Teaching the Bad Girls:
The "Servant Problem" and California's Reform School, 1890-1915

Jaclynn Davis

The girls that are wanted are good girls,
Good from the heart to the lips;
Pure as the lily is pure and white,
From its heart to its sweet leaf tips.

The girls that are wanted are home girls,
Girls that are Mother's right hand;
That Fathers and Mothers can trust to,
And the little ones understand.

Girls that are fair on the hearth stone,
And fair when nobody sees;
Kind and sweet to their own folks,
Ready and anxious to please….

The clever, the witty, the brilliant girl,
They are very few understand;
But O, for the wise loving home girls,
There's a constant and steady demand.[1]

Background: Conflicting Ideals

When the Girls' Department of the Whittier State School of California opened its grounds in 1891, legislators, administrators, instructors and reformers were hoping to create an environment that would transform the immoral wayward girl into a useful and desirable young lady. The founders of Whittier envisioned a reform agenda that would "turn out upon the community…women able and willing to make an honest living, and with character and ability to fill [that] very station in life."2 Rebellious girls would enter Whittier as wild teens, and years later would leave as reformed ladies.

The desire was motivated by a new ideology of reform that began in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, a Progressive ideology that supplanted the philosophy and traditions of Victorian reform. Victorian efforts at reform had involved a crusade for moral purity that cast the fallen woman as the helpless prey of male lust, and thus as a victim in need of being saved and civilized. Acting on assumptions of moral, intellectual, religious, and racial superiority, middle-class Christian women had established missionary homes to reform and reclaim the girls and women whose purity had been tainted. Because "culture and civilization were assumed to be the sole property of white middle-class Americans," missionary workers sought to re-shape their wards in the likeness of themselves.[3]

By 1890, however, the "civilizing mission" had faded and been replaced by the Progressive reform ideology that gave birth to Whittier State School. Rather than viewing women as passionless victims of male aggression, Progressive reformers began to acknowledge female sexuality and self-determination. Instead of blaming men, the new generation of reformers saw delinquency as a product of family environment, with poverty, illiteracy, a lack of structure and authority, and an absence of Christian values in the working-class home all creating the conditions that allowed for and even encouraged delinquent behavior.[4] One reformer expressed her belief that "the majority of our juvenile delinquents…have been more sinned against than sinning."[5]

The face of reformers changed as well. Educated middle-class social workers replaced pious Christian ladies, and reformatories replaced mission homes**.** Progressives turned away from the private religious organizations that had sheltered wayward girls, and now demanded that the State take responsibility for its rebellious daughters.[6] Reform schools such as Whittier were the result. Despite the emerging reform ideology in the larger society and despite its founders' intentions, however, Whittier—in both curriculum and practice–was influenced heavily by the older moral purity crusades rooted in Christianity and Victorian ideology. Within the walls of Whittier the civilizing mission continued alongside the Progressive agenda, creating an uneasy and, for the most part, unacknowledged tension between conflicting ideals.

Everyone involved with Whittier hoped that the school would become "a monumental declaration of an advanced civilization involving a home for the homeless, an asylum for the unfortunate, a refuge for the uncared-for and unkempt; a school for the physical as well as intellectual and moral culture."[7] Because Progressive reform efforts targeted the victims of industrialization–the poor, the homeless, the downtrodden worker–Whittier would transform these "unfortunate children of depravity" into productive and law-abiding members of society, and they would do so through love and compassion.[8]

At Whittier, the scrutiny of family environment led to professed attempts to create a nurturing home at the school. Reverend Dr. Thomas Stalker declared that "the State must work according to the nature and laws of governing children or it cannot save them. The nearer the reform school approximates the character and conditions of the Christian family, the more *efficient* it will become."[9] This quotation highlights one of the central tensions within life at Whittier: while reformers hoped to create a loving environment, a family, and a Christian home, they also hoped to create an efficient institution, complete with hard work, strict schedules, bells and regulations.

Other incompatibilities ensued from the contradictory impulses and ideals of the older and the emerging reform movements. Progressive institutions of reform hoped to simultaneously shape ideal mothers and efficient breadwinners. The importance of women to the next generations and the role the reformatory would play in the redemption of future mothers were ideas established within the very first reform school for girls in North America. In 1857, the Lancaster School for Girls was established with the intent of saving wayward girls and with the philosophy that "it is sublime work to save a woman, for in her bosom generations are embodied, and in her hands, if perverted, the fate of innumerable men is held."[10] This view held through the end of the century, and was one of the ideals on which Whittier was founded.

So while the reform school intended to shape dutiful mothers and wholesome families, it also emphasized the preparation of girls for work. These were, after all, *working-class* girls who would have to support themselves and also their families. Whittier recognized this reality, and so developed a curriculum that prepared the girls to succeed in a trade, teaching sewing, cooking, cleaning and other domestic tasks. At a Thanksgiving dinner in the Girls' Department, guest speaker Reverend Florence Kollock noted that "the chief advantage that you have here is this, that you are being taught how to do something.... Many times I have said to fathers and mothers,...do something which is infinitely better, give them a trade, teach them to do something, teach them to be independent."[11]

According to the rhetoric of reform, however, being both a working mother (a primary goal of Progressive ideology) and an ideal parent (a primary goal of Victorian ideology, yet one adopted by Progressives) was an incompatible combination. For while reformers sought to turn wayward girls into productive members of society, they felt that women could not work and simultaneously live up to the ideals of motherhood. As one reformer stated, it was the "hard labor" of that "class of honest and hard-working parents" that both "support[ed] the little ones, [and made] it impossible for [parents] to give the time necessary for their proper bringing up."[12] And yet, despite the contradiction, the girls at Whittier, as we shall see, were inculcated in both ideals through school curriculum and routine, and therefore were caught between the conflicting ideals.

Just as reformers and their institutions were shifting phases, the rebellious girls whom reformers targeted were also changing and presenting new problems. Whittier opened in the midst of a striking transition in female gender and sexual ideology, and the Whittier girls, by the very nature of their crimes, were pioneers of this new culture of social and sexual freedom that the reformatory sought to regulate. While records of the Whittier girls' specific crimes remain under restricted access, the school's public records reveal that the majority of girls were committed for sexual delinquency, a "crime" which, according to available historical records, was overwhelmingly the most common justification for committing girls to reformatories at the turn of the century.[13] Reformers spoke frequently of "the stigma of immorality" that marked the girls, and Whittier Superintendent Fred C. Nelles spoke of hopes to reform "the girl who has drunk so deep of the cup of shame."[14]

Committed to reformatories by the courts for transgressions of proper feminine behavior, these girls had offended law enforcement, families, and reformers by engaging in sexual behavior, refusing to obey parental authority, and participating in a youth culture that took them out of the home and placed them in environments such as dance halls and amusement parks. Although they were first drawn into the public workplace by the necessity of contributing to a family economy, these girls, many of them from immigrant families, participated in a movement that revolutionized gender roles and sexuality for working-class females. They transgressed gendered norms by staying out late, drinking, smoking, flirting, and engaging in sexual relations with various men. Caught by law enforcement officials or turned over to the courts by frustrated parents who had lost control, these were the girls gone wrong, the bad girls of Whittier, and they, along with other young working-class women, were creating a culture all their own.[15]

Reformers increasingly worried about this "Girl Problem," which threatened the stability of dominant white middle-class ideology, and they mobilized a campaign of moral purity to save adolescent females from sexual exploitation, and to save their own middle-class daughters from corruption. Whittier emerged out of the attempt to solve this "Girl Problem."[16] So while Whittier was established as a Progressive reform institution to benefit the girls, it also served to meet middle-class needs and to quiet middle-class fears.

