



Demographic differences in the substantiation of child abuse and neglect
by Thomas Arnold Curtis

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in
Home Economics
Montana State University
© Copyright by Thomas Arnold Curtis (1992)

Abstract:

The purpose of this study was to determine if demographic differences existed between cases of child abuse and neglect which were reported to authorities and substantiated following investigation and those cases which were reported and not substantiated. A data set containing records of 12,616 incidents involving 10,476 children reported as abused or neglected during 1991 was obtained from the Montana Department of Family Services.

Seven different types of abuse and neglect were considered including physical abuse, emotional abuse, sexual abuse, physical neglect, emotional neglect, educational neglect, and medical neglect. The demographics of each of these was examined using the variables of gender, age, ethnicity, source of the report and relationship of the perpetrator to the victim.

The study found that overall 37.9% of the reported incidents of abuse or neglect were substantiated. Significant trends relating age and gender to reporting and substantiation rates were uncovered. The likelihood of substantiation of abuse and neglect varied based on the type of abuse or neglect and the victim's race, the relationship of the victim to the referral source, and the relationship of the perpetrator to the victim.

It was determined that there were demographic differences between cases of abuse and neglect which are reported and substantiated and those which are reported and not substantiated. These findings supported existing literature in some instances and contradicted it in others.

This study was conducted in part as a pilot for later research using expanded data bases. Recommendations for changes in certain data collection procedures are discussed as are suggestions for using the findings to screen reports of abuse and neglect.

DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN THE SUBSTANTIATION
OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

by

Thomas Arnold Curtis

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Science

in

Home Economics

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

May 1992

© COPYRIGHT

by

Thomas Arnold Curtis

1992

All Rights Reserved

N378
C9465

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Thomas Arnold Curtis

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

5/20/92
Date

Caro Knudson-Martin
Chairperson,
Graduate Committee

Approved for the Major Department

5/21/92
Date

[Signature]
Head, Major Department

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

May 29, 1992
Date

[Signature]
Graduate Dean

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under the rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made.

Requests for permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis in whole or in parts may be granted by the copyright holder.

Signature

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be "John D. ...", written over a horizontal line.

Date

22 May 1992

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to the many people who have assisted me during this project. The encouragement and patience of my wife, Susan, my five children, and my friends have been deeply appreciated. Susan's assistance and 10-year-old Aaron's editing were invaluable.

I am grateful to my committee members, Dr. Dale Brotherton and Dr. Sandy Osborne, who endured this endeavor with me. I am especially thankful to Dr. Carmen Knudson-Martin, my committee chairperson, who was always there to hold my hand when panic hit. Without their time, expertise, and wise counsel, this thesis would have languished.

Dr. Gary Conti's statistical and computer expertise made the analysis of this large amount of data possible. I cannot thank him enough for his willingness to lend that expertise and many hours of his time to this project.

I would like to thank Dr. Randy Hitz, Dean of the College of Education, Health and Human Development, for his efforts on my behalf.

I would also like to recognize and express appreciation for the many hours of effort expended by Frank Kromkowski and Pat Gaydos at the Department of Family Services. Without them this project would not have been possible.

Finally, I want to recognize Donnie Marie Seibel for her contribution to the theoretic rationale of this thesis, as well as Marlene Short and Sheryl Was for their proofreading.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL	ii
STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
ABSTRACT	xiv
CHAPTER:	
1. ORIENTATION OF THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Purpose	2
Theoretic Rationale	3
Nominal Definitions	5
Types of Abuse and Neglect.....	6
Physical Abuse	6
Emotional Abuse	6
Sexual Abuse	6
Physical Neglect	7
Emotional Neglect	7
Educational Neglect	7
Medical Neglect	7
Fatality	7
Other Definitions	8
Report	8
Investigation	8
Substantiated	8
Unsubstantiated	8
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Introduction	9
Section 1. Research Literature	9

TABLE OF CONTENTS--CONTINUED

	Page
Section 2. Characteristics of Abuse and Neglect...	11
Gender of Child	11
Age of Child	12
Child's Ethnicity	12
Gender of Perpetrator	12
Relationship of Perpetrator to Victim	12
Family Size	13
Type of County	13
Source of Report	13
Conclusion	13
Hypotheses	14
Hypothesis 1	14
Hypothesis 2	14
Hypothesis 3	14
Hypothesis 4	14
Hypothesis 5	15
Hypothesis 6	15
3. METHODS	16
Introduction	16
Data Collection	16
Variables	17
Delimitations	19
Limitations	19
Analysis	20
Significance	21
4. RESULTS	23
Introduction	23
Statistics	24
Significance	24
Findings	24
Hypothesis 1 - Overall Abuse and Neglect	25
Gender	26
Age	28
Ethnicity	30
Referral Source	31
Perpetrators	33
Summary	34
Gender	34
Age	34
Ethnicity	34
Referral Source	34
Perpetrators	34

TABLE OF CONTENTS--CONTINUED

	Page
Hypothesis 2 - Physical Abuse	35
Gender	35
Age	36
Ethnicity	38
Referral Source	40
Perpetrators	44
Summary	45
Gender	45
Age	45
Ethnicity	46
Referral Source	46
Perpetrators	46
Hypothesis 3 - Emotional Abuse	47
Gender	48
Age	48
Ethnicity	51
Referral Source	52
Perpetrators	55
Summary	56
Gender	56
Age	56
Ethnicity	56
Referral Source	56
Perpetrators	56
Hypothesis 4 - Sexual Abuse	57
Gender	58
Age	58
Ethnicity	61
Referral Source	62
Perpetrators	65
Summary	67
Gender	67
Age	68
Ethnicity	68
Referral Source	68
Perpetrators	68
Hypothesis 5 - Physical Neglect	69
Gender	70
Age	70
Ethnicity	72
Referral Source	73
Perpetrators	77
Summary	78
Gender	78
Age	79

TABLE OF CONTENTS--CONTINUED

	Page
Ethnicity	79
Referral Source	79
Perpetrators	79
Hypothesis 6 - Emotional Neglect	79
Gender	80
Age	81
Ethnicity	83
Referral Source	83
Perpetrators	85
Summary	85
Gender	85
Age	85
Ethnicity	85
Referral Source	85
Perpetrators	86
Summary of Major Significant Findings	86
Gender Proportions in Reports	86
Effect of Age on Reporting	86
Substantiation Rates	86
Effect of Ethnicity	87
Differences by Referral Sources	87
Perpetrator Relationship	87
5. DISCUSSION	89
Theoretic Assimilation	89
Goodness of Fit with the Literature	92
Gender of the Victim	92
Age of Victim	93
Ethnicity of Victim	93
Relationship of Perpetrator to Victim	94
Source of Reports	94
Summary	94
Implications	95
Implications for Future Research	95
Implications for Department of Family Services	96
Implications for Mandated Reporters	98
Conclusion	99
REFERENCES	100

TABLE OF CONTENTS--CONTINUED

APPENDICES:

	Page
A. Department of Family Services Policy Manual Philosophy	104
B. Department of Family Services Policy Manual Guidelines for Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect	107
C. Department of Family Services Risk Assessment Instrument	122
D. Department of Family Services Form Used to Report on Child Protective Services Referrals and Instructions for Completion of Form	127
E. Definition of an Indian Child	143
F. Department of Family Services Data Transmittal Cover Letter	146
G. Analysis of Educational Neglect	149
H. Analysis of Medical Neglect	154
I. 1990 Census of Population and Housing Summary Tape File 1A	159
J. Department of Family Services 1990 Report to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System	162
K. Department of Family Services 1989 Report to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System	174
L. Department of Family Services 1988 Report to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System	185

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Findings by Category	25
2. Overall Abuse and Neglect Reports by Gender	26
3. Reported Cases of Abuse and Neglect with Female Victims	27
4. Reported Cases of Abuse and Neglect with Female Victims	28
5. Overall Abuse and Neglect Reports by Age.....	29
6. Overall Abuse and Neglect Reports by Victim's Ethnicity	30
7. Overall Abuse and Neglect Reports by Referral Source	32
8. Overall Abuse and Neglect Reports by Perpetrators Relationship to Victim	33
9. Physical Abuse Reports by Gender	36
10. Male Physical Abuse Reports by Victim Age	37
11. Female Physical Abuse Reports by Victim Age	37
12. Substantiated Cases of Physical Abuse by Gender Compared by Age	38
13. Male Victim's Physical Abuse by Ethnicity	39
14. Female Victim's Physical Abuse by Ethnicity	39
15. Substantiated Cases of Physical Abuse by Ethnicity Compared by Gender	40
16. Reporters of Physical Abuse of Male Victims	41
17. Reporters of Physical Abuse of Female Victims	42
18. Substantiated Cases of Physical Abuse Compared by Gender of Victim and Referral Source	43

LIST OF TABLES - CONTINUED

Table	Page
19. Physical Abuse of Male Victims Compared by Perpetrator Relationship.....	44
20. Physical Abuse of Female Victims Compared by Perpetrator Relationship.....	45
21. Emotional Abuse Reports by Gender of Victims	48
22. Male Emotional Abuse Reports by Victim's Age	49
23. Female Emotional Abuse Reports by Victim's Age ..	49
24. Substantiated Cases of Emotional Abuse Age Groups Compared by Gender	50
25. Cases of Emotional Abuse by Male Victim's Ethnicity	51
26. Cases of Emotional Abuse by Female Victim's Ethnicity	52
27. Reporters of Emotional Abuse of Male Victims	53
28. Reporters of Emotional Abuse of Female Victims ..	54
29. Cases of Emotional Abuse Compared by Perpetrator Relationship	55
30. Sexual Abuse Reports by Gender	58
31. Sexual Abuse Reports by Male Victim's Age	59
32. Sexual Abuse Reports by Female Victim's Age	60
33. Cases of Sexual Abuse of Males by Ethnicity	61
34. Cases of Sexual Abuse of Females by Ethnicity ...	61
35. Reporters of Sexual Abuse of Male Victims	63
36. Reporters of Sexual Abuse of Female Victims	64
37. Parents Reported as Perpetrators by Category	65

LIST OF TABLES - CONTINUED

Table	Page
38. Male Cases of Sexual Abuse Compared by Perpetrator Relationship	66
39. Female Cases of Sexual Abuse Compared by Perpetrator Relationship	67
40. Physical Neglect Reports by Gender	70
41. Physical Neglect Reports by Male Victim's Age	71
42. Physical Neglect Reports by Female Victim's Age	71
43. Physical Neglect by Ethnicity of Male Victims	72
44. Physical Neglect by Ethnicity of Female Victims	73
45. Reporters of Physical Neglect of Male Victims	75
46. Reporters of Physical Neglect of Female Victims	76
47. Perpetrators of Physical Neglect of Male Victims	77
48. Perpetrators of Physical Neglect of Female Victims	78
49. Emotional Neglect Reports by Gender	81
50. Emotional Neglect Reports by Male Victim's Age	82
51. Emotional Neglect Reports by Female Victim's Age	82
52. Emotional Neglect by Ethnicity of Victim	83

LIST OF TABLES - CONTINUED

Table	Page
53. Referral Sources of Reports of Emotional Neglect	84
54. A Comparison of Physical Abuse Reports	97
55. Educational Neglect Reports by Victim's Gender..	150
56. Educational Neglect Reports by Victim's Age	150
57. Educational Neglect by Victim's Ethnicity	151
58. Referral Sources for Reports of Educational Neglect	152
59. Educational Neglect by Perpetrator's Relationship to Victim	153
60. Medical Neglect Reports by Victim's Gender	155
61. Medical Neglect Reports by Victim's Age	155
62. Medical Neglect by Victim's Ethnicity	156
63. Referral Sources for Reports of Medical Neglect	157
64. Medical Neglect by Perpetrator's Relationship to Victim	158

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if demographic differences existed between cases of child abuse and neglect which were reported to authorities and substantiated following investigation and those cases which were reported and not substantiated. A data set containing records of 12,616 incidents involving 10,476 children reported as abused or neglected during 1991 was obtained from the Montana Department of Family Services.

