, was your family) completely dependent on you for their food, clothes, and everything?

No	73- 0*
Yes	1

*A. IF "NO": How do you think you would feel if you were completely responsible for supporting a family?

(74)

IV-9. Why do you suppose so many men on (West Madison) (South State)
(North Clark) Street drink so much? (Any other reasons?)

(52-53)

ASK ONLY IF NOT COVERED ABOVE:

A. Some men say they drink so much because there's nothing
else to do. Do you agree or disagree with that? (What
makes you say that?)

(54)

B. Some men say they drink so much because of the environment--
that is, with so many taverns here, it's hard not to drink a
lot. Do you agree or disagree with that? (Why?)

(55)

C. Some say that you can't have very many friends here unless you
spend a lot of time in the bars and buy a drink for people when
you have money. Do you agree or disagree with that? (Why?)

(56)

Interview Number (1-3)

27. How heavy a drinker are you? Do you consider yourself to be a heavy drinker, a moderate drinker, a light drinker, a periodic drinker, or don't you drink at all?

Never drink	4- X*
Light drinker	1**
Moderate drinker	2**
Periodic drinker	3**
Heavy drinker	4**

*IF "NEVER DRINK," SKIP TO QUESTION 29.

**UNLESS "NEVER DRINK," ASK A - F.

A. About how much of the money you get do you spend on drinking?
(Specify either fraction or percentage)_____ (5-6)

B. Do you have spells when you drink heavier than you usually do?

No . . .	7- X
Yes . .	1#

#IF "YES," ASK (1) AND (2).

(1) How often do you have these spells?

(2) Why do you suppose you drink more at those times than at others?

(8)

C. What do you usually drink? Wine, beer, whiskey, or something else?

Wine	9- 1
Beer	2
Whiskey	3
Something else (SPECIFY)	

D. Why do you suppose you drink? (What pleasure or satisfaction do you get from drinking?) /Have you ever found anything else that helps you (_____) (relax)?/ (What other satisfaction does it give you?) (How do you feel when you drink?)

(10-11)

27. (Continued)

E. How do you drink? Do you usually buy at a bar or do you usually buy a bottle?

Buy at a bar . . .	12- X
Buy a bottle . . .	2*
Half and half . . .	3*

*IF "BUY A BOTTLE," OR "HALF AND HALF," ASK (1) AND (2).

(1) Where do you go to drink the bottle? (When you buy a bottle, where do you go to drink it?)

(2) When you drink from a bottle are you usually alone or with others?

Alone	13- 1
With others . . .	2

F. Do you ever feel guilty or sorry after you have been drinking? How often do you feel this way?

(14)

28. About how many days last week did you take a drink of beer, wine, whiskey, or anything with alcohol in it?

Did not drink at all	15- X
Number of days	_____ *

*A. (IF DRANK AT ALL): About how much did you drink in one day?

(16)

29. IF "NEVER DRINK," ASK: Were you ever a heavy drinker?

No	17- X
Yes	1*

*IF "YES," ASK (1), (2), AND (3)

(1) When did you stop? _____ (18)

(2) How did you stop? _____ (19)

(3) Who helped you stop and how did they help you?

(20)

30. ASK ALL RESPONDENTS EXCEPT THOSE WHO NEVER DRINK. Do you ever feel like you have to take a drink in the morning just before or after breakfast? How often does this happen?

Never or almost never	21- 0
Occasionally	1
A few times a week	2
Almost every day	3
Every day when on a spree . . .	4

31. ASK ALL HEAVY DRINKERS. (FOR THIS QUESTION A HEAVY DRINKER IS ANY PERSON WHO (a) REPORTS HIMSELF AS SUCH IN ITEM 27; (b) WHO DRANK ON FIVE OR MORE DIFFERENT DAYS LAST WEEK AND WHOSE AVERAGE DAILY CONSUMPTION IS EQUIVALENT TO A PINT OF WINE OR THREE SHOTS OF WHISKEY; OR (c) WHO DRINKS ALMOST EVERY MORNING. IF IN DOUBT WHETHER HEAVY DRINKER, ASK THE QUESTION AND EDITORS WILL DECIDE.)