The proper role and image for women were difficult to define in the midst of the transition from a Victorian ideology that prized piety, purity, and morality, to the philosophy of a new womanhood that valued education, independence, sexual autonomy, and participation in a public economic, social, and political sphere. The girls who entered Whittier were caught between conflicting images of what they should be, and the school was confused about what it should teach.

Whittier thus embodied the problems and contradictions faced by an institution bent on reform. What exactly was a *reformed* girl? Who determined the standards by which reformation could be deemed successful? To what "station in life" was it appropriate that the girls aspire? A portrait of life at Whittier reveals an institutional experience with strict regulations, tight schedules, and hard work. Yet a day at the school also involved evening prayer and hymns, elegant dining facilities, and lectures on the meaning of womanhood. Two different pictures of Whittier emerge, and tensions between the school as a home and the school as an institution repeatedly converge to reflect contradictory visions of a reformed girl. So what exactly did reformers hope to achieve at Whittier, and what messages about working-class womanhood were they delivering to the girls?

With a curriculum like that of most other reform schools in the United States at the time, Whittier State School sought to reform girls not only by channeling the girls' sexual drive into appropriate forms, not only by molding them into dutiful and loving mothers, but also by training them for work–and more specifically for domestic service. It is here that the "Girl Problem" converges with another prevalent issue of the era, the "Servant Problem." At the turn of the century, the occupation of domestic service carried vast social implications and stigmas. The topic of hostile relations between middle-class employers and their workers, "The Servant Problem," occupied countless magazine articles and various reform agendas. And yet for twenty-five years, Whittier trained its girls to fulfill perfectly the station of a servant, the object of such debate and condescension in this era.

The girls of Whittier were thus bombarded with conflicting signals, and were confronted with several implicit questions: Was Whittier a home or an institution? Were they a part of a family, or were they inmates and workers?

Reformers taught that, on one hand, the girls' fall from grace resulted directly from a lack of family structure, parental authority, and support and nurture. Working-class parents were too heavily burdened with other concerns to devote adequate time to raising respectful and dutiful children. So the reform school would replace the family and provide the home environment necessary to cultivate these young women and to ensure that they would one day be the type of mother that reformers desired. Whittier would therefore be a Christian home, a nurturing family.

On the other hand, Whittier emphasized the importance of independence and economic autonomy for the girls, knowing what challenges faced them outside the reformatory walls. Long work hours, strict schedules, rules and regulations would prepare the girls to be efficient workers. A primary aim, therefore, must be to train the girls as industrial workers. To this end, the curriculum at Whittier included classes in which the girls learned the skills necessary for various trades and then used those skills to provide services to the school. Girls stationed at the laundry washed the school's clothes, girls in the kitchen cooked and served the meals, and girls in the sewing room assembled new dresses and mended tears and loose buttons.

To their critics, reformers at Whittier responded: "Some good people might think [the girls] should be taught music and the fine arts, but the majority of these girls will have to earn their own living when they leave the school, and if they are to turn out respectable women and credible members of society, they must learn at school that which will serve them to be useful, and will serve them as breadwinner, not as an accomplishment."[17] The underlying philosophy was "that moral elevation and industry will be acquired only by educating the youth to a point where they will have the desire to cheerfully perform some work in life."[18] This emphasis suggests that Whittier valued preparation for work above correction of delinquency, or rather, that work was the primary means of correction. In this way, the institutional aspects of Whittier dominate over the image of the reformatory as a loving Christian family.

Concurrent with the intensive training and with the inculcation of the value of being an independent and autonomous worker, however, came a host of messages that complicated this idea of womanhood. Although Whittier prepared the girls for working-class trades, the lectures and classes were simultaneously emphasizing the possibility of alternative futures. An article published in *The Whittier*, entitled "Women as Doctors," for instance, touted the vast professional opportunities that awaited the girls upon their release, encouraging their dreams of social and economic mobility: "[N]owhere in the world is there a place where the modern woman has had and has such enthusiastic support in all her ventures as here in America, and the modern woman has not been slow in improving opportunities offered her. It is hard to mention any field into which she has not entered to compete successfully with the sterner sex."[19] While women in society indeed had greater access to the professions, working-class girls were largely excluded, practically if not theoretically, from these opportunities. Likewise, while some reformers suggested that learning middle-class refinements such as music would serve no purpose for the working girl, the curriculum at Whittier still called for music courses that young middle-class ladies would have enjoyed. The school thus seemingly encouraged middle-class ambitions while preparing the girls for the realities of a working-class life.

To add to the confusion, Victorian ideals of gender, religion, and class pervaded the school. The girls not only received the mixed messages about their role as working girl and as aspiring middle-class housewife, but also were indoctrinated with the ideals of Victorian womanhood. Surrounded by "gentler home influences," the girls listened to talks that instructed them in the finer traits of purity and piety, directed them to be helpful and dutiful, and exhorted them as women to be "gentle,…kind in [their] treatment of other women,…unselfish and self-denying."[20] By remaining gentle, harmonious, and pious, the girls could prove themselves "good wom[e]n, and a pride to [their] kind."[21]

A poem published in *The Whittier*, entitled "The Girls that are Wanted," instructed them further in what was desirable in a young lady. Good girls are "Pure as the lily is pure and white…kind and sweet…ready and anxious to please." Good girls are "home girls," "careful girls," girls that "are wanted for mothers and wives." At the same time, they are "the frailest of lives." Here, the autonomous and independent girl working in the public sphere is replaced entirely by the subdued, dependent, domestic girl. As a final blow to the image of the modern woman, the poem concludes by dismissing "the clever, the witty, the brilliant girl" and praising "the wise loving home girls" for whom "there's a constant and steady demand."[22] The message? A girl who can attain the image of Victorian womanhood is more desirable than the new woman who values independence, education, athleticism and economic autonomy.[23]

The images of womanhood at Whittier conflated different ideals. The girls received one message that validated their position as working-class girls and urged them to embrace their station cheerily, another that promised access to social and economic upward mobility, and yet another that suggested that the ultimate virtue lay in adopting Victorian gender roles and ideology.

In the mass of contradictions at the heart of the Whittier education lay a paradoxical curriculum of working-class efficiency and middle-class sophistication that ultimately prepared the girls to meet the standards of a good servant, one of the most class-conscious and stigmatized lines of work available to working girls. Thus, while the school acted with benevolent intentions, seeking to engage wayward girls in productive work, its educational program *in practice* denied social mobility to the very girls it sought to help.