Seven different types of abuse and neglect were considered including physical abuse, emotional abuse, sexual abuse, physical neglect, emotional neglect, educational neglect, and medical neglect. The demographics of each of these was examined using the variables of gender, age, ethnicity, source of the report and relationship of the perpetrator to the victim.

The study found that overall 37.9% of the reported incidents of abuse or neglect were substantiated. Significant trends relating age and gender to reporting and substantiation rates were uncovered. The likelihood of substantiation of abuse and neglect varied based on the type of abuse or neglect and the victim's race, the relationship of the victim to the referral source, and the relationship of the perpetrator to the victim.

It was determined that there were demographic differences between cases of abuse and neglect which are reported and substantiated and those which are reported and not substantiated. These findings supported existing literature in some instances and contradicted it in others.

This study was conducted in part as a pilot for later research using expanded data bases. Recommendations for changes in certain data collection procedures are discussed as are suggestions for using the findings to screen reports of abuse and neglect.

CHAPTER 1

ORIENTATION OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Nationwide in 1963, 150,000 incidents of suspected child abuse or neglect were reported to authorities (Martin & Besharov, 1991). By the late 1980's, that number had increased to 2,400,000 (Daro & Mitchell, 1990, cited in U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect [USABCAN], 1990). The 16-fold increase in reports of maltreatment coincided with the implementation of mandatory reporting laws. The majority of reports were made by medical, educational, law enforcement, child care, and social service professionals who are statutorily required to report suspicions of neglect or abuse (American Humane Association [AHA], 1988).

Following receipt of reports of suspected child abuse or neglect, local child protective services investigate the allegations in an attempt to verify the maltreatment. Historically, between 40% (AHA, 1989) and 53% (National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect [NCCAN], 1988) of the reported incidents of abuse have been substantiated as a result of investigations by local child protective services. The remainder of cases, between 47% and 60%, were thus unsubstantiated.

Most available research has attempted to describe the population in which child abuse or neglect is substantiated. There is little information available on those families in which abuse is reported, but not substantiated. It is proposed that this thesis will attempt to answer the question: What are the differences between cases in which child abuse or neglect are reported and substantiated and those cases in which maltreatment is reported but not substantiated?

The research was conducted in conjunction with the Montana Department of Family Services (DFS), the agency responsible for child protective services in the state. The data was taken from the 10,476 incidents of abuse and neglect investigated by DFS in 1991. Following investigation, abuse and neglect allegations were substantiated in 4059 or 38.7% of the cases. A substantiated case is one in which DFS has been able to collect enough evidence through investigation to determine that the alleged abuse actually occurred. Included in the DFS data base was information on the type of abuse or neglect (sexual, physical, emotional, educational or medical) and demographic information on both the victim and the alleged abuser as well as the identity of the reporting source.

Purpose

The purpose of this research was twofold. The first was to develop a basic understanding of the characteristics of and differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated cases of

differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated cases of reported child abuse and neglect in an effort to lay a foundation for further research. This study provides a basic demographic description of each of these groups, highlighting their similarities and differences.

A second purpose was to develop information that will be of value in both the investigation and prevention of child abuse and neglect. A better understanding of the differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated reports may assist child abuse and neglect investigators in the development of more efficient screening methods. Enhanced understanding of cases in which abuse or neglect is not substantiated may place social workers and therapists in a better position to assist these families following an investigation.

It should be noted that lack of substantiation does not necessarily equate with absence of abuse or neglect. An unsubstantiated case is one in which DFS investigators have failed to find sufficient grounds to prove that abuse or neglect are present.

Theoretic Rationale

Systems theory proposes that the family is an open, social system. It functions not as a discrete, autonomous unit, but rather in the context of the other systems with which it co-exists. Researchers at the Marlborough Family Service in London, England, described child abuse in a family

...families do not exist in isolation: They have their own contexts, involving relatives and friends, the neighborhood, and indeed the wider social and political setting. Child abusing families often demonstrate this, having unparalleled powers to recruit and to keep engaged significant groups of professionals from a wide variety of disciplines. Child abuse in a systems framework is therefore defined as an event which is related to the structural requirements and interactional patterns of the family and the wider network as it becomes involved. (Asen, George, Piper, & Stevens, 1989, p. 46)

Bronfenbrenner (1979) described the effect of interlocking systems on individual development from an ecological viewpoint. He proposed that there are four basic systems which affect the development of a child. The microsystem is the child's pattern of activities and relations in a given setting, for example, the family or school. The mesosystem is made of interactions between the child's various microsystems such as between family or school or friends. The exosystems are those systems which affect the child, but with which the child has no direct contact, such as a parent's employer. The macrosystem refers to the culture as a whole and its belief systems. Garbarino (1977a) suggested that the ecological viewpoint is a valuable model for describing child abuse. He proposed that abuse is a pathological adaptation by both caregiver and child which is created by a coming together of forces within a microsystem.

Belsky (1980) and Seibel (1990) expanded the work of Bronfenbrenner, by suggesting a slightly different ecological model to explain child abuse. Belsky posited a four-part framework including, the micro, exo, and macro systems and

framework including, the micro, exo, and macro systems and adds ontogenic development. Ontogenic development includes all of the characteristics which an abuser brings into the relationship with the child. These characteristics might include poor health, physical disability, lack of education or abusive experiences in childhood.

Garbarino (1977b) suggested that child abuse occurs when stresses within the family microsystem reach a critical mass. Garbarino (1977a, 1977b) and Belsky (1980) both pointed to a linkage between these stresses and isolation of the family microsystem from other micro, meso, and exo support systems in families where abuse occurs.

This study attempts to describe patterns relating to child abuse and neglect within and among these systems. The relationship of the abuser and victim is a description of the microsystem. The relationship of the reporter to the victim may describe either an interaction involving a microsystem (i.e., family or school) and a exosystem (child protective services) or two exosystems (i.e., a therapist and child protective services). Ethnicity may be one indicator of a large macrosystem's influences on substantiation of child abuse and neglect.

Nominal Definitions

There are a number of distinct approaches used to define maltreatment of children (Graham, Dingwall, & Wolkind, 1985).

For the purpose of this paper, definitions were derived from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services National Incidence Study of 1986 (NCCAN, 1988) and the American Humane Association's National Study on Child Neglect and Abuse Reporting (AHA, 1984). Following is a list of definitions used for this study.

Types of Abuse and Neglect

Physical Abuse: Action toward a child resulting in physical injury or potential physical injury to the child. This can range from shaking a child or twisting a limb to cuts, burns, broken bones, internal organ or brain damage.

Emotional Abuse: Includes three subcategories: (a) close confinement such as tying, binding, or confining a child to an enclosed area as a means of punishment; (b) verbal or emotional assault such as habitual patterns of belittling, denigrating, scapegoating, rejecting, or threatening with physical or sexual assault or abandonment; and (c) other or unknown abuse which includes attempted or potential physical or sexual assault, intentional withholding of food, shelter, or sleep as a punishment; or economic exploitation.

Sexual Abuse: Includes three sub-categories: (a) intrusion which is actual penile penetration;

b) molestation with genital contact where genital contact has occurred but there is no indication of intrusion; and
(c) Other or unknown which includes unspecified acts not known to have involved the genitals such as fondling of breasts or buttocks, or exposure.

Physical Neglect: Includes abandonment, expulsion from the home without other arrangements for care being made, custody-related inattention to a child's needs, inadequate supervision, and inattention or inadequate nutrition, clothing, hygiene, safety, or welfare.

Emotional Neglect: Includes inadequate nurturance or affection, chronic or extreme spouse abuse, permitted drug or alcohol abuse, permitted maladaptive behavior, such as delinquency, refusal or delay of psychological care, and neglect of developmental or emotional needs.

Educational Neglect: Includes permitted chronic truancy, failure to enroll, and inattention to special educational needs.

Medical Neglect: Refusal of health care or delay in seeking health care.

Fatality: A death resulting from abuse or neglect.

Other Definitions

Report: Information received by DFS alleging that a child has been the possible victim of abuse or neglect. A report may be submitted by someone mandated by law to report suspicions such as mental health workers, medical service suppliers, educators, child care providers, or law enforcement personnel. A report may also come from the general public such as concerned neighbors or relatives.

Investigation: The process used by DFS to determine the veracity of reported incidents of child abuse or neglect. This process varies based on jurisdiction and nature of the report. The investigation usually results in a finding that the report of abuse or neglect was substantiated or unsubstantiated.

Substantiated: Reported cases in which the investigation has uncovered sufficient evidence to determine that the abuse or neglect has occurred are classified as substantiated.

Unsubstantiated: Reported cases in which the investigation has not uncovered sufficient evidence to determine that the abuse or neglect has occurred are classified as unsubstantiated. Unsubstantiated does not mean that abuse or neglect have not occurred, only that insufficient evidence of the allegations is available to substantiate the report.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

A review of literature was conducted to explore the extent to which the subject of reporting and substantiation of child abuse and neglect has been researched. The review is presented in two sections. The first section describes the research literature and its content. The second section is an examination of empirically derived descriptions of abusers, victims, and reporters. From this review of literature, a set of hypotheses was developed. These hypotheses are enumerated following the second section of the literature review.

Section 1. Research Literature

Quantitative research on child abuse reporting and substantiation is limited. While there are entire journals dedicated to the study of the maltreatment of children, little attention is given to these initial stages of intervention by child protective services.