A. How did your heavy drinking develop? Please tell me about it. (Had you drunk much before that?) (What happened to start the heavy drinking?) (And then what happened?) (And then?)

(22-28)

B. Were there any especially tough problems that started your drinking or did you just drift into it? (What were the problems?) (Any family problems?) (Any work problems?)

(29)

C. How did your family act about your heavy drinking?

(30)

D. How did your friends and neighbors act about your heavy drinking?

(31)

E. How did your boss and the people at work act about your heavy drinking?

(32)

F. Did you try to take any treatments for it? What kind of treatments did you take? (Who gave you the treatments?) (Why do you suppose they failed to keep you dry?)

(33)

IV-10. A. About how many times would you say you have been arrested for being drunk?

Never	57- 0
Less than 5 times .	1
5 - 10 times . . .	2
10 - 20 times . . .	3
20 - 30 times . . .	4
More than 30 times.	5

B. And how many of those times were you sentenced to several days in jail for being drunk?

(58)

C. When was the last time you were arrested for drunkenness?

(59)

D. Have you ever been hospitalized for drunkenness or as a result of being drunk?

(1) How many times were you hospitalized? _____ (60)

(2) Who took you to the hospital usually? _____ (61)

(3) When did this happen? _____ (62)

(4) What kind of treatment did you get? _____ (63)

IV-11. How many times have you been jackrolled or robbed in the past year?

_____ times (64)

32. ASK ALL WHO EVER DRANK.

IF RESPONDENT NEVER DRANK, SKIP TO QUESTION 34.

How many times, if any, have you had the D.T.'s? Never 34- X
Number of times . *

*A. IF EVER HAD D.T.'s: When did you have the D.T.'s?

(35)

33. Have you ever joined Alcoholics Anonymous, the Salvation Army program, or some other program that tries to help people stop drinking too much?

None 36- X
Alcoholics Anonymous 1*
Salvation Army 2*
Other (SPECIFY) _____ *

*A. IF "JOINED A PROGRAM": Did this program help you or not?

No 37- X
Yes 1

34. Have you ever served a jail or penitentiary sentence (for some offense besides being drunk)?

No 38- X
Yes, one time 1*
Yes, have been in jail _____ times *

*IF "YES," FOR EACH TERM OF IMPRISONMENT ASK A - D AND ENTER IN COLUMNS BELOW.

(39-42)

- A. What was the charge?
- B. How long was your sentence?
- C. When did you get out?
- D. Where was that?

A. Charge	B. Length of sentence	C. Date of release	D. Place

HERE ARE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF AS A PERSON:

35. If you were asked to describe yourself, what kind of a person would you say you are?

(43-47)

36. A. Do you ever feel that it is hopeless to try to get ahead? How often do you feel that way?

(48)

B. IF "YES" TO A: Why do you feel that way?

(49)

37. A. Do you think there are some people who want to hurt you? What kind of people are they?

(50)

B. Are there any special kinds of people you hate? (What kind of people are they?):

No	51- X
Yes	1

38. Do you associate with women nowadays?

No	52- 0
Yes	1*

*IF "YES," ASK A, B, C, AND D.

A. How often?

_____ (53)

B. Where do you meet them?

_____ (54)

C. What kinds of women are they?

(55)

D. Do you go with the women who live around (West Madison) (South State) (North Clark) Street?

No	56- X#
Yes	1

#IF "NO,": Why not?

39. People say that some of the men living around (West Madison) (South State) (North Clark) Street have sex experiences with other men.