A deeper look into the nature of "The Servant Problem" helps to frame an examination of the ways in which Whittier's program enacted the contradictions outlined in this section. In the following sections, we will see that, as Whittier's training of the girls sought to solve the "Servant Problem," its mission merged with that of middle-class employers, thus ultimately serving to preserve social stratification and oppressive class relations.

The "Servant Problem"

> Say what we will, turn from it as we may, the one problem which more than any other incessantly confronts woman is that of domestic service. It annoys her and vexes her as does no other question. And despite all the discussion which has been waged, the problem still fails of being any nearer to a practical solution.[24]

Finding a good servant lay at the root of the "Servant Problem" that plagued middle-class housewives and working-class domestics alike. Looking closely at the nature of the "Servant Problem" reveals a complex relationship between middle and upper class employers and working girls, and ultimately implicates the reform school in helping to maintain class stratification by preparing girls to meet the middle-class image of the ideal servant.

Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the "Servant Problem" vexed both employers and workers. For employers, finding a good servant seemed nearly impossible. Middle-class homemakers thought that servants were generally unkempt, dishonest and immoral, and feared that they would bring crude working-class mannerisms into the middle-class home. Additionally, servants were thought to be arrogant, stubborn, presumptuous, and disrespectful of proper class relations. From a worker's standpoint, the attitudes of employers posed the greatest obstacle to successful relations. Servants generally viewed employers as demanding, snobbish, condescending, and determined to maintain the role of master. While there were always many girls searching for work, most did not view domestic service as a desirable option. A factory worker only subjected herself to an unkind boss throughout the day, but was freed in the evenings to dress as she liked and see whom she pleased. But a domestic servant was on call throughout the night, and sacrificed autonomy in making personal decisions and in participating in the leisure activities of youth culture. Most girls preferred long hours and dangerous conditions in factories to the restricted freedom and social stigma of domestic service.[25]

Domestic service was, however, a common option for orphans and delinquents. A history of child labor in America reveals the occupation of poor children, orphans, and wayward girls in middle-class homes. In one scheme reported by *Good Housekeeping*, reformers "selected eight girls from about the city, children of helpless parents" and organized a school in 1895 dedicated to "the training and care of homeless girls for the useful occupation of domestic service."[26] When girls received parole from reformatories, they were placed in middle-class homes to begin an upstanding and respectable life as a servant, and schools such as Whittier would point to these placements as evidence of their success.[27] Some reformers went so far as to consider domestic service an *alternative* to reformatories, claiming that the gentle influences of the middle-class home would guide the moral education of the nation's depraved children.

Reform schools and domestic service were so closely tied in employers' and reformers' minds that the issue of rebellious girls and rebellious workers was often conflated. In *Good Housekeeping*, the author of an article entitled "Why Boarding Schools for Girls" discussed the benefits of boarding school for the development of working girls:

> Boarding schools are an unfortunate necessity. Home is the place for the girl–and the boy, as well–when the conditions are what they should be. It develops her as no boarding school can; it trains her, in nature's great school, in lessons of responsibility, unselfishness, practical help-

> fulness, and love, which can be taught nowhere else so happily and so well. But, unfortunately, the conditions of the family life may be such as not to give her the best chance to learn either these lessons or those the schools are supposed to teach….[Boarding] School gives another invaluable discipline, that of steady, uninterrupted work.[28]

This excerpt is eerily similar to those describing the aims and intentions of the Whittier School. It touches on the role of the family and the desirable female qualities of unselfishness and dutifulness, and it suggests the boarding school as a solution to instill in the girls a sense of discipline and work ethic. Reformers and employers alike praised the benefit of reformatories and boarding schools for girls.

Despite their good intentions, however, the reformers' agenda often resulted in repression and discontent. While the middle-class home ideally would provide an environment conducive to reform, the stigma of domestic service and the tense relationship between employer and worker often thwarted the aim of providing an instructive, nurturing home, one that mimicked the Christian family life that most unruly girls lacked. Most workers, for example, felt some degree of hostility or degradation in their homes–and with good cause, if we take the following to represent a widespread employer attitude:

> She is the worker who announces that she is capable of doing almost anything that you could wish; who talks much of honesty and honor, and who, at the same time, deceives you whenever she can. She is not honest in her work nor in her words. When you are looking at her she is industrious, when your eyes are off her she is lazy. Her manner to you is almost subservient. In speaking of you she is impertinent and unladylike. Any kindness which may be shown her she regards as her right, rather than as her privilege. She has never realized what a sham she is, and she does not know–more's the pity!–how bad her example is. Claiming to do much, she is absolutely perfect in nothing. Coming to her work is a bore, going from it a release from prison.[29]

Class consciousness lay at the root of the animosity between workers and employers. Employers used servants as symbols of status, and middle-class housewives carefully preserved a social distance between themselves and their servants. One servant noted, "I am distinctly [made to feel] I am a servant, as the mistress artificially created the wide gap between her and me."[30] Although some recognized that the issue of social status interfered with domestic service, and therefore attempted to form harmonious relationships, most households continued to employ servants as a show of prosperity, with actual efficiency mattering little.

Along with class consciousness, white middle-class anxieties over race and national origin complicated the relationships between employers and their servants. Some employers, like the woman who wrote to *Ladies' Home Journal* with advice for those "housewives who wish part-time service [but] are unwilling to take foreigners or colored helpers," would hire only native-born white women.[31] Other employers ranked their preferences for European-born immigrants, with English as the most desirable, followed by Scots, Scandinavians, and Germans, while still others scrutinized religion and would employ only pious Protestant girls.[32] This anxiety prompted reformers to argue that attempts at assimilation defined an immigrant as American, and spurred schools like Whittier to develop a curriculum that emphasized American history, language, and holidays.

Complicating these anxieties over race, class, and nationality was the premise that education would lead to refinement. *Education* and *refinement* were vague terms subject to personal interpretation. In many cases, *education* referred not to intellectual capabilities but to sophistication.[33] A sophisticated servant understood the way a middle-class home functioned–knowing such etiquette as how properly "to open the door, salute the guest, [and the] language to be used according to the rank of the guests and how to handle the name card."[34] This refinement ensured that a servant's lower-class origins and crude mannerisms did not intrude upon the middle- or upper-class home. But a refined servant needed to be very careful not to put on airs that might suggest she possessed the same degree of sophistication as her employer.

Maintaining this precarious balance between working-class servant and middle-class housekeeper defined the essence of a good servant. A good servant met an employer's specific preferences in regard to race, ethnicity, religion, and personality. A good servant was quiet and pleasant, docile and obedient. She cheerily performed tasks without resenting her work or her employer, and she showed appreciation for the kindness of her masters. A good servant embraced her station in life, gratefully accepting the accommodations and food offered her. Employers demanded that a servant acknowledge her subservient role while simultaneously showing contentment with her good fortune at being employed in that household. Although some readers of popular ladies' magazines recognized the injustice in a system that, as one woman wrote, "[taught] the poor to be content with their lot,"[35] most employers expected servants to express gratitude for their positions, despite poverty or oppression.