One area of focus includes several studies which explore variables that affect the validity of reports and substantiation. Flango (1991) looks at means of increasing

substantiation rates through the use of central registries and through the development of risk-assessment models. Thoennes & Tjaden (1990) looked at the effect of custody disputes on sexual abuse allegations and found that only 50% of such allegations were substantiated. Zuravin & Watson (1987) found that anonymous reports were less likely to be substantiated than those filed by professionals. Knudsen (1989) looked at the affects that repeated complaints involving the same children over a period of years and nonreporting of known cases had on research. He found that the lack of reporting of many known cases of abuse and duplicate reporting of others should be cause for skepticism about child abuse statistics and the adequacy of interventions.

Eckenrode, Munsch, Powers, and Doris (1988) review a number of variables involved in the substantiation of sexual abuse reports in New York State. Eckenrode et al. focused on substantiated cases but makes no mention of the demographic features of those whose cases were not substantiated. Johnson and Showers (1985) reviewed 616 cases of children admitted to a Columbus, Ohio, hospital with injuries believed to be the result of abuse. They found that mothers were the most frequent perpetrators of abuse. Johnson and Showers research also reported that males constituted more than half of the abusers. Types of injuries varied with age and race, but not the sex of children.

Faller (1985) outlined problems which exist in the reporting to and investigations by child protective services. She reports that in 1980, 47% of reports by professionals were substantiated as compared to only 35% of the reports by nonprofessionals.

Section 2. Characteristics of Abuse and Neglect

Several publications describe reported and substantiated incidents of abuse and neglect. These publications were compiled by the American Humane Association (AHA, 1984, 1988, 1989) and the National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse (Daro & Mitchell cited in USABCAN, 1990) as well as various governmental agencies such as the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (1988) and the Montana Department of Family Services. The National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect Study of National Incidence (1988) reached the following conclusions regarding trends in the characteristics of maltreated children and their families. Except where noted, the following statistics are derived from that source.

Gender of Child

1. Females are more likely to be abused than males.
2. Females are abused more than neglected, while among males the rates are similar.
3. Females are sexually abused nearly 4 times the rate of males.
4. Females experienced more injuries than males.

Age of Child

1. Maltreatment, overall, increases reliably up through age 8.
2. Children 0-2 years old and 15-17 experienced somewhat more abuse than neglect.
3. For those older than 2 and under 15 abuse exceeded neglect.
4. Fatalities most often occur in the under 6 age category.

Child's Ethnicity

The characteristic of race was not related to the type or severity of maltreatment.

Gender of Perpetrator (AHA, 1988)

1. All maltreatment types: Males 46.7%, Female 53.3%
2. Physical Abuse: Males 50.5%, Females 49.5%
3. Sexual Abuse: Males 82.4%, Females 17.6%
4. All Neglect: Males 30.3%, Females 69.7%
5. Emotional Maltreatment: Males 42%, Females 58%

Relationship of Perpetrator to Victim (AHA, 1988)

1. About 80% of all abuse perpetrators fall into the "Parent" category; that is, natural, step, or foster parents. About 7% are other relatives, and about 12% are unrelated.
2. About 42% of sexual abuse is committed by parents, about 23% by other relatives and 35% are unrelated.
3. About 92% of neglectors are parents.

Family Size

There was no relationship between number of children in a family and the type or severity of abuse.

Type of County

There was no relationship between type of county (rural, urban or major urban) and the type or severity of abuse.

Source of Report (AHA, 1988)

1. Self (victim or perpetrator)	2.0%
2. Relatives, friends or neighbors	32.3%
3. Medical personnel	11.2%
4. School personnel	16.3%
5. Law enforcement	13.0%
6. Child care providers	11.4%
7. Anonymous	9.4%
8. Other (includes landlords clergy and others not classified)	2.3%

Conclusion

The existing literature provides detailed information on cases where maltreatment of children is substantiated. It supplies no empirically based description of the differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated cases of child abuse and neglect. Insufficient information is available in the literature to indicate if there are specific significant differences in the various demographic attributes of these two

possible outcomes of investigations by child protective services.

Given that no basis has been found in the literature to assume that there are demographic differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated cases of child abuse and neglect, the following hypotheses were tested.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

There is no demographic difference between cases in which child abuse or neglect was reported and substantiated and those in which such behavior was reported and not substantiated.

Hypothesis 2

There is no demographic difference between cases in which physical abuse was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated.

Hypothesis 3

There is no demographic difference between cases in which physical abuse was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated.

Hypothesis 4

There is no demographic difference between cases in which emotional abuse was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated.

Hypothesis 5

There is no demographic difference between cases in which physical neglect was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated.

Hypothesis 6

There is no demographic difference between cases in which emotional neglect was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Introduction

The data for this study was provided by the Montana Department of Family Services. The sample included 10,476 incidents of child abuse or neglect investigated during calendar year 1991.

Data Collection

Suspected incidents of child abuse and neglect were reported to the local county DFS office. Investigations were conducted to determine the validity of the allegations. Each DFS office had autonomy to determine the method of investigation to be used in that county. DFS investigators throughout the state have received uniform training conducted by the state DFS (see Appendices A and B). Among training materials was the Protocol Notebook for Child Welfare Workers (Bertsche, Francetich, & Horejsi, 1985) which was prepared by the Department of Social Work at the University of Montana for DFS. The protocol is a description of the steps that should be taken by DFS workers in various situations as they investigate reported abuse. The protocol contains 14 stages

of investigation and intervention. It provides interviewing information and possible dialogues to be used, depending on the circumstances of the investigation and type of abuse or neglect being investigated. Another manual used in training was entitled Step by Step: Sixteen Steps Toward Legally Sound Sexual Abuse Investigations (Hindman, 1987). Hindman described legally sound techniques for investigating abuse.

Based on these guidelines, a decision was reached as to whether there existed sufficient evidence of abuse or neglect to require further intervention or the filing of criminal charges (see Appendix C). Following the investigation, a report was sent to the state DFS. These reports contained information about the incident, the participants and whether the local DFS was able to substantiate the report.

Variables

Each report described the type of abuse or neglect involved and whether the maltreatment had been substantiated. Categories included: physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse, physical neglect, emotional neglect, educational neglect, and medical neglect. The reports described the age, sex, and ethnicity of the victim and the relationship of the abuser. The source of the original report was also categorized. The reports were maintained in a discrete rather than cumulative form in the DFS computer which means that each of the variables from a particular investigation remained

linked to that case. Below is a complete listing of the variables that were considered. Appendix D is a copy of the report form used by DFS.

1. Type of Abuse or Neglect:

Physical abuse	Emotional neglect
Emotional abuse	Medical neglect
Sexual abuse	Educational neglect
Physical neglect	

2. Case Determination:

Substantiated	Unsubstantiated
---------------	-----------------

3. Gender of Child

4. Age of Child: For purposes of this study, the variable of victim's age was organized by combining children into groups based on the age of the child at the time of the investigation. Each group consists of all children whose ages fall within a 2-year block. For example, all of the children under the age of 2 are in the group identified as 0-1. All of the children who were either 10 or 11 years old at the time of the investigation are in the 10-11 group.

5. Ethnicity of child:

Caucasian	Vietnamese/Cambodian
Black	Asian/Pacific Islander
American Indian (see Appendix E)	Hispanic
Alaskan Native	Other or unknown

6. Relationship of Referral Source to Child:

Mother	Youth court
Father	Human/social services
Self	School
Sibling	Hospital staff
Other relative	Other medical professional
Neighbor	Residential staff
Child care provider	Legal guardian
Attorney	Economic assistance
Law enforcement	Other

7. Relationship of Perpetrator to Child:

Parent	Other caretaker
Other household member	Licensed/registered care provider
Caretaker substitute	School
Other	

Delimitations

Because this study was based on a sample drawn from reports originating in the state of Montana, it is not possible to generalize its findings to specific populations outside of Montana or the nation as a whole.

Limitations

This study was limited by the fact that it relies on investigations by DFS to substantiate abuse and neglect. There was no way to determine whether abuse or neglect has

occurred in those families in which it was not substantiated. It follows then, that some families which contributed to the description of the unsubstantiateds may have maltreated their children. The study was also limited by the fact that not all cases of child abuse were reported to the authorities. Without being able to draw a sample from the total population of abusers, it was impossible to know if the descriptions resulting from those investigated by DFS were representative of the total population.

The study was also limited by certain deficiencies in the data collection. For example, the data included a category defined as relationship of perpetrator. One of the options for reporting was parent, but it was not possible to determine from the data whether the parent was a mother or a father, stepfather or stepmother, or foster parents. Data on other family characteristics were not available. The researcher was limited to information required on DFS reports and was unable to seek additional data.

Analysis

The data contained in each of these cases was transferred from DFS in Helena to the Montana State University computers in Bozeman (see Appendix F). The methodology was similar to that which was used by Johnson and Showers (1985) in their study on injury variables in child abuse. Chi-square methods were employed to test differences between substantiated and

unsubstantiated reports based on the variables outlined above and to test each of the null hypotheses. The average percentage of cases that were substantiated or unsubstantiated in a given category was used as the expected value for that category. For example, in the category of Physical Abuse Reports by Female Victim Age, the overall percentage of cases which were reported and substantiated was also the expected value against which the substantiated cases for various age groups were compared. The overall percentage of substantiated cases in this category was 32.7; therefore, the expected percentage for females 14 and 15 years old was also 32.7. The actual percentage for substantiated cases in this age group turned out to be 42.3%. The difference between the expected value and the real value was tested using chi-square. This test determined that the difference between the actual 42.3% differs significantly at $\alpha < .5$ from the expected 32.7% given the overall number (n) of cases for this subcategory.

A minimum expected value of 5 in any given cell was required to avoid distortion (Huck, Cormier, & Bounds, 1974).

Significance

P-values represent the degree to which the differences between the expected values and the actual data may be attributed to chance. The level of significance or alpha was established at .05. This means that the null hypotheses were rejected if the difference between the variable and the

expected value happening by chance were less than 5%. The actual possibility of the differences occurring by chance is represented in the tables by the p-value. A p-value of .05 indicates that there is a 5% possibility that the difference between the actual and expected values happened by chance. A p-value of .50 indicates that there is a 50% possibility that the differences can be attributed to chance. A p-value of .00 indicates that there is no possibility that the differences can be attributed to chance.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The findings of this study are presented in seven sections. The first section is a generalized description of child abuse and neglect reporting and substantiation in Montana during 1991. The second section describes and analyzes the overall demographic factors in order to respond to the first null hypothesis which posited that there are no demographic differences between cases in which abuse or neglect is reported and substantiated and those in which abuse or neglect are reported and not substantiated. The remaining five sections describe the attributes of the various types of abuse and neglect in response to the remaining null hypotheses which state that there were no demographic differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated cases of physical abuse, emotional abuse, sexual abuse, physical neglect, and emotional neglect. Each section consists of an examination of the differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated reports based on gender, age, ethnicity, relationship of the referral source to the alleged victim, and relationship of the reported

perpetrator to the alleged victim. Tables describing educational and medical neglect are found in Appendices G and H.