A. How many of the men do you think do this more or less regularly?

Almost none of them	57- 0
About a quarter of them	1
About half of them	2
About 3/4 of them	3
Almost all of them	4

B. How do you feel about men who do that sort of thing?

(50)

40. Here are some questions about religion.

A. Were you ever a member of any church? What church was that?

No 59- 0

Name of church _____

B. How about your parents? What church did they attend when you were growing up?

No church 60- 0

Name of mother's church _____

Name of father's church _____ (61)

C. How religious (were) (are) your parents?

(62)

D. How do you feel about most churches?

(63)

E. Do you believe in God?

No 64- 0

Yes (64) 1

F. Do you attend church services of the Salvation Army, the Christian Industrial League, Cathedral Shelters, Pacific Garden Mission, and other church groups like that?

No 65- 0

Yes 1

(1) How do you feel about their programs?

41. If you had your life to live over again, what kinds of things would you do differently?

(66-68)

-
42. If you could make three wishes and they would all be granted, what would you ask for?

(69)

- A. What do you think are the chances for your wishes to come true?
(Which ones do you think will come true?) (Which ones won't?)

(70)

- B. FOR WISHES EXPECTED TO COME TRUE: What would have to happen for that to come true?

(71)

- C. FOR WISHES NOT EXPECTED TO COME TRUE: Why don't you think (they) (it) will come true?

(72)

IV-12. Do you think the police are or are not doing a good job protecting the people who live on this street?

No 65- 0*
Yes 1*

*ASK EVERYONE: In what way is it (good) (bad)?

IV-13. Considering the prices they charge for a room, do you think the hotel operators are or are not doing a good job of housing the men of (West Madison) (South State, North Clark) Street

No 66- 0
Yes 1

A. Are there any things they should (what should they) do differently?

IV-14. Considering the prices they charge for meals, do you think the restaurant operators on (West Madison) (South State) (North Clark) Street do or do not keep their places as clean as they should and are doing a good job of providing meals?

No 67- 0
Yes 1

A. Are there any things they should (what should they) do differently?

IV-15. A. Do you think the liquor stores, taverns, and bars on (West Madison) (South State) (North Clark) Street do or do not treat their customers fairly and run their places right?

No 68- 0
Yes 1

B. What things should they do differently? (Are there any things they should do differently?)

IV-16. A. Do you think the employment agencies (including railroad hiring offices) in Chicago are operated fairly and treat the workers right or not?

No 69- 0
Yes 1

B. What things should they do differently? (Are there any things they should do differently?)

IV-17. I am going to list several organizations whose job is to help you men on (West Madison) (South State) (North Clark) Street and ask you what kind of a job you think they are doing. For the ones you know, please tell me whether they are very good, good, not so good, or bad. (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE CODE BELOW.)

(70-75)

Organization	Ranking of job done				No opinion	DK agency
	Very good	Good	Not so good	Bad		
1. Chicago Welfare Department	1	2	3	4	X	y
2. Salvation Army	1	2	3	4	X	y
3. Referees, judges, and social workers at Monroe Street Court .	1	2	3	4	X	y
4. Dawes Center	1	2	3	4	X	y
5. Reading Room	1	2	3	4	X	y
6. Catholic Charities	1	2	3	4	X	y
7. Pacific Garden Mission	1	2	3	4	X	y
8. Cook County Hospital	1	2	3	4	X	y
9. The new Alcoholic Treatment Center	1	2	3	4	X	y
10. Cook County Department of Welfare	1	2	3	4	X	y

III-10. Which political party do you like best?