Thus, in order to be a "good" servant, a girl had to negotiate the treacherous waters between her working-class station, which she must never forget, and the middle-class mannerisms of her employer's home, which she was expected to mimic perfectly, yet without aspiring to the sophistication that they implied. Although she was expected to uphold refinement and elegance, she remained a working girl whose sophistication served the sole purpose of pleasing her employers. Catherine Beecher Stowe, the Victorian dictator of good housekeeping, praised the ideal servant as a "tall, well-dressed young person, grave, unobtrusive, self-respecting, yet not in the least presuming."[36]

This highly specified ideal image served to maintain repressive conditions for domestic workers. Servants subjected themselves to insult and poor treatment. They were frequently over-worked and under-respected and sometimes even underfed.[37] Employers continued to engage servants as a symbol of status, and they continued to lament the "Servant Problem" with airs of racial, religious, and intellectual superiority. The severity of the "Servant Problem" concerned some employers more than pressing social issues. In an article entitled "Woman's Most Vexing Problem," one employer lamented the state of domestic service and the lack of any solution. He suggested that:

> First of all, women must drop a lot of outside problems with which they are at present grappling….Foreign missions, the ballot, the higher education of women, good government, the amelioration of the poor–it will be well enough for women to labor for all these causes when their own more immediate problems are settled. The servant-girl problem is far more important at present than any of these….The heathens in African lands ought to be civilized. No one will dispute that. But true charity begins at home, and we have heathens in a few of our kitchens who need civilizing and educational influences just as much as the natives of India's coral strand.[38]

Here, the familiar racial and ethnocentric rhetoric of the "civilizing mission" is directed toward the "Servant Problem." Compared to the "heathens in African lands" whom missionaries sought to civilize, domestic servants endured an occupation that consistently subjected them to a brand of denigration and humiliation that one servant described as "disgraceful."[39]

Of course, most domestics failed to meet the ideal expectations of a servant. Breaches of the ideal image were numerous, and included a girl who, although "satisfactory in every other respect becomes objectionable through lack of adequate personal cleanliness."[40] Many employers considered immorality inevitable, and, assuming that "servants [could not] be trusted and depended upon,"[41] expected dishonesty, theft, and sexual promiscuity. Dealing with those servants whom they considered stupid or lazy presented yet another challenge for mistresses. Ladies' magazines filled pages with advice on how to handle unruly or inefficient domestics. From such accounts, a picture of the employer's plight emerges: the perfect worker was indeed hard to find.

To those prospective employers and to reformers alike, the reform school promised a solution. Both a home and an institution, schools such as Whittier taught both working skills and refined decorum. Whittier would attempt to mold girls in the ideal image of the servant outlined by Stowe and her contemporaries. By catering to this middle-class ideal, a standard that repressed and degraded working girls, Whittier helped to maintain class-consciousness and social stratification and inequalities–ironically, one of the very things that reformers such as Stowe were attempting to combat. In educating delinquent girls to meet the demanding standards of an ideal servant, Whittier succeeded in shaping the working-class girl even after her parole. Rather than simply containing adolescent rebellion, the school's program of reform relegated the girls to a line of work that supported the status quo in class relations as well.

A Servant in Training: Life at Whittier

> Here the wayward girl will be taught to ply the needle, fit the garment, and cook the food; here the poor unfortunates, who have been regarded as the destined producers of illegitimate offspring, with whom our prisons and reformatories are stocked, will find a temple of ethics where the influence of reclaiming love will lift them into a realm of purity, hopefulness and a life to be enjoyed.[42]

Caught between Victorian assumptions of gender, sexuality and class, and a generation that would forge a new definition of womanhood, the Whittier State School operated for twenty-five years with contradictory forces informing its curriculum and practices. The girls followed a strict daily schedule of work, classes, lectures, and regulations designed to solve the "Servant Problem" by encouraging the development of the ideologies, industry, mannerisms, and character desired by employers. Every aspect of their lives, from mealtime rules and merit systems to uniforms and housing, attempted to mold the domestic servant, and the curriculum and lifestyle suggest that reformers equated the standards of reform with the standards of a good servant.

Both the curriculum and the routines at Whittier were dictated by the goal of cultivating the desired balance between refined manners and working skills. As an industrial school, Whittier was an institution of regulations and routine that molded efficient workers. But its curriculum went further, attempting to establish in the girls a sense of pride in their work, and qualities such as cheerfulness and eagerness that were demanded by employers. Even more importantly, because employers desired a girl whose presence did not intrude upon the refinement of the household, Whittier structured its living spaces to mimic the middle-class home, thus introducing the girls to their future work environment. Throughout their stay, the girls were being shaped through lectures on the meaning of womanhood, acclimation to an American culture, and the value of purity and piety. Through these four lessons–in efficiency, in work ethic, in middle-class environment and in desirable character–the girls were supposed to leave Whittier as ideal servants for the middle classes.

As an institution of industrial training, Whittier established strict time schedules and numerous rules and regulations, insisted on efficiency and subservience, and in every way mimicked the standards and expectations of future employers. Work occupied the majority of the girls' day. The reformatory curriculum focused on housekeeping, sewing, laundry, cooking and millinery, while largely neglecting academic studies. These were, after all, working girls, with no need for learning beyond simple reading and arithmetic. An educated girl, both in the reformatory and in the middle-class home, was not so much *intelligent* as she was *trained*. The girls worked, and they worked hard.

The monotony of reformatory life also prepared the girls for their future employment. Routine and repetition dictated the girls' day. An article on the desirable features of a reformatory maintained that a strict schedule with limited freedom would "accustom them to the routine which is so necessary an element in the life of a successful laboring [woman]." Girls who failed to follow the schedule were denied meals as punishment.

The day began early with a rising bell, followed by several more bells signaling the inspection of bed and clothing, the time to leave the dorm, the completion of a meal, the start of work. These bells served as a primary means of communication between the girls and their instructors, much as they would later between servants and their employers. As one girl warned another who was just about to begin a job as a servant, "It's the bell…it's her own bell, and she'll jingle it in the middle o' the night if she takes a notion."[43] The girls were thereby trained that bells represented an authority to which they must submit.

In the same spirit, throughout the day, the girls moved about the school in straight lines, marching quietly. One girl described this routine in a poem that reveals the strictness of life at Whittier:

Co. B's Daily Routine

Very early in the morning Company B have to rise,
And oh! What a time we have in opening our eyes,
Then hastily we dress and spread our beds neat,
When the second bell rings we stand straight on our feet.
But in all this not a sound should be heard,
It is all strict silence, not a whisper, not a word,
With the word 'Face,' we silently turn; with 'Pass,'
We step together and steadily downstairs we go.[44]

The girls learned to move when directed, instructed by bells and commands. They learned to be obedient, quiet and subdued. In effect, they were being programmed to follow a very specific routine.