Statistics

Chi-squares were used to determine whether the measured value for each demographic attribute within a variable differs significantly from the average substantiation rate for that variable.

Significance

Probability (p) values represent the degree to which the differences between the expected values and the actual data may be attributed to chance. The level of significance or alpha has been established at .05.

Findings

During calendar year 1991, 12,616 reports of child abuse and neglect involving 10,475 children were investigated by the Montana Department of Family Services (DFS). Of these cases 4,776 or 37.9% were substantiated, while 7,840 or 62.1% were unsubstantiated when the investigations were closed (see Table 1).

Table 1. Findings by Category

Type of Abuse or Neglect	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		Cases	Percent
Physical Abuse	966**	32.6	1,998	67.4	.0001	2,964	23.5
Emotional Abuse	710**	53.1	626	46.9	.0001	1,336	10.6
Sexual Abuse	484	37.1	819	62.9	.5939	1,303	10.3
Physical Neglect	1,988	34.7	3,734**	65.3	.0001	5,722	45.4
Emotional Neglect	423**	54.7	350	45.3	.0001	773	6.1
Medical Neglect	118	35.1	218	64.9	.3200	336	2.7
Educational Neglect	87**	47.8	95	52.2	.0074	182	1.4
Total	4,776	37.9	7,840	62.1		12,616	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

The volume of reports ranged from 5,722 cases of alleged physical neglect down to 182 cases of educational neglect. Substantiation rates ranged from a low of 32.6% for physical abuse to 54.7% for emotional neglect.

Hypothesis 1 - Overall Abuse and Neglect

The first null hypothesis stated that there is no difference between cases in which child abuse or neglect is reported and substantiated and those in which such behavior is reported and not substantiated. An evaluation of the data regarding abuse and neglect was conducted in order to determine if there were differences between substantiated and

unsubstantiated cases based on age, gender, or race of the victim, the identity of the referral source, or the relationship of the perpetrator to the victim. Chi-square formulae were used to determine whether substantiation rates for categories within these independent variables differed significantly from the average or mean substantiation rate for that variable.

Gender

The individual children reported were fairly evenly divided by gender. Of those included in reports 5,036 or 48.1% were male and 5,439 or 51.9% were female. However, 1990 census data indicates that 51.5% of the children in Montana under age 18 were and only 48.5% were (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1991) (see Appendix I). When this was taken into account, there were significantly ($p = .0001$) more female victims than would have been expected. The substantiation rate for males was 38.1% and 39.3% for females (see Table 2).

Table 2. Overall Abuse and Neglect Reports by Gender

Gender	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent
Male	1,920	38.1%	3,116	61.9%	5,036	48.1%
Female	2,138	39.3%	3,301	60.7%	5,439	51.9%
Total	4,058	38.7%	6,417	61.3%	10,475	100.0%

Cases with female victims were most likely to be substantiated when they involved emotional abuse, emotional neglect, or educational neglect. All three had substantiation rates at or above 50%. Physical abuse and physical neglect were least likely to be substantiated for female victims (see Table 3).

Table 3. Reported Cases of Abuse or Neglect With Female Victims

TYPE OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square <u>p</u>	Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		Cases	Percent
Physical Abuse	476	32.8	976**	67.2	.0001	1,452	22.2
Emotional Abuse	390**	54.3	328	45.7	.0001	718	11.0
Sexual Abuse	362	38.4	580	61.6	1.0000	942	14.4
Physical Neglect	954	34.5	1,815**	65.5	.0001	2,769	42.3
Emotional Neglect	218**	55.9	172	44.1	.0001	390	6.0
Medical Neglect	69	39.2	107	60.8	.9087	176	2.7
Educational Neglect	49*	50.0	49	50.0	.0254	98	1.5
Total	2,518	38.5	4,027	61.5		6,545	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

Cases with male victims were also least likely to be substantiated for physical abuse and physical neglect. Cases of emotional abuse and emotional neglect were substantiated significantly more often than expected (see Table 4).

Table 4. Reported Cases of Abuse or Neglect With Male Victims

TYPE OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		Cases	Percent
Physical Abuse	490	32.4	1,022**	67.6	.0001	1,512	25.0
Emotional Abuse	320**	51.8	298	48.2	.0001	618	10.2
Sexual Abuse	122	33.8	239	66.2	.1991	361	5.9
Physical Neglect	1,034	35.0	1,919*	65.0	.0148	2953	48.6
Emotional Neglect	205**	53.5	178	46.5	.0001	383	6.3
Medical Neglect	49	30.6	111	69.4	.1012	160	2.6
Educational Neglect	38	45.2	46	54.8	.1581	84	1.3
Total	2,258	37.2	3,813	62.8		6,071	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

Age

Each age group consisted of all children whose ages fell within a 2-year block. There were 367 cases in which the age of the victim could not be determined or was reported improperly.

The total number of reports by group tended to decrease as the children grew older. There were 1,494 investigations for abuse or neglect of children in the 0-1 group and only 487 cases for the 16-17 group (see Table 5).

Table 5. Overall Abuse and Neglect Reports by Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		Cases	Percent
0-1	531	35.5%	963**	64.5%	.0052	1,494	14.8%
2-3	539	36.9%	923	63.1%	.0849	1,462	14.5%
4-5	538	40.2%	801	59.8%	.4346	1,339	13.2%
6-7	482	37.2%	812	62.8%	.1815	1,294	12.8%
8-9	461	38.9%	723	61.1%	.9315	1,184	11.7%
10-11	420	39.0%	658	61.0%	.9503	1,078	10.7%
12-13	413*	42.6%	557	57.4%	.0288	970	9.6%
14-15	373**	46.6%	427	53.4%	.0001	800	7.9%
16-17	200	41.1%	287	58.9%	.3990	487	4.8%
Total	3,957	39.1%	6,151	60.9%		10,108	100.0%

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

Census figures compiled in 1990 revealed that the populations in the 0-1 and 14-15 age groups were similar and that size of the group did not account for the decreases (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1991). The trend in the rate of substantiation was directly opposite. As the age of the child increased, the percentage of substantiations also increased. The number of unsubstantiated cases for children under the age of 2 was significantly greater than expected. The number of substantiated cases in the 12-13 age group was greater than expected. The number of substantiated cases in the 14-15 age group was also greater than expected.

Ethnicity

Over 80% of the victims for whom ethnicity was reported were Caucasian. Native American children made up only 8.9% of the total population under the age of 18 (U.S. Census Bureau, 1991), yet accounted for 16.3% of the total reported incidents (see Table 6). The substantiated cases were greater than expected for Native Americans. All others fell within expected ranges.

It should be noted that DFS grouped Vietnamese and Cambodians together in one category. In tables throughout this study, the Vietnamese/Cambodian group will be identified as Vietnamese. In the same way, Pacific Islanders are grouped with the Asians throughout this study.

Table 6. Overall Abuse and Neglect Reports by Victim's Ethnicity

ETHNICITY OF VICTIM	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square p	Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		Cases	Percent
Caucasian	2,765	38.8	4,366	61.2	.0537	7,131	80.2
Native American	668**	46.0	783	54.0	.0001	1,451	16.3
Hispanic	59	34.7	111	65.3	.1920	170	1.9
Black	38	41.3	54	58.7	.8661	92	1.0
Asian	10	35.7	18	64.3	.7954	28	0.3
Vietnamese	3	30.0	7	70.0	N/A	10	0.1
Alaskan	5	71.4	2	28.6	N/A	7	0.1
Total	3,548	39.9	5,341	60.1		8,889	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cell in this row

Referral Source

Data was available on 19 different reporting sources (see Table 7). Of those categories which identify a relationship between alleged victim and referral source, educators had the largest representation at 14.8%, followed by neighbors with 12.8%, and law enforcement with 10.5%. Relatives of the alleged victim filed 19.8% of the reports, while mothers filed 5.1%, fathers filed 4.3%, self (the victims) filed 2.5%, siblings filed .8%, and other relatives filed 7.1%. The largest single category of referral source was "Other," indicating either a source not included on the investigation forms or that the information was not available.

Reports filed by foster parents had the highest substantiation rate at 71.9%. This was significantly above the expected substantiation rate of 38.7%. The lowest substantiation rate was that of reports filed by fathers. Only 19.3% of the reports filed by this group were substantiated which is significantly below the expected rate.

Referrals from the alleged victim (self) and from law enforcement were both substantiated at a rate greater than expected. Educators, child care providers, and attorneys all had rates higher than expected. Other relatives, neighbors, and the category of "other" had lower than expected rates of substantiation.

Table 7. Overall Abuse and Neglect Reports by Referral Source

Referral Source	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		Cases	Percent
Mother	213	40.0	319	60.0	.5559	532	5.1
Father	89	19.6	365**	80.4	.0001	454	4.3
Self	133**	50.2	132	49.8	.0002	265	2.5
Sibling	42	47.2	47	54.5	.1246	89	.8
Other Relatives	248	33.2	500**	66.8	.0021	748	7.1
Neighbor	442	32.9	901**	67.1	.0001	1,343	12.8
Child Care Provider	136*	45.3	164	54.7	.0215	300	2.9
Foster Parent	23**	71.9	9	28.1	.0002	32	.3
Attorney	32*	52.5	29	47.5	.0380	61	.6
Law Enforcement	707**	64.6	388	35.4	.0001	1,095	10.5
Youth Court	41	32.9	44	52.1	.0903	85	.8
Human Services	166	36.2	293	63.8	.2860	459	4.4
Educators	640*	41.2	914	58.8	.0472	1,554	14.8
Hospital Staff	95	36.7	164	63.3	.5460	259	2.5
Other Medical	121	42.3	165	57.7	.2333	286	2.7
Residential Staff	11	39.3	17	60.7	1.0000	28	.3
Legal Guardian	2	100.0	0	0.0	N/A	2	.0
Economic Assistance	10	23.8	32	76.2	.0683	42	.4
Other	908	31.9	1,934**	68.1	.0001	2,842	27.1
Total	4,059	38.7	6,417	61.3		10,476	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 for at least one cell in this row

Perpetrators

Eighty-five percent of the alleged perpetrators fell into the parent category. Only 37.6% of the allegations against parents were substantiated (see Table 8). Statistics were not collected regarding the exact relationship of the perpetrator to the victim, making it impossible to determine if the "parent" was a mother, father, or stepparent.

Caretaker substitutes had a higher than expected rate of substantiation at 57.1. The other caretakers, other household members, and the "other" category also had significantly higher than expected rates of substantiation.

Table 8. Overall Abuse and Neglect Reports by Perpetrator's Relationship to Victim

Perpetrator	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Total
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Parent	3,344	37.6	5,552	62.4	.1717	8,896	85.0
Other Caretaker	242**	45.2	293	54.8	.0008	535	5.1
Other Household Member	182**	45.5	218	54.5	.0022	400	3.8
Licensed Care Provider	19	37.3	32	62.7	1.0000	51	.5
Caretaker Substitute	36**	57.1	27	42.9	.0022	63	.6
School	2	40.0	3	60.0	N/A	5	.0
Other	232**	45.0	284	55.0	.0004	516	4.9
Total	4,057	38.3	6,409	61.2		10,466	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 for at least one cell in this row

Summary

Significant differences exist between substantiated and unsubstantiated reports of child abuse and neglect based on the demographic attributes contained in those reports.