None 60- 0
Republicans 1
Democrats 2
No interest in politics. 3
Other (SPECIFY) _____

A. How do you feel about the Republican Party? (Why?)

(61)

B. How do you feel about the Democratic Party? (Why?)

(62)

C. How do you feel about the Socialist Party? (Why?)

(63)

III-11. ASK FOR EACH ETHNIC GROUP TO WHICH THE RESPONDENT DOES NOT BELONG:

A. How do you feel about Negroes? (How would you feel about
living in the same building that they do?)

(64)

B. How do you feel about Puerto Ricans?

(65)

C. How do you feel about Indians?

(66)

D. How do you feel about Mexicans?

(67)

E. How do you feel about white people?

(68)

43. Sometimes we like to make a follow-up study to find out how the people we have interviewed are getting along. That doesn't mean that we will definitely ask you to give us another interview some day, but I would like to know how to get in touch with you if we should need to talk to you again after a few months. Would you mind giving me your social security number and the names and addresses of two relatives or close friends who might be able to tell us where you are or where you've been recently? (If you'd rather not, that's O.K.)

Social Security Number _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Relationship
to respondent _____

INTERVIEWER'S OBSERVATIONS

To be completed immediately after the interview and before another interview is undertaken.

A. CHECK LIST OF RESPONDENT'S BEHAVIOR DURING INTERVIEW

CARD VIII

1. ACTIVITY: AMOUNT

(4)

Underactive--Seldom moves, almost stuporous	0
Able to sit and converse quietly throughout interview	1
Unusually restless, but would have more relaxed periods	2
Acutely restless and excited	3

2. SPEECH: PRODUCTION

(5)

Uncommunicative--responds with only short replies to direct questioning	1
Enters readily into conversation in a normal manner and in a moderate tone of voice	2
Talks excessively. Periodic outbursts of talking	3
Noisily overtalkative. Sometimes shouts and yells. Hard to restrain	4

3. SPEECH: COHERENCE

(6)

Speaks in a coherent, relevant, and logical fashion. Conversation is logically consistent and connected by some common idea or relationship	1
Tends to speak in an incoherent fashion. Successive elements of his thought are frequently inconsistent or do not hang together. Conversation rambles or is irrelevant	2
Speech is incoherent to a high degree. It appears to have little or no associative continuity. Speech appears to be scattered, disconnected, or confused	3

4. MOOD LEVEL:

(7)

Exhilarated, gay, exuberant, laughing and singing. Ignores unpleasant aspects and difficulties of any situation	1
Euphoric, happy, persistently cheerful even under inappropriate circumstances	2
Neither very gay nor very blue, but appropriate to the situation	3
Generally sad, depressed. Cries easily	4
Very depressed and melancholic. Cannot be cheered	5

A. Check List of Respondent's Behavior During Interview--Continued

5. AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR:

(8)

- Most aggressive and combative. Tries to "pick a fight" at each query.
Violent outbursts of temper 1
- Occasionally or moderately aggressive and combative. Easily irritated and reacts with irritation or signs of poorly controlled temper 2
- Even temper--seldom irritable. Few signs of being either aggressive or defensive about the interview 3
- Under-aggressive. Frequent self-negation, self-criticism, self-hate. Does not defend himself or his past actions, but believes he is not as good as others. Much feeling of inferiority 4
- Extreme self-hate. Does not defend himself or actions in any way. Real and deep feelings of complete inferiority 5

6. ANXIETY:

(9)

- Extremely anxious and worried, panicky, filled with apprehension. Anticipates disasters, death, and dangers. Symptoms of deep guilt feelings. At some point in the interview he may wring his hands, pace the floor, strike head with hands while talking of guilt, sins, fears, problems. 1
- Distinctly worried and anxious. May talk about guilt, sins, and unworthiness. May wring hands, etc., but not prolonged and uncontrolled 2
- Shows concern only as called for by circumstances 3
- Careless and unconcerned. Rarely shows uneasiness or uncertainty 4
- Nonchalant; completely unconcerned and without a care as to the present or the future 5

7. MANNERISTIC BEHAVIOR:

(10-11)

- Exhibits bizarre, peculiar or fantastic behavior. May repeat over and over the same words, phrases, movements, gestures, or grimaces. May assume a fixed posture for long periods of time. May laugh uncontrollably. May mutter to himself a great deal 1
- Describe mannerisms:

- No unusual mannerisms apparent 2

8. HALLUCINATIONS:

(12-13)

The person may report sensations for which there is no stimulus:

- a. Seeing visions, ghosts, fairies, or other strange or supernatural sights
- b. Hearing voices, ringing, hissing, whistling or other strange sounds for which there is no stimulus
- c. Talking with supernatural or deceased persons--God, the Devil, spirits, etc.
- d. Experiencing unusually good or bad odors or tastes, or strange olfactory sensations.