At the same time, Whittier also attempted to mold their students into servants who enjoyed work, who took pride in their duties and displayed a cheerful and eager work ethic. To convince the girls to embrace their social and economic role as domestic workers, the school extolled the virtues of the various departments to suggest the rewards the girls would reap from their hard work. These departments reflected the division of labor in the middle-class home and the specialization of servants. For instance, working in the kitchen was "considered a great favor, for the warmth from the large range gives comfort to the outer woman, and the odors of the delicious cooking, suggests comfort to the inner woman."[45] The school insisted that the girls feel privileged to do their work, thus "establishing a feeling of personal responsibility and duty."[46] Instructors also associated happiness with hard work, acceptance, and adaptability. One Whittier publication advised students, "You will notice that some people are miserable wherever you can put them. Perhaps some girl is miserable in this school. Girls, that is not the way to live. We should get the real harmony out of life and you get it as easy in this school as anywhere else. Adjust yourself with your surroundings and you will be sure to live more contentedly and happy."[47]

The girls at Whittier may not have accepted their lot or enjoyed their work, but they certainly understood that they were *supposed* to. Whether earnestly desiring instructors' approval or simply attempting to earn parole, the girls reported their love of industry and their hopes to learn more. One girl commented, "I have a great interest in housekeeping," and another asserted, "I am going to stay in the kitchen till I learn the trade well."[48] A girl who worked in the "Sunrise Laundry" department claimed that she "wouldn't give up [her] place" there because of "the fun we have in the laundry."[49]

Whittier also taught the girls to be content with their station in life and their role as workers. Speakers at the school noted that "the American girl does not fully appreciate the advantages she has, for she is often heard to complain,"[50] and so instructed the girls to embrace their lot. This call echoes that of the wealthy society women, their future employers, who complained of the burdens of money and directed lower classes to gratefully accept their poverty. Middle-class magazines, too, often agreed that working girls should embrace their station and gratefully accept the kindness bestowed upon them by their wealthy superiors.

The school reinforced this idea by presenting gifts to particularly well-behaved girls, providing incentives for hard work coupled with the appropriate attitude. There was an emphasis on outward appearance not only in demeanor but in dress as well: "[E]very girl…[was] supposed to have her dress buttoned and her shoes tied," her hair brushed and her personal belongings tidied.[51] A prohibition against adornments echoed employers' demands that a good servant should not "wear gewgaws of any sort."[52] Whittier stressed that "the girls that are wanted are girls of sense,/Whom fashion can never deceive."[53] The standard uniform at Whittier was therefore plain and simple. The girls wore gray dresses with buttons that matrons expected to be kept clean and mended. Yet the school allowed and encouraged one addition to the standard uniform. As a reward for exemplary work and behavior, Whittier presented a good girl with cuffs and a collar to add to her standard grey dress. In the complete outfit, then, a Whittier girl resembled a young domestic servant dressed for a day's work.

On holidays the girls also enjoyed additional rewards for their hard work. Holidays provided a break from strict regulations, yet still served the girls' training. On Thanksgiving, Christmas and Easter, the dining room resounded with talk and laughter. Girls donned Easter hats or Christmas bows, earned through hard work in the sewing room. Yet on these special occasions, the speakers were reformers, clergymen, and patrons who made toasts and gave lectures. The girls answered questions and informed visitors about their experience at the school. They sang songs and read stories prepared to impress the guests, and the festivities generally focused on portraying the best possible side of Whittier and its training successes. The girls worked especially hard to prepare the grounds–cleaning, cooking, and mending for weeks in advance–and instructors claimed that "it [was] gratifying to the girls to know that…recent visitors [had commented] on the fine appearance which the polished floors and immaculate tidiness presents."[54] These holidays gave girls experience in serving their future employers as they cooked, served, and cleared the entire meal. While holiday festivities certainly gave the girls a chance to celebrate and while their hard work benefited their own celebration–no doubt they enjoyed the songs, decorations and warmth about the school–amidst all the festivities the girls remained in training, with Whittier holidays providing the opportunity to publicly advertise the school's success.

While Whittier emphasized both the efficiency and pride of working-class skill, it also catered to employers' demands for a servant with middle-class mannerisms. A truly good servant knew how to work hard while maintaining the refinement and delicacy of the home. However, since the girls were unaccustomed to the structure of middle-class households, Whittier introduced the girls to their future working environment.

The decoration of the school mimicked the interior of a middle-class home. The girls lived in family units called Cottages, with their own parlor, dining room, and library to replicate the structure of the middle-class household. The parlor included a sitting area where girls could spend what little free time they had knitting or reading. A piano sat in the corner where girls could display their musical skill, and a chandelier hung from the ceiling. Rather than applying donations to text books or improved industrial equipment, the school purchased "two beautiful etchings" to "adorn the walls of the girls' sitting room."[55] The dining room was an "an attractive corner in the Girls' Department" that was "about as cheerful and homelike a room as one would wish to find anywhere. Overlooking the beautiful shrubberies and palms and shaded by the climbing rose bushes with the bright sunlight peeping in, it can scarcely fail to shed a little sunshine over the lives of its occupants."[56] At long tables laid with white cloths and flower vases, the girls glimpsed the refined dining of middle-class households. The girls also enjoyed access to a library, where they read the novels of "miss Alcott," "mrs burnett," Wallace, Scott and Dickens, as well as magazines like *Ladies' Home Journal*, *Good Housekeeping*, and *Harpers*.[57] Rather than reading the dime novels and adventure heroine stories so popular among working women,[58] the girls at Whittier enjoyed fine literature by respected American and British writers, along with the journals and magazines read by middle-class homemakers.

While the girls enjoyed a decorated sitting room, charming dining room, and even a library, their personal living conditions were spare, thus preparing them for the lifestyle of a servant. The dormitory housed approximately twenty girls. Twenty beds sat side-by-side with only a few feet between each girl. A narrow shelf held each girl's few personal belongings. There was no need for closet space, as the girls' wardrobes were limited to the school uniform. Similarly, domestic servants worked in beautiful homes, but their own rooms were usually cramped, with only very basic furniture and no decorative additions. Some servants even shared beds.[59] The cheerful light illuminating the reformatory dining room was typical of a middle-class home, as was the cramped living space in the servants' quarters. The sharp contrast between the luxury of the school parlor, where the girls spent very limited time, and the cramped and spare conditions of the living quarters mimicked exactly the situation they would face as domestic servants, thus reinforcing and promoting the girls' acceptance of class distinctions.