Gender: There was a significant difference in the ratio of male to female victims based on the representation in the general population. Emotional abuse and emotional neglect were most likely to be substantiated for girls, while physical abuse and physical neglect were most likely to be substantiated for boys.

Age: As the age of the victim increased, the number of reports filed decreased. As age increased, the substantiation rate increased.

Ethnicity: Cases involving Native American victims were substantiated more frequently than expected. Native American victims were overrepresented based on the size of the Native American population in the state. Caucasians were underrepresented.

Referral Source: Substantiation rates varied greatly depending on the source of the report.

Perpetrators: Parents constituted the largest group of alleged perpetrators, but four other groups had higher rates of substantiation.

Significant demographic differences were found between cases in which physical abuse was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated. Therefore the first null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 - Physical Abuse

The second hypothesis stated that there is no demographic difference between cases in which physical abuse is reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated.

Physical abuse is an action toward a child resulting in physical injury or potential physical injury to the child. This can range from shaking a child or twisting a limb to cuts, burns, broken bones, internal organ, or brain damage.

There were 2,964 reports of physical abuse investigated in 1991. Of these, 966 or 32.6% were substantiated.

An evaluation of the data regarding physical abuse was conducted in order to determine if there were differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated cases based on age, gender or race of the victim, the referral source, or the relationship of the perpetrator to the victim.

Gender

Female victims accounted for 51% of the physical abuse reports and male victims for 49% (see Table 9). There was not a significant difference in rate of substantiation based on gender.

Table 9. Physical Abuse Reports by Gender

Gender	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent
Male	490	32.4%	1,022	67.6%	1,512	51.0%
Female	476	32.8%	976	67.2%	1,452	49.0%
Total	966	32.6%	1,998	67.4%	2,964	100.0%

Age

Reports involving children under the age of 4 were least likely to be substantiated for both males and females. The 14-15 age group had the highest substantiation rate for both genders. Reports involving children over 10 years of age were much more likely to be substantiated than those involving younger children (see Tables 10 and 11).

Physical abuse of males in the 2-3 age group was significantly more likely to be substantiated than it was for their female counterparts. The opposite was true for females in the 14-15 and 16-17 age groups for which reports were significantly more likely to be substantiated than would be expected when compared to males of the same age (see Table 12).

Table 10. Male Physical Abuse Reports by Victim Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
0-1	35	20.6%	135**	79.4%	.0012	170	11.7%
2-3	62	25.7%	179*	74.3%	.0295	241	16.6%
4-5	67	33.3%	134	66.7%	.8595	201	13.8%
6-7	54	30.5%	123	69.5%	.6274	177	12.2%
8-9	50	30.3%	115	69.7%	.6035	165	11.4%
10-11	62	37.6%	103	62.4%	.1906	165	11.4%
12-13	60	37.3%	101	62.7%	.2273	161	11.1%
14-15	56**	49.1%	58	50.9%	.0002	114	7.8%
16-17	26	44.1%	33	55.9%	.0787	59	4.1%
Total	472	32.5%	981	67.5%		1,453	100.0%

**Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

Table 11. Female Physical Abuse Reports by Victim Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
0-1	32	17.8%	148**	82.2%	.0001	180	12.9%
2-3	34	23.0%	114*	77.0%	.0149	148	10.6%
4-5	44	28.6%	110	71.4%	.3143	154	11.0%
6-7	46	29.3%	111	70.7%	.4104	157	11.2%
8-9	32	28.6%	80	71.4%	.4062	112	8.0%
10-11	54*	41.5%	76	58.5%	.0399	130	9.3%
12-13	76*	40.4%	112	59.6%	.0292	188	13.5%
14-15	88**	42.3%	120	57.7%	.0040	208	14.9%
16-17	50*	38.9%	69	58.0%	.0386	119	8.5%
Total	456	32.7%	940	67.3%		1,396	100.0%

**Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

Table 12. Substantiated Cases of Physical Abuse by Gender Compared by Age

Age	FEMALES		MALES		Chi-Square p	Total
	Substantiated		Substantiated			
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
0-1	32	17.8%	35	20.6%	1.0000	67
2-3	34	23.0%	62**	25.7%	.0099	96
4-5	44	28.6%	67	33.3%	.0576	111
6-7	46	29.3%	54	30.5%	.6030	100
8-9	32	28.6%	50	30.3%	.0864	82
10-11	54	41.5%	62	37.6%	.6483	116
12-13	76	40.4%	60	37.3%	.1346	136
14-15	88**	42.3%	56	49.1%	.0051	208
16-17	50**	38.9%	26	44.1%	.0052	119
Total	456	32.7%	472	32.5%		928

**Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

Ethnicity

Cases involving physical abuse showed no significant differences from expected values based on ethnicity. Of the cases with male victims, 87.1% involved Caucasian children as did 84.6% of the cases with female victims (see Tables 13, 14, and 15). This compares with 80.2% overall (see Table 6). There was a corresponding decline in the percentage of reports which involved Native American children for both genders.

Table 13. Male Victim's Physical Abuse by Ethnicity

ETHNICITY OF MALE VICTIMS	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Total Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Caucasian	373	32.6	772	67.4	.8663	1145	87.1
Native American	32	27.4	85	72.6	.3292	117	8.9
Hispanic	11	44.0	14	56.0	1.000	25	1.9
Black	4	26.7	11	73.3	N/A	15	1.1
Asian	2	33.3	4	66.7	N/A	6	.5
Vietnamese	3	50.0	3	50.0	N/A	6	.5
Alaskan	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Total	425	32.3	889	67.7		1314	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 14. Female Victim's Physical Abuse by Ethnicity

ETHNICITY OF FEMALES VICTIMS	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square p	Row Total	Percent of Total Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Caucasian	351	33.4	701	66.6	.6694	1052	84.6
Native American	45	27.8	117	72.2	.2107	162	13.0
Hispanic	7	50.0	7	50.0	.2735	14	1.1
Black	2	20.0	8	80.0	.6037	10	.8
Asian	2	40.0	3	60.0	N/A	5	.4
Vietnamese	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Alaskan	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Total	407	32.7	836	67.3		1243	100.00

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 15. Substantiated Cases of Physical Abuse by Ethnicity Compared by Gender

ETHNICITY OF VICTIM	FEMALES		MALES		Chi- Square p	Total Cases
	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated			
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Caucasian	351	33.4	373	32.6	.8504	724
Native American	45	27.8	32	37.8	.1185	77
Hispanic	7	50.0	11	44.0	.5393	18
Black	2	20.0	4	26.7	N/A	6
Asian	2	40.0	2	33.3	N/A	4
Vietnamese	0	0	3	50.0	N/A	3
Alaskan	0	0	0	0	N/A	0
Total	407	32.7	425	32.3		832

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Referral Source

Fathers were the least substantiated reporters of physical abuse for victims of both genders. Neighbors also had substantiation rates under 20%. Law enforcement reports had a significantly higher than expected number of substantiated cases for both males and females. Educators did better than expected in reporting cases involving females, while hospital staffs did better than expected when reporting cases involving males (see Tables 16 and 17). There were significantly more substantiated cases involving females reported by educators than there were for males.

Table 16. Reporters of Physical Abuse of Male Victims

REFERRAL SOURCE	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Mother	37	34.9	69	65.1	.6545	106	7.0
Father	11	13.1	73**	86.9	.0002	84	5.6
Self	17	45.9	20	11.3	.1130	37	2.4
Sibling	4	44.4	5	55.6	N/A	9	.6
Other Relatives	24	28.2	61	71.8	.4811	85	5.6
Neighbor	32	19.6	131**	80.4	.0007	163	10.8
Child Care Provider	20	40.0	30	60.0	.3187	50	3.3
Foster Parent	4	80.0	1	20.0	N/A	5	.3
Attorney	3	25.0	9	75.0	N/A	12	.8
Law Enforcement	44*	42.7	59	57.3	.0330	103	6.8
Youth Court	7	63.6	4	36.4	N/A	11	.7
Human Services	29	36.7	50	63.3	.4851	79	5.2
Educators	103	37.9	169	62.1	.0626	272	18.0
Hospital Staff	24**	54.5	20	45.5	.0029	44	2.9
Other Medical	10	26.3	28	73.3	.5299	38	2.5
Residential Staff	0	0	1	100.0	N/A	1	.1
Legal Guardian	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Economic Assistance	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Other	121	29.4	290	70.6	.2189	411	27.2
Total	490	32.4	1,022	67.6		1,512	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 17. Reporters of Female Victims of Physical Abuse

REFERRAL SOURCE	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Mother	35*	46.1	41	53.9	.0194	76	5.2
Father	8	15.1	45**	84.9	.0093	53	3.7
Self	28	41.8	39	58.2	.1506	67	4.6
Sibling	4	33.3	8	66.7	1.0000	12	.8
Other Relatives	22	28.2	56	71.8	.4570	78	5.4
Neighbor	25	18.7	109**	81.3	.0007	134	9.2
Child Care Provider	10	25.0	30	75.0	.3776	40	2.8
Foster Parent	3	50.0	3	50.0	N/A	6	.4
Attorney	1	33.3	2	66.7	N/A	3	.2
Law Enforcement	47**	45.2	57	54.8	.0097	104	7.2
Youth Court	7	36.8	12	63.2	1.0000	19	1.3
Human Services	19	34.5	36	65.5	1.0000	55	3.8
Educators	142**	41.4	201	58.6	.0009	343	23.6
Hospital Staff	14	36.8	24	63.2	.7204	38	2.6
Other Medical	10	32.3	21	67.7	1.0000	31	2.1
Residential Staff	1	16.7	5	83.3	N/A	6	.4
Legal Guardian	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Economic Assistance	0	0	5	100.0	N/A	5	.3
Other	100	26.2	282**	73.8	.0069	382	26.3
Total	476	32.8	976	67.2		1,452	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 18. Substantiated Cases of Physical Abuse
Compared by Sex of Victim and Referral Source

RELATIONSHIP OF REFERRAL SOURCE TO VICTIM	FEMALES		MALES		Chi- Square p	Total Cases
	Substantiated		Substantiated			
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Mother	35	46.1	37	34.9	1.0000	72
Father	8	15.1	11	13.1	.6907	19
Self	28	41.8	17	49.9	.1130	45
Sibling	4	33.3	4	44.4	N/A	8
Other Relatives	22	28.2	24	28.2	1.0000	46
Neighbor	25	18.7	32	19.6	.4908	57
Child Care Provider	10	25.0	20	40.0	.1172	30
Foster Parent	3	50.0	4	80.0	N/A	7
Attorney	1	33.3	3	25.0	N/A	4
Law Enforcement	47	45.2	44	42.7	.7314	91
Youth Court	7	36.8	7	63.8	N/A	14
Human Services	19	34.5	29	36.7	.2293	48
Educators	142**	41.4	103	37.9	.0081	245
Hospital Staff	14	36.8	24	54.5	.1695	38
Other Medical	10	32.3	10	26.3	1.0000	20
Residential Staff	1	16.7	0	0	N/A	1
Other	100	26.2	121	29.4	.1203	221
Total	476	32.8	490	32.4		966

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Perpetrators

Parents were most often the alleged perpetrators of physical abuse. Parents were listed as the suspected abuser in 83.7% of the cases involving females and 80.7% of the cases involving males. Other caretakers were the second highest category for both genders (see Tables 19 and 20).