A. Check List of Respondent's Behavior During Interview--Continued

8. HALLUCINATIONS--Continued

(12-13)

Describe kind and evaluate intensity of such hallucinations.

No evidence of hallucinations

2

9. DELUSIONS:

(14-15)

The person may report misconceptions or false belief about himself, such as:

- a. Believing that he is a famous, important, powerful, unusually gifted or otherwise unusual individual--with no factual evidence to support his claim
- b. That someone is trying to kill him, hurt him
- c. That society at large or a group of people are trying to harm, oppress, disgrace, him

Describe the content of the delusion and evaluate its intensity--how firmly obsessed with it is the person.

No evidence of delusions

2

RATING SHEET--FOR INTERVIEWER'S USE ONLY

CARD VIII

I. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONDENT:

1. Build:

Somewhat skinny	16-	1
Average		2
Somewhat fat		3
2. Appearance:

Somewhat ugly	17-	1
Average		2
Nice-looking		3
3. Missing teeth:

None or few missing . . .	18-	1
Several missing		2
No teeth		3
4. Unusual facial or other physical features. (DESCRIBE: Big nose, big ears, deformed nose, unusually-shaped face, big scar, birth-mark, pock-marked face, etc.)

(19-20)

IN ANSWERING ITEMS 5 - 8 COMPARE RESPONDENT WITH THE AVERAGE LOWER CLASS WORKINGMAN--E.G., TRUCK DRIVER.

5. Cleanliness of clothes:

Dirty	21-	1
Average		2
Very clean		3
6. Condition of clothes:

Torn, worn	22-	1
Average		2
Neat, presentable		3
7. Condition of shoes:

Worn-out, run-over . . .	23-	1
Average		2
Good, new		3
8. Cleanliness of hands, face:

Dirty, neglected	24-	1
Average		2
Clean		3

9. Were there evidences of recent drinking? Of hangover?
(DESCRIBE)

(25)

II. NOTES ON THE INTERVIEW:

1. How cooperative was the respondent?

Very cooperative	26- 1
Somewhat cooperative	2
Uncooperative	3
Very uncooperative	4

-
2. What appeared to be his attitude toward being interviewed?

(27-28)

-
3. What subjects did he refuse to discuss fully or seem to be sensitive about?

(29-30)

-
4. In general, do you think he gave truthful answers or was "spinning a yarn" some of the time? What parts of the interview do you question?

(31)

-
5. What, in your opinion, are the most significant factors in this person's being on Skid Row?

(32-33)

6. Do you think he would accept help if it were given to him?
What kind of help do you think would benefit him?

(34-35)

-
7. What do you think must be done for this man if he is to be rehabilitated?

(36-37)

-
8. What do you think is his attitude toward himself and the possibilities of his getting off Skid Row?

(38)

-
9. How would you rate the intelligence of this man?

Superior intelligence (should have gone to college)	39- 1
Quick, alert, intelligent	2
Average	3
Dull, borderline intelligence . . .	4
Deficient--feeble minded, moronic .	5

-
10. Was this a person who seemed to have been normal and happily adjusted at one time, or does he strike you as having been maladjusted since adolescence?

Still is well-adjusted	40- 1
Once was well-adjusted but not now	2
Probably never well-adjusted, but formerly in much better shape than now	3
Probably always poorly-adjusted since adolescence	4

-
11. Are there any other helpful insights or information you have about this respondent that may not be obvious to someone else reading the schedule? If so, please describe.

(41-42)