A girl at the school could, however, earn a private room. The school rewarded outstanding girls with a place in the Honor Home. Here, a nearly reformed girl close to parole occupied her own bedroom, a "quiet and happy domicile." Reformers guessed that nothing "could be more delightful to any young girl than to have a tiny bedroom all to herself," and so a place in the Honor Home became a tremendous incentive for hard work and proper behavior, a "coveted home" for the girls of Whittier.[60] Similarly, ladies' magazines and reformers advised employers to provide private bedrooms for good servants as a reward and incentive for proper service, noting that "good surroundings are potent civilizers, and a house-servant whose room is well and carefully furnished feels an added value in herself, which makes her treat herself respectfully in the care of her room."[61]

Whether or not a girl lived in the cramped dormitory or in the Honor Home, the school still maintained a distinction between sleeping quarters and public spaces. While the girls enjoyed meals in the beautifully decorated dining room, the strict regulations that accompanied their dining ensured that the girls would not grow accustomed to luxury. They were to serve the meals, not enjoy them, and so the girls lined up outside the dining room, entered in a single file of quiet marching, stood for grace, and then sat to eat in silence, with only twenty minutes allotted for the meal. Dining was neither relaxing nor enjoyable. A matron oversaw the room and disciplined as necessary. If a girl arrived late, she suffered hunger until the next meal. One inmate described in a poem the strict demeanor required in the dining room and the consequence for transgressing the rules: "On line we stand till every figure is straight./Miss Wall says, 'Woe betide the youngster that is late.'/You may wonder why, but well we all know/Our comrade without her breakfast will have to go."[62]

So despite the "cheerful and homelike" decor of the dining room, the girls learned to remain formal and obedient, eating quickly and silently.[63] They dined in a middle-class environment to accustom them to a middle-class home, but they were not allowed to feel any sense of belonging or comfort in that environment. Similarly, the library housed books by Wallace and Stevens, but exposure to them served more as training for service in the middle-class home than as educational material for the girls' intellectual stimulation. After all, the girls were surely responsible for dusting these books as well, just as they would be in their future employment. Whittier thus ensured that the girls would not only be familiar with their future working environment, but also understand their appropriate place within that environment. They were taught to know the shared spaces of the middle-class home, but to interact within them only as servants.

Whittier also taught the girls about relationships with their future employers through the strict yet maternal role assumed by the school's instructors. Girls' comments depict the instructors as firm maternal figures who provided both nurture and discipline. A girl who wrote about her position in the Sunrise Laundry also revealed the nature of her relationship with "Mama Thompson," who oversaw the laundry department and "is proud of us, every one," although "sometimes she gets cross."[64] Similarly, to the girls, Miss Wall of the housekeeping department "is just like a mother" and "Miss Love is just like a mother to all of us kitchen girls. We all love her dearly."[65] While Miss Wall also oversaw mealtimes and disciplined girls by denying food, the girls felt obligated to write of her as "our kind matron and mother."[66] The girls repeatedly expressed gratitude and love for their instructors' firmness.

Perhaps these sentiments reflect the girls' knowledge of what they were supposed to say rather than what they actually felt, but this obedience to a strict parental figure was not unlike the relationship between many servants and employers. An advice column in *Ladies' Home Journal* suggested that when employing a new servant, the employer should welcome her warmly and "try to make the new maid feel as much at home as possible." At the same time, the magazine cautioned middle-class ladies about "remembering that over-familiarity, even though meant in kindness, is not the best way of making a servant feel perfectly at home." The columnist suggested that an employer play a dual role, one that was both commanding and nurturing, advising employers to "Be firm and kind, and when you give an order see that it is obeyed."[67] This advice describes exactly the role that the matrons at Whittier played.

While Whittier went to these lengths to ensure that employers' demands would be fulfilled, it sought also to refine the girls' character. In response to employers' frequent complaints about workers' bad qualities, their accusations of servants' immorality and crudeness, their diatribes against the uncivilized heathens who intruded upon the sanctity of the middle-class home with their foreign lower-class habits,[68] the Whittier curriculum indoctrinated the girls with middle-class social and cultural ideology. In essence, employers were asking for good American girls. And so the stories and articles typical of the Whittier publications encouraged assimilation by glorifying American Presidents and important historical events. Photographs and biographies of American heroes such as Abraham Lincoln helped to Americanize foreign-born girls and make them more desirable to employers. Similarly, stories of traditional Christmas celebrations and baseball games relayed American cultural values. The girl who assimilated into American culture by learning English, practicing Protestantism, and valuing American cultural traditions and hobbies would fare better than the girl who remained thoroughly attached to her culture and language. The girls also received great praise for their quick learning and for their command of the English language. The school taught the girls how to be desirable ladies in the model of Victorian American womanhood, valuing purity and piety above all else.

Teaching purity, however, provided a special challenge. After all, the girls, according to society's standards, were sexual delinquents, and so one might expect that Whittier felt compelled to address this issue. Surprisingly, however, while other reformatories and charity leagues, prompted by Progressive ideals, were establishing programs of sex education, Whittier remained fairly silent on the matter, or dealt with it in oblique ways. Whittier instructors and lecturers spoke often of purity and virtue, for instance, but the actual issue of sex remained veiled in the rhetoric of Victorian womanhood. Although Progressive reformers voiced a view of women as self-determined sexual actors rather than victims of male lust, Whittier's curriculum sought to encourage the Victorian standard of female "passionlessness."[69]

Because this view of womanhood prized piety above all else, religious instruction and missionary rhetoric played a central role in the education of the Whittier girls. Piety was a necessity for proper women, and Christianity was highly desired by most employers. Despite a diverse inmate population that included Irish and Mexican Catholics, Eastern European Jews and Chinese Buddhists, it was Protestantism that reigned at Whittier. Every Sunday brought a new lecturer to the school, frequently a minister or a female missionary in fine clothes who had just returned from some far-off land with stories of jungles and heathens and the Good Word of Jesus Christ.

While the school certainly hoped to convert many of the girls, these visits served other purposes as well. The missionary talks used the language of the "civilizing mission," with the dual purpose of civilizing the girls and also encouraging them to take up the reins of moral and religious instruction in order to continue the good work of missionaries. In one notable instance, a Miss Miller shared her experience "out in the deep, tangled jungles [of India], in rude little bamboo huts" with "the ones whose souls she was to win for the Father of all." Employing language heavy with racial determinism, ethnocentrism and religious intolerance, she told of "a legend that had descended for ages from father to son on down [that] told of one, true, living God, and of the white foreigner, who was to bring the white book, which would teach them of this God, the knowledge of whom, they had lost through sin." Here, the girls received a lesson not just in Christianity and how it could lift them out of sin, but in the moral, intellectual and religious superiority of whites as well.

As Miss Miller continued, she told the "sad, sweet, story of little Zathee. How she grew from babyhood with heathens all about her, had never heard of Christ. How when about sixteen, she attended a mission school, there learned of the wonderful Savior, and gave her heart, and better still, her hand to Him and His work."[70] The story of Zathee is remarkably parallel to the common view of delinquent girls who, raised in "the mass of ignorance and vice" and "locked in heavy bars of degeneracy, heredity, ignorance and environment," came to Whittier as "poor mental and physical anomalies, whose character and temperament have been transmitted to them." Reformers remembered that "in the beginning man was created in God's image," and so, just as Miss Miller saved the souls of Indian heathens, Whittier acknowledged that, in the delinquent girl, "the soul is there–there and half awakened." Rather than attending a mission school at age sixteen like little Zathee, the delinquent girls attended Whittier. While Zathee went on and "taught many people the ways of God," Miss Miller insisted that "we American girls must rouse ourselves, and do more for the cause of humanity. Surely we will not allow ourselves to be out-done by a poor un-taught Karen girl."[71] Here, in this single lecture, the paradox at the heart of a Whittier education becomes most apparent. The girls are inferior and godless working girls, but also American missionaries, an occupation generally reserved for good middle-class Christian ladies. The girls are both the object and the directors of the civilizing mission. They are poor little Zathees, but also Miss Millers.