Table 19. Physical Abuse of Male Victims Compared by Perpetrator Relationship

PERPETRATOR'S RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Parent	375	30.8	843	62.2	.2132	1,218	80.7
Other Caretaker	54	39.1	84	60.9	.1159	138	9.1
Other Household Member	35	39.8	53	60.2	.1793	88	5.8
Licensed Care Provider	5	35.7	9	64.3	N/A	14	.9
Caretaker Substitute	4	40.0	6	60.0	N/A	10	.7
School	1	50.0	1	50.0	N/A	2	.1
Other	16	40.0	24	60.1	.3987	40	2.6
Total	490	32.5	1,020	67.5		1,510	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01*

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 20. Female Cases of Physical Abuse Compared by Perpetrator Relationship

PERPETRATOR'S RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Parent	385	31.7	828	68.3	.4067	1,213	83.7
Other Caretaker	39	36.8	67	63.2	.4535	106	7.3
Other Household Member	37**	50.0	37	50.0	.0026	74	5.1
Licensed Care Provider	4	30.8	9	69.2	N/A	13	.9
Caretaker Substitute	0	0	4	100.0	N/A	4	.3
School	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	
Other	11	28.2	28	71.8	.6501	39	2.7
Total	476	32.9	973	67.1		1,449	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Summary

Significant differences existed between substantiated and unsubstantiated reports based on the demographic attributes contained in those reports.

Gender: There was a significant difference in the ratio male to female victims as compared to the representation of each gender in the general population.

Age: As age increased, the substantiation rate increases for both sexes. Physical abuse was more likely to be substantiated for younger boys and for older girls.

Ethnicity: Cases involving Native American victims represented a lower proportion of the total physical abuse cases than of all abuse and neglect cases together. Caucasians were represented at a rate higher than expected based on their proportion of all abuse and neglect cases.

Referral Source: Substantiation rates varied greatly depending on the source of the report.

Perpetrators: Parents constituted the largest group of alleged perpetrators, but other household members had a significantly greater rate of substantiation for cases involving female victims.

Significant demographic differences were demonstrated between cases in which physical abuse was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated. Therefore, the second null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 3 - Emotional Abuse

The third null hypothesis posited that there is no demographic difference between cases in which emotional abuse is reported and substantiated and those in which it is reported and not substantiated.

Emotional abuse includes three subcategories: (a) Close confinement such as tying, binding, or confining a child to an enclosed area as a means of punishment; (b) verbal or emotional assault such as habitual patterns of belittling, denigrating, scapegoating, rejecting, or threatening with physical or sexual assault or abandonment; and (c) other or unknown abuse which includes attempted or potential physical or sexual assault, intentional withholding of food, shelter, or sleep as a punishment, or economic exploitation. There were 1,336 cases of physical abuse reported in 1991. Of that number, 710 or 53.1% were substantiated.

An evaluation of the data regarding physical abuse was conducted in order to determine if there were differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated cases based on age, gender, or race of the victim, the identity of the referral source, or the relationship of the perpetrator to the victim.

Gender

There were significantly more reports of female emotional abuse than male. The chi-square p for this comparison was .0068. The overall substantiation rate of 53.1% was second only to the substantiation rate for emotional neglect. Of the reports involving male victims, 51.8% were substantiated. The rate for female victims was 54.3% (see Table 21).

Table 21. Emotional Abuse Reports by Gender of Victim

Gender	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent
Male	320	51.8	298	48.2	618	46.3
Female	390	54.3	328	45.7	718	53.7
Total	710	53.1	626	46.9	1,336	100.0%

Age

There was a major difference in the reporting trends of emotional abuse between males and females. The percentage of the total reports filed for this category remained fairly constant across the age groups. For example, the category Females 2-3 contained 11.3% of all emotional abuse reports for females, and the category Females 16-17 contained 11.2%.

The percentage of total emotional abuse reports for boys trended consistently lower, from 14.6% for the 2-3 age group to 5.1% for the 16-17 group (see Tables 22 and 23).

Table 22. Male Emotional Abuse Reports by Victim Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
0-1	20	43.5	26	54.3	.3194	46	7.8
2-3	32	37.2	54**	62.8	.0088	86	14.6
4-5	57	58.8	40	41.2	.2109	97	16.4
6-7	45	50.0	45	50.0	.7985	90	15.2
8-9	39	55.7	31	44.3	.6037	70	11.8
10-11	49*	65.3	26	34.7	.0269	75	12.7
12-13	26	53.1	23	46.9	1.0000	49	8.3
14-15	26	54.2	22	45.8	.8651	48	8.1
16-17	26	43.3	17	56.7	.4494	30	5.1
Total	307	51.9	284	48.1		591	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

Table 23. Female Emotional Abuse Reports by Victim Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
0-1	21	45.7	25	54.3	1.0000	46	6.6
2-3	37	46.8	42	53.2	1.0000	79	11.3
4-5	39	55.7	31	44.3	.1183	70	10.0
6-7	44	51.2	42	48.8	.3635	86	12.3
8-9	51*	60.0	34	40.0	.0112	85	12.2
10-11	51**	67.1	25	32.9	.0003	76	10.9
12-13	44	47.3	49	52.7	.8353	93	13.3
14-15	56**	65.1	30	34.9	.0005	86	12.3
16-17	38	48.7	40	51.3	.6735	78	11.2
Total	381	54.5	318	45.5		699	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

The substantiation rates for female victims aged 10 and 11 were higher than expected for both genders. Additionally, the substantiation rates were higher than expected for females in the 8-9 and 14-15 age groups. The 10-11 females had the highest substantiation rate at 67.1%, while the males 2-3 had the lowest at 37.2%.

Emotional abuse of boys aged 4 and 5 was significantly more likely to be substantiated than it was for girls the same age. Not only were there significantly more cases of emotional abuse reported for older girls than boys, but the substantiation rate was also significantly higher for females in the 14-15 and 16-17 age groups (see Table 24).

Table 24. Substantiated Cases of Emotional Abuse Female Compared to Male by Age Group

Age	FEMALES Substantiated		MALES Substantiated		Chi-Square p	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
0-1	21	45.7	20	43.5	.7029	41
2-3	37	46.8	32	37.2	.8604	69
4-5	39	55.7	57**	58.8	.0050	96
6-7	44	51.2	45	50.0	.3054	89
8-9	51	60.0	39	55.7	.8920	90
10-11	51	67.1	49	65.3	.4327	100
12-13	44	47.3	26	53.1	.2564	70
14-15	56*	65.1	26	54.2	.0252	82
16-17	38**	48.7	13	43.3	.0092	51
Total	381	54.5	307	51.9		688

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

Ethnicity

Caucasian victims were significantly overrepresented for both genders in reports of physical neglect at $\alpha < .01$. The p was .0001 for the 90.1% of cases which the Caucasian boys represented and the 89.3% which the Caucasian girls represented. These were measured against the overall rate 80.2% for all types of abuse and neglect cases involving Caucasian victims. Native American children were identified as victims significantly less often than expected at the same alpha level and p (see Tables 25 and 26).

Table 25. Cases of Emotional Abuse by Male Victim's Ethnicity

ETHNICITY OF MALE VICTIMS	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Caucasian	259	53.6	224	46.4	1.0000	483	90.1
Native American	14	48.3	15	51.7	.7055	29	5.4
Hispanic	7	58.3	5	41.7	1.0000	12	2.2
Black	3	42.9	4	57.1	N/A	7	1.3
Asian	1	50.0	1	50.0	N/A	2	.4
Vietnamese	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Alaskan	3	100.0	0	0	N/A	3	.6
Total	287	53.5	249	46.5		536	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at $\alpha < .01$

* Significantly greater than expected at $\alpha < .05$

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 26. Cases of Emotional Abuse by Female Victim's Ethnicity

ETHNICITY OF FEMALE VICTIMS	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Caucasian	296	54.3	249	45.7	1.0000	545	89.9
Native American	25	50.0	25	50.0	.6395	50	8.2
Hispanic	3	42.9	4	57.1	N/A	7	1.1
Black	6	85.7	1	14.3	N/A	7	1.1
Asian	1	100.0	0	0	N/A	1	.2
Vietnamese	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Alaskan	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Total	331	54.3	279	45.7		610	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Referral Source

Siblings had the highest rate of substantiation for both genders. Every time a sibling reported that a brother was being emotionally abused, the report was substantiated. When a sibling reported that a sister was the victim of emotional abuse, 85.7% of the incidents were substantiated. Only 2 of the 21 incidents reported by siblings were not substantiated following investigation.

Law enforcement had a significantly higher than expected rate of substantiation than expected for both sexes. Of 133 reports filed by law enforcement, 99 were substantiated. Fathers once again had a significantly lower rate of substantiation than expected (see Tables 27 and 28).