In this, as in so many other ways, listening to the lectures at Whittier gave the girls a preview of the life of domestic service into which they soon would go. Employers were part of the middle- and upper-class culture whose ideology made them partners in "the civilizing mission." Just as reformers joined a movement for social and moral progress, so, too, did employers sense that they "should be morally responsible for [their servants]…when they are in our employ, especially young girls and boys."[72] When, therefore, the girls did not quite meet the employers' expectations in some regard, they could expect to be reminded of their "heathen" natures, as one employer did when he intoned that it was "the heathens in a few of our kitchens who need civilizing and educational influences just as much as the natives of India's coral strand."[73]

Employers thus expected the girls to come to them displaying all the characteristics of an already-civilized and pious girl, yet simultaneously maintained a sense of moral superiority over the girls they hired. At Whittier, the girls learned to fit that ideal image as closely as possible and received rewards for approaching or achieving it. They mastered the art of marching quietly, making their beds speedily, eating quickly and in silence, responding to bells and one-word commands, polishing floors, washing linen, cooking dinner and serving respected guests from the middle-class religious and reform movement. They dusted the piano in the parlor, even if they seldom enjoyed free time to play it. They set the flowers out in a light-filled dining room, even if they had to sit in a sober silence and finish their meal in only twenty minutes. They quickly glanced over the books of Wallace, Stevens and Scott, even if they seldom attended reading or writing courses. And they worked efficiently, quietly, and routinely, only to return to a cramped corner in a dormitory, vowing constantly to work harder and more quietly in hopes of earning a private room.

The girls thus learned to achieve a careful balance between working-class skill and middle-class mannerisms and sophistication. If they continued to obey and behave as they had at Whittier, they would indeed solve the "Servant Problem" for some very satisfied families.

Conclusion

The Whittier Girls' Department functioned for about twenty-five years in the midst of tremendous social and cultural change. At a time when the dominant gender, cultural, and class ideologies were being challenged and destabilized, Whittier girls entered the school as pioneers of a revolution for sexual, social, and economic autonomy, and left as pawns in the maintenance of class-consciousness and traditional gender roles.

The "Girl Problem" and the "Servant Problem" were ultimately one and the same. Both challenged dominant middle-class ideologies; both fed off middle-class fear at the threat presented by working-class girls. Reformers saw working girls as transgressors of sexual propriety; middle-class employers regarded them as transgressors of proper class relations. Reformers felt threatened by a revolution in gender roles and sexuality, by the economic independence of working girls that had somehow led to claims of sexual agency as well; middle-class employers felt threatened by their demands for respect, by the challenge they posed to white Christian American superiority, and by their presumption of equality.

Reformers and employers alike not only felt threatened, but also sensed a moral mission at hand. In their attempts to shape girls into subdued servants, they followed what they believed to be their social duty as white, Christian, middle-class Americans. Their vision of wayward girls as ideal domestic servants was neither intentionally nor knowingly repressive. Yet the moral crusade held repressive implications, and despite virtuous intentions, reformers' and employers' moral obligation to servants was all too often shaded by anxiety, hostility, and disregard.

The training at Whittier State School embodied these tensions. Whittier shaped girls who conformed to an image desired by middle-class employers of one of the most class-conscious and stigmatized lines of work available, and in so doing, the school assisted in the continued and repressive regulation of working girls. While not all girls sought or continued employment as domestic workers, the lessons they learned at Whittier served them in the same ways, whether they became factory workers, laundresses, or waitresses. The school shaped girls into an ideal held by the middle and upper classes who clung to earlier ideas of racial determinism, class superiority, and Protestant righteousness. The school shaped servants, and thereby helped to preserve stratified class relations and oppressive working conditions. Rather than improving the lives of the girls, it solved a major problem for the middle classes.

And so, while 1890 is often cited as the beginning of the Progressive Era, Whittier exposes the difficulty in "marking" the beginning of an era. It also exemplifies what often happens in a society that is in the process of clarifying its values and its self-image, as conflicting ideologies tug and pull at each other, sometimes catching the innocent between them.

Notes

1. Youth Authority Records [hereafter YAR], Inmate Publications, *The Whittier* 3 (n.d.): 59. Cited hereafter as *The Whittier*.
2. Harvey Lindley, "Defense of the Whittier State School and its Purposes," 1890, 5, in YAR, Articles and Publications.
3. Peggy Pascoe, *Relations of Rescue: The Search for Female Authority in the American West*, 1874-1939 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 114.
4. Pascoe; Mary E. Odum, *Delinquent Daughters: Policing and Protecting Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States, 1885-1920* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 103.
5. Qtd. in Evart Jansen Wendell, "The Educational Features of a Reform School," *Charities Review* 3 (January 1894): 111.
6. Odem, 95-96, 115.
7. YAR, Articles and Publications, "The Whittier Idea," 7. Cited hereafter as "The Whittier Idea."
8. Adina Mitchell, "The Reformation of Wayward Girls," read at the Congress of the National Prison Association at New Orleans, LA., January 24, 1899. Reprinted in YAR, Institutional History Files.
9. Rptd. in "The Whittier Idea," 8.
10. Qtd. in Barbara Brenzel, *Daughters of the State: A Social Portrait of the First Reform School for Girls in North America, 1865-1905* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1983), 196.
11. Qtd. in *The Whittier* 3, 14.
12. Wendell, 112
13. See Odem; Ruth M. Alexander, *The 'Girl Problem': Female Sexual Delinquency in New York, 1900-1930* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995).
14. Whittier State School Biennial Report, 1916, qtd. in George E. Miller, *Administrative History of California Institutions for Juvenile Offenders* (Los Angeles State College, 1961), 73.
15. See Odem for a discussion of court cases and parental roles; for discussion of working-women's culture, see Kathy Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986) and Nan Enstad, *Ladies of Labor, Girls of Adventure* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999). The Youth Authority Records–in particular, the Superintendent's Records, Institutional History Files, and Inmate Publications–offer numerous accounts of the rebellion, disobedience, and promiscuity for which girls were committed to Whittier.
16. For further discussion of this problem, see Alexander.
17. *The Whittier* 3, 70.
18. YAR, Inmate Publications, *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, January 1904, 10. Cited hereafter as *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*.
19. *The Whittier* 3, 61.
20. YAR, Inmate Publications, *The Sentinel*, November 1913. Hereafter cited as *The Sentinel*.
21. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, November 1898.
22. *The Whittier* 3, 59.
23. Peiss, 7
24. *Ladies' Home Journal*, "Woman's Most Vexing Problem," April 1897, 14.
25. Susan Strasser, *Never Done: A History of American Housework* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982), 169-172; see also David M. Katzman, *Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981), Ch. 1.
26. *Good Housekeeping*, "What Others Do, Why Cannot You?", May 1902.
27. For example, *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine* noted in its May 1904 issue: "Alice Serkins was paroled on May 6th to take a position in Pasadena" (8).
28. *Good Housekeeping*, "Why Boarding School for Girls?", July 1905.
29. Ruth Ashmore, "Shams of the Modern Girl," *Ladies' Home Journal*, October 1897, 16.
30. Hamilton Holt, ed., *The Life Stories of Undistinguished Americans as Told By Themselves* (London: Routledge, 2000), 164-65.
31. Qtd. in Frances A. Kellor, "The Housewife and Her Helper," *Ladies' Home Journal*, April 1907, 42.
32. Daniel E. Sutherland, *Americans and Their Servants: Domestic Service in the United States from 1800 to 1920* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), 42.
33. Ibid, 64.
34. Holt, 164.
35. M.K.H., letter in "Just Among Ourselves" (ed. Mrs. Lyman Abott), *Ladies' Home Journal*, March 1893, 26.
36. Catherine Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe, *Principles of Domestic Science as Applied to the Pleasures of Home: A Textbook for the Use of Young Ladies in Schools, Seminaries, and Colleges* (New York: J.B. Ford & Company, 1870), 271.