Table 27. Reporters of Emotional Abuse of Male Victims

Referral Source	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Mother	29	63.0	17	37.0	.1722	46	7.4
Father	10	30.3	23*	69.7	.0209	33	5.3
Self	13	54.2	11	45.8	1.0000	24	3.9
Sibling	7	100.0	0	0	N/A	7	1.1
Other Relatives	22	48.9	23	51.1	.7986	45	7.3
Neighbor	41	45.1	50	54.9	.2294	91	14.7
Child Care Provider	6	46.2	7	53.8	1.0000	13	2.1
Foster Parent	3	75.0	1	25.0	N/A	4	.6
Attorney	4	66.7	2	33.3	N/A	6	1.0
Law Enforcement	45*	67.2	22	32.8	.0174	67	10.8
Youth Court	3	50.0	3	50.0	N/A	6	1.0
Human Services	11	50.0	11	50.0	1.0000	22	3.6
Educators	55	56.1	43	43.9	.4620	98	15.9
Hospital Staff	2	25.0	6	75.0	N/A	8	1.3
Other Medical	6	54.5	5	45.5	1.0000	11	1.8
Residential Staff	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Legal Guardian	2	100.0	0	0	N/A	2	.3
Economic Assistance	0	0	1	100.0	N/A	1	.2
Other	61	45.5	73	54.5	.1642	134	21.7
Total	320	51.9	297	48.1		618	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 28. Reporters of Emotional Abuse of Female Victims

REFERRAL SOURCE	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Mother	17	65.4	9	34.6	.3484	26	3.6
Father	13	37.1	22	62.9	.0618	35	4.9
Self	25	49.0	26	51.0	.5376	51	7.1
Sibling	12*	85.7	2	14.3	.0365	14	1.9
Other Relatives	43	58.9	30	41.1	.5015	73	10.2
Neighbor	42	49.4	43	50.6	.4261	85	11.8
Child Care Provider	5	50.0	5	50.0	1.0000	10	1.4
Foster Parent	3	100.0	0	0	N/A	3	.4
Attorney	3	50.0	3	50.0	N/A	6	.8
Law Enforcement	54**	81.8	12	18.2	.0001	66	9.2
Youth Court	0		1	100.0	N/A	1	.1
Human Services	7	31.8	15	68.2	.0571	22	3.1
Educators	82	56.6	63	43.4	.6448	145	20.2
Hospital Staff	6	46.2	7	53.8	.7556	13	1.8
Other Medical	4	50.0	4	50.0	N/A	8	1.1
Residential Staff	4	66.7	2	33.3	N/A	6	.8
Legal Guardian	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Economic Assistance	0	0	2	100.0	N/A	2	.3
Other	70	46.1	82*	53.9	.0500	152	21.2
Total	390	54.3	328	45.7		718	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Only 23 out of 68 cases of emotional abuse reported by fathers were substantiated by DFS investigations. For females the only reporting category with a lower rate than fathers was human services. This category which includes counselors had a substantiation rate of only 31.8%

Perpetrators

Licensed care providers, other caretakers, and other household members were the perpetrator categories with the highest percentages of substantiated reports (see Table 29).

Table 29. Cases of Emotional Abuse Compared by Perpetrator Relationship

Perpetrator Relationship	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		Cases	Percent
Parent	583	51.0	561	49.0	.1368	1,144	85.7
Other Caretaker	69**	67.6	33	32.4	.0047	102	7.6
Other Household Member	30	66.7	15	33.3	.0967	45	3.4
Licensed Care Provider	9	81.8	2	18.2	.1096	11	.8
Caretaker Substitute	2	28.6	5	71.4	N/A	7	.5
School	0	0	1	100.0	N/A	1	.1
Other	17	68.0	8	32.0	.1996	17	1.9
Total	710	53.2	625	46.8		1,335	100.0

Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Parents were the alleged perpetrators in 85.7% of the reported incidents of emotional abuse. Fifty-one percent of the reports in which parents were the alleged abusers were substantiated.

Summary

Significant differences existed between substantiated and unsubstantiated reports of emotional abuse based on the demographic attributes contained in those reports.

Gender: There was a significant difference in the ratio of male to female victims as compared to the representation of each gender in the general population.

Age: Emotional abuse was more likely to be substantiated for younger boys and for older girls.

Ethnicity: Cases involving Native American victims represented a lower than expected proportion of the total emotional abuse cases. Caucasian victims were reported at a rate higher than expected.

Referral Source: Substantiation rates varied greatly depending on the source of the report.

Perpetrators: Parents constituted the largest group of alleged perpetrators. Siblings had a significantly greater rate of substantiation for cases involving female victims.

Significant demographic differences were demonstrated between cases in which emotional abuse was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated. The third null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 4 - Sexual Abuse

The fourth null hypothesis posits that there is no significant demographic difference between cases in which sexual abuse is reported and substantiated and those in which it is reported and not substantiated.

Sexual abuse was divided into three subcategories: (a) Intrusion, which was actual penile penetration; (b) molestation with genital contact, where genital contact had occurred, but there was no indication of intrusion; and (c) other or unknown which includes unspecified acts not known to have involved the genitals such as fondling of breasts or buttocks or exposure. There were 1,303 reports alleging sexual abuse of children investigated during 1991. Of this total, 484 or 37.1% were substantiated and 819 or 62.9% were not.

An evaluation of the data regarding sexual abuse was conducted in order to determine if there were differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated cases based on age, gender or race of the victim, the identity of the referral source, or the relationship of the perpetrator to the victim.

Gender

There were almost 3 times as many sexual abuse cases involving female victims as males. Of the 942 reports involving female victims, 362 or 38.4% were substantiated. There were 361 reports involving male victims of which 122 or 33.8% were substantiated (see Table 30).

Table 30. Sexual Abuse Reports by Gender

Gender	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent
Male	122	33.8	239	66.2	361	27.7
Female	362	38.4	580	61.6	942	72.3
Total	484	37.1	819	62.9	1,303	100.0%

Age

The rate of substantiation tended to increase for both genders with age. For males the rate of substantiation for the 0-1 age group was 21.4%. The rate for the 16-17 age group was 70.0%. For females the rate of substantiation for the 0-1 age group was 11.4% with only 31 out of 35 cases not substantiated. For the female 14-15 age category, 59.8% or 64 out of 107 reports were substantiated (see Tables 31 and 32).

Reported incidents of males peaked in the 6-7 age group with 70, while the 4-5 and 8-9 age groups had 68 reports. These three male age categories accounted for more substantiated cases than the other six age groups combined.

Table 31. Sexual Abuse Reports by Male Victim's Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
0-1	3	21.4	11	78.6	.4726	14	4.0
2-3	13	31.7	28	68.3	1.0000	41	11.8
4-5	23	33.8	45	66.2	1.0000	68	19.7
6-7	25	35.7	45	64.3	.8738	70	20.2
8-9	15	22.1	53	77.9*	.0492	68	19.7
10-11	9	27.3	24	72.7	.5197	33	9.5
12-13	12	52.2	11	47.8	.1077	23	6.6
14-15	11	57.9	8	42.1	.0517	19	5.5
16-17	7	70.0	3	30.0	N/A	10	2.9
Total	118	34.1	228	65.9		346	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Reported incidents for girls peaked in the 10-11 age group with 144. The female 10-11, 12-13, and 14-15 age categories accounted for only 41.1% of the reports but accounted for over half of the total substantiations. Cases involving girls in the 0-1 and 2-3 age groups were substantiated significantly less frequently than expected. Cases involving girls in the 12-13 and 14-15 were substantiated at a significantly higher rate than expected.

Table 32. Sexual Abuse Reports by Female Victim's Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
0-1	4	11.4	31**	88.6	.0020	35	3.9
2-3	20	22.0	71**	78.0	.0021	91	10.1
4-5	38	32.2	80	67.8	.2128	118	13.1
6-7	38	33.0	77	67.0	.2973	115	12.7
8-9	39	37.1	66	62.9	.9025	105	11.6
10-11	49	34.0	95	66.0	.3448	144	16.0
12-13	62	51.7**	58	48.3	.0033	120	13.3
14-15	64	59.8**	43	40.2	.0001	107	11.9
16-17	31	46.3	36	53.7	.2174	67	7.4
Total	345	38.2	557	61.8		902	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Ethnicity

Race was not a significant independent variable in sexual abuse cases (see Tables 33 and 34).

Table 33. Cases of Sexual Abuse of Males by Ethnicity

ETHNICITY OF VICTIM	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square p	Total Cases	Percent Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Caucasian	97	36.3	170	63.7	.7998	267	88.4
Native American	10	37.0	17	63.0	1.0000	27	8.9
Hispanic	0	0	7	100.0	N/A	7	2.3
Black	0	0	1	100.0	N/A	1	.3
Asian	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Vietnamese	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Alaskan	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Total	107	35.4	195	64.6		302	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01
 * Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05
 N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 34. Cases of Sexual Abuse of Females by Ethnicity

ETHNICITY OF VICTIM	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Caucasian	294	40.7	428	59.3	.5637	722	89.9
Native American	17	27.0	46	73.0	.0550	63	7.8
Hispanic	4	44.4	5	55.6	N/A	9	1.1
Black	1	50.0	1	50.0	N/A	2	.2
Asian	2	40.0	3	60.0	N/A	5	.6
Vietnamese	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Alaskan	0	0	2	100.0	N/A	2	.2
Total	318	39.6	485	60.4		803	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01
 * Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05
 N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Referral Source

Sexual abuse of males was reported by the victims' mothers more often than any other identified source. The only category that differed from the expected rate for males was other relatives. For this category only 3 out of 25 reports or 12.0% were substantiated. Of possible interest, only 3 out of 17 male sexual abuse cases reported by human services workers were substantiated (see Table 35).

Sexual abuse of females was reported by educators more often than any other identified source. Mothers were the second highest identified source, followed by other relatives, law enforcement, and human services. Reports filed by girls (self) claiming to have been abused had a significantly higher than average rate of substantiation at 62.2%. Law enforcement referrals on female victims also had a significantly higher than expected rate of substantiation at 58.5%. Only 2 out of 20 female sexual abuse cases reported by child care providers were substantiated, a rate significantly lower than expected (see Table 36).

Over 27% of all reports of sexual abuse were filed by the miscellaneous category titled "Other."

Table 35. Reporters of Sexual Abuse of Male Victims

REFERRAL SOURCE	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Mother	27	42.9	36	57.7	.1656	63	17.5
Father	6	37.5	10	62.5	1.0000	16	4.4
Self	3	50.0	3	50.0	N/A	6	1.7
Sibling	0	0	3	100.0	N/A	3	.8
Other Relatives	3	12.0	22**	88.0	.0364	25	6.9
Neighbor	6	26.1	17	73.9	.5744	23	6.4
Child Care Provider	4	44.4	5	55.6	N/A	9	2.5
Foster Parent	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Attorney	0	0	1	100.0	N/A	1	.3
Law Enforcement	10	50.0	10	50.0	.1952	20	5.5
Youth Court	1	33.3	2	66.7	N/A	3	.8
Human Services	3	17.6	14	82.4	.2595	17	4.7
Educators	10	26.3	28	73.9	.4215	38	10.5
Hospital Staff	9	60.0	6	40.0	.0612	15	4.2
Other Medical	5	26.3	14	73.7	.6548	19	5.3
Residential Staff	2	66.7	1	33.3	N/A	3	.8
Legal Guardian	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Economic Assistance	1	100.0	0	0	N/A	1	.3
Other	32	32.3	67	67.7	.8380	99	27.4
Total	122	33.8	239	66.2		361	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 36. Reporters of Sexual Abuse of Females

REFERRAL SOURCE	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Mother	42	42.0	58	58.0	.5239	100	10.6
Father	9	37.5	15	62.5	1.0000	24	2.5
Self	23**	62.2	14	37.8	.0051	37	3.9
Sibling	3	30.0	7	70.0	1.0000	10	1.1
Other Relatives	19	27.5	50	72.5	.0833	69	7.3
Neighbor	7	24.1	22	75.9	.1651	29	3.1
Child Care Provider	2	8.3	22**	91.7	.0048	24	2.5
Foster Parent	5	71.4	2	28.6	N/A	7	.7
Attorney	5	62.5	3	37.5	N/A	8	.8
Law Enforcement	38**	58.5	27	41.5	.0014	65	6.9
Youth Court	3	27.3	8	72.9	N/A	11	1.2
Human Services	24	38.7	38	61.3	1.0000	62	6.6
Educators	63	43.2	83	56.8	.2734	146	15.5
Hospital Staff	11	37.9	18	62.1	1.0000	29	3.1
Other Medical	24	44.4	30	55.6	.4393	54	5.7
Residential Staff	1	20.0	4	80.0	N/A	5	.5
Legal Guardian	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Economic Assistance	0	0	3	100.0	N/A	3	.3
Other	83	32.0	176**	68.0	.0415	259	27.4
Total	362	38.4	580	61.6		942	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Perpetrators

This variable stands out because of the manner in which it differed for sexual abuse as compared to all other types of abuse and neglect. Parents were listed as the perpetrators in 85% of the abuse and neglect reports filed with DFS in 1991. Parents were the alleged perpetrators in only 40.9% of the reported incidents of sexual abuse (see Table 37). Overall, only 28% of the accusations against parents were substantiated (see Table 37).