37. Katzman, 110.
38. *Ladies' Home Journal*, "Woman's Most Vexing Problem," 14.
39. Holt, 165.
40. *The Outlook*, Advice Column, June 1902.
41. Holt, 165.
42. Hon. Josaiah Sima, 1890, reprinted in "The Whittier Idea," 7.
43. Qtd. in Katzman, 19.
44. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, September, 1898.
45. *The Whittier* 3, 13.
46. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, June 1898.
47. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, November 1898.
48. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, August 1898.
49. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, October 1899.
50. *The Whittier* 3, 13.
51. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, June 1898.
52. Sarah Tyson Rorer, "Market Estimates and Servants," *Ladies' Home Journal*, May 1897, 26.
53. *The Whittier* 3, 59.
54. Ibid.
55. *The Whittier* 3, 13.
56. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, March 1904.
57. *The Whittier* 3, 13.
58. See Enstad for more on working girl culture and image.
59. Elizabeth Collins Cromley, "American Beds and Bedrooms," in *American Home Life, 1880-1930: A Social History of Spaces and Services*, edited by Jessica H. Foy & Thomas J. Schlereth (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1992), 126.
60. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, March 1904, 17.
61. Candace Wheeler, *Principles of Home Decoration* (New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1903), 45.
62. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, September 1898.
63. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, March 1904.
64. Ibid.
65. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, August 1898.
66. *Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine*, September 1898.
67. Rorer, 26.
68. Sutherland, chapters 2, 4.
69. "Passionlessness" refers to the Victorian view of the absence of sexuality and lust in women. Nancy F. Cott, "Passionlessness: An Interpretation of Victorian Sexual Ideology, 1790-1850," in *A Heritage of Her Own*, edited by Nancy F. Cott and Elizabeth H. Pleck (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1979).
70. Qtd. in YAR, Institutional History Files, 6-7.
71. Ibid.
72. Qtd. in Kellor, 42.
73. *Ladies' Home Journal*, "Woman's Most Vexing Problem," 14.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Youth Authority Records. California State Archives, Sacramento.
  Inmate Publications F3738: 178-266
    The Whittier
    Whittier Boys and Girls Magazine
    The Sentinel
  Institutional History Files F3738:741-746
  Superintendent's Records F3738: 275-540

Articles and Publications	F3738:95
Scrapbooks	F3738:549-552
Theses, Dissertations, Reports	F3738:653-676
Histories	F3738:273
Biennial Reports	F3738:71-91
Souvenir Report	F3738: 270

Ashmore, Ruth. “Shams of the Modern Girl.” *Ladies’ Home Journal*, October 1897, 16.

Beecher, Catherine E., and Harriet Beecher Stowe. *Principles of Domestic Science as Applied to the Pleasures of Home: A Textbook for the Use of Young Ladies in Schools, Seminaries, and Colleges*. New York: J.B. Ford & Company, 1870.

Good Housekeeping. “What Others Do, Why Cannot You?”, May 1902.

Good Housekeeping. “Why Boarding School for Girls?”, July 1905.

H., M. K. Letter. “Just Among Ourselves.” Edited by Mrs. Lyman Abott. *Ladies’ Home Journal*, March 1893, 26.

Kellor, Frances A. “The Housewife and Her Helper.” *Ladies’ Home Journal*, April 1907, 42.

Ladies’ Home Journal. “Woman’s Most Vexing Problem,” April 1897, 14.

Lindley, Harvey. “Defense of the Whittier State School and its Purposes,” 1890, 5. YAR, Articles and Publications.

Mitchell, Adina. “The Reformation of Wayward Girls.” Read at the Congress of the National Prison Association at New Orleans, LA., January 24, 1899. Reprinted in YAR, Institutional History Files.

Outlook, The. Advice Column. June 1902.

Rorer, Sarah Tyson. “Market Estimates and Servants.” *Ladies’ Home Journal*, May 1897, 26.

Wendell, Evart Jansen. “The Educational Features of a Reform School.” *Charities Review 3* (January 1894): 111.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Alexander, Ruth M. *The ‘Girl Problem’: Female Sexual Delinquency in New York*, 1900-1930. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Brenzel, Barbara. *Daughters of the State: A Social Portrait of the First Reform School for Girls in North America*, 1865-1905. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1983.

Cott, Nancy F. “Passionlessness: An Interpretation of Victorian Sexual Ideology, 1790-1850.” In *A Heritage of Her Own*, edited by Nancy F. Cott and Elizabeth H. Pleck, 162-181. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1979.

Cromley, Elizabeth Collins. “American Beds and Bedrooms.” In *American Home Life*, 1880-1930: A Social History of Spaces and Services, edited by Jessica H. Foy & Thomas J. Schlereth, 120-141. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1992.

Enstad, Nan. *Ladies of Labor, Girls of Adventure*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Holt, Hamilton, ed. *The Life Stories of Undistinguished Americans as Told By Themselves*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Katzman, David M. *Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981.

Miller, George E. *Administrative History of California Institutions for Juvenile Offenders*. Los Angeles State College, 1961.

Odem, Mary E. *Delinquent Daughters: Policing and Protecting Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States*, 1885-1920. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

Pascoe, Peggy. *Relations of Rescue: The Search for Female Authority in the American West, 1874-1939*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Peiss, Kathy. *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century* New York. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.

Strasser, Susan. *Never Done: A History of American Housework*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

Sutherland, Daniel E. *Americans and Their Servants: Domestic Service in the United States from 1800 to 1920*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981.

Wheeler, Candace. *Principles of Home Decoratio*n. New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1903.