Table 37. Parents Reported as Perpetrators by Category

Type of Abuse or Neglect	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Physical Abuse	760	31.3	1,671	68.7	2,431	82.2
Emotional Abuse	561	49.0	583	51.0	1,144	85.7
Sexual Abuse	149	28.0	383	72.0	532	40.9
Physical Neglect	1,868	34.1	3,604	65.9	5,472	95.7
Emotional Neglect	393	54.4	330	45.6	723	93.7
Medical Neglect	110	34.3	211	65.7	321	95.5
Educational Neglect	84	48.0	91	52.0	175	95.6
Total	3,925	36.3	6,873	63.7	10,798	85.6

Only 36.1% of the reports involving boys and 42.7% of the cases involving girls allege that a parent was the perpetrator. Substantiation rates were also the lowest for

sexual abuse. Only 18.5% of the male sexual abuse cases with parents as the alleged perpetrators were substantiated. For cases of female sexual abuse, that percentage rose to 31.1% (see Tables 38 and 39).

Table 38. Male Cases of Sexual Abuse Compared by Perpetrator Relationship

Perpetrator Relationship	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Parent	24	18.5	106	81.5	.0004	130	36.1
Other Caretaker	12	32.4	25	67.6	1.0000	37	10.3
Other Household Member	15	32.6	31	67.4	1.0000	46	12.8
Licensed Care Provider	1	25.0	3	75.0	N/A	4	1.1
Caretaker Substitute	3	37.5	5	62.5	N/A	8	2.2
School	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Other	66**	48.9	69	51.1	.0002	135	37.5
Total	121	33.6	239	66.4		360	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

The "Other" category accounts for 37.5% of the reports with male victims and 30.1% of the reports with female victims. Other household members account for 158 or 16.8% of the cases alleging sexual abuse of females. For males, other household members account for 46 or 12.8% of the cases (see Tables 38 and 39).

Table 39. Female Cases of Sexual Abuse by Perpetrator Relationship

Perpetrator Relationship	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Parent	125	31.1	277**	68.9	.0031	402	42.7
Other Caretaker	31	40.3	46	59.7	.8271	77	8.2
Other Household Member	69	43.7	89	56.3	.2004	158	16.8
Licensed Care Provider	0	0	5	100.0	N/A	5	.5
Caretaker Substitute	10	62.5	6	37.5	.0845	16	1.7
School	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Other	127**	44.7	157	55.3	.0333	284	30.1
Total	362	38.4	580	61.6		942	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Summary

Significant differences existed between substantiated and unsubstantiated reports of sexual abuse based on the demographic attributes contained in those reports.

Gender: There was a significant difference in the ratio of male to female victims as compared to the representation of each gender in the general population. Other significant differences between genders were found when that variable was viewed in conjunction with the variables of age, referral source, and perpetrator relationship.

Age: Sexual abuse was more likely to be substantiated as the age of the victim increased. Reports involving female victims were substantiated at a significantly lower rate than expected for younger girls and at a significantly higher rate than expected for older girls.

Ethnicity: Cases involving Native American victims represented a lower proportion of the total sexual abuse cases than of all abuse and neglect cases together. Caucasians were represented at a rate higher than expected based on their proportion of all abuse and neglect cases. Race was not a significant independent variable in determining substantiation rates for sexual abuse cases.

Referral Source: Substantiation rates varied greatly depending on the source of the report.

Perpetrators: Parents had the lowest substantiation rate for sexual abuse and were reported as the perpetrators less frequently in this category than any other.

Significant demographic differences were demonstrated between cases in which sexual abuse was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated. Therefore, the fourth null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 5 - Physical Neglect

The fifth null hypothesis states that there is no significant demographic difference between cases in which physical neglect is reported and substantiated and those in which it is reported and not substantiated.

Physical neglect included abandonment, expulsion from the home without other arrangements being made, custody related inattention to a child's needs, inadequate supervision, and inattention or inadequate nutrition, clothing, hygiene, safety or welfare.

An evaluation of the data regarding sexual abuse was conducted in order to determine if there were differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated cases based on age, gender or race of the victim, the referral source, or the relationship of the perpetrator to the victim.

With 5,722 reported cases, physical neglect had the highest incidence of all the categories of abuse and neglect. Only physical abuse had a substantiation rate lower than physical neglect's 34.7%. However, even with that low substantiation rate, there were over 1,000 more cases of physical neglect substantiated than the next highest category (see Table 1).

Gender

Males accounted for 51.6% of the reported cases of physical neglect and females for 48.4%. Gender does not appear to affect the overall substantiation rate for physical neglect (see Table 40).

Table 40. Physical Neglect Reports by Gender

Gender	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent
Male	1,034	35.0	1,919	65.0	2,953	51.6
Female	954	34.5	1,815	65.5	2,769	48.4
Total	1,988	34.7	3,734	65.3	5,722	100.0%

Age

The volume of reports declined as children grew older. This was true for both genders, but the drop was more precipitous for males. Cases involving male victims ranged from a high of 556 for the 0-1 age group to a low of 63 for the 16-17 age category. Cases involving female victims ranged from a high of 533 for the 0-1 age group to a low of 109 for the 16-17 age category.

Substantiation rates for female victims showed no significant variation from the mean across age groups. Male victims, however, had a significant drop in rate of substantiation from a high of 39.9% for the 2-3 age group to a low of 21.1% for the 14-15 age group (see Tables 41 and 42).

Table 41. Physical Neglect Reports by Male Victim's Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
0-1	206	37.1	350	62.9	.4717	556	19.5
2-3	194*	39.9	292	60.1	.0468	486	17.1
4-5	165	39.7	251	60.3	.0848	416	14.6
6-7	126	34.1	244	65.9	.5982	370	13.0
8-9	133	36.1	235	63.9	.8394	368	12.9
10-11	90	32.1	190	67.9	.2663	280	9.8
12-13	56	30.6	127	69.4	.1910	183	6.4
14-15	26	21.1	97**	78.9	.0012	123	4.3
16-17	14	22.2	49*	77.8	.0384	63	2.2
Total	1,010	35.5	1,835	64.5		2,845	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

Table 42. Female Physical Neglect Reports by Victim Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
0-1	197	37.0	336	63.0	.3165	533	19.7
2-3	160	35.0	297	65.0	1.0000	457	16.9
4-5	136	37.5	227	62.5	.3120	363	13.4
6-7	115	32.8	234	67.2	.4574	348	12.9
8-9	98	33.1	198	66.9	.5823	296	10.9
10-11	88	34.2	169	65.8	.9024	257	9.5
12-13	75	36.8	129	63.2	.6061	204	7.5
14-15	43	30.5	98	69.5	.3249	141	5.2
16-17	32	29.4	77	70.6	.2747	109	4.0
Total	943	34.8	1,765	65.2		2,708	100.0

Ethnicity

Native Americans were overrepresented in the category of physical neglect. Native Americans were victims in 20.6% of the reports involving physically neglected males and 23.1% of the reports involving physically neglected females. Native American victims also had significantly higher than expected substantiation rates for both genders. Caucasian victims were underrepresented in terms of total reports and had significantly lower than expected rates of substantiation for both genders (see Tables 43 and 44).

Table 43. Physical Neglect by Ethnicity of Male Victims

ETHNICITY OF VICTIM	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square P	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Caucasian	612	32.8	1,255**	67.2	.0040	1,687	75.6
Native American	246**	48.4	262	51.6	.0001	508	20.6
Hispanic	14	27.5	37	72.5	.2601	51	2.1
Black	11	44.0	14	56.0	.5320	25	1.0
Asian	2	20.0	8	80.0	N/A	10	.4
Vietnamese	0	0	4	100.0	N/A	4	.2
Alaskan	3	100.0	0	0	N/A	3	.1
Total	888	36.0	1,580	64.0		2,468	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 44. Female Physical Neglect by Ethnicity

ETHNICITY OF VICTIM	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Caucasian	565	32.5	1,172**	67.5	.0037	1,737	73.3
Native American	255**	46.5	293	53.5	.0001	584	23.1
Hispanic	16	36.4	28	63.6	1.0000	44	1.9
Black	14	38.9	22	61.1	.8414	36	1.5
Asian	1	20.0	4	80.0	N/A	5	.2
Vietnamese	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Alaskan	1	100.0	0	0	N/A	1	.0
Total	852	35.9	1,519	64.1		2,371	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Referral Source

Neighbors reported more cases of physical neglect for both genders than any other identified source but had a lower than expected rate of substantiation. Law enforcement was the second most frequent source for both genders. Law enforcement also had the highest rate of substantiation for both genders; 67.0% for male victims and 68.4% for female victims.

Child care providers and nonhospital (other) medical personal had significantly higher than expected rates of substantiation for male victims of physical neglect. Fathers, other relatives, neighbors, and educators all had lower than expected rates of substantiation in cases involving male victims. Only 25 out of 149 or 16.8% of the reports made by fathers of physical neglect of their sons were substantiated.

Mothers, child care providers, law enforcement, youth courts, and the victims themselves all had higher than expected rates of substantiation for reports involving female victims. Fathers had the lowest rate of substantiation as reporters of physical neglect of their daughters. Only 19 out of 140 or 13.6% of the reports filed by fathers regarding physical neglect of their daughters were substantiated (see Tables 45 and 46).

More cases fell into the other or unidentified category than into any of the identified referral sources. Of physical neglect cases involving female victims, 28.8% were in the other category as were 27.2% of the physical neglect cases involving male victims.

Table 45. Reporters of Physical Neglect of Male Victims

REFERRAL SOURCE	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Mother	28	28.6	70	71.4	.2193	98	3.3
Father	25	16.8	124*	83.2	.0001	149	5.0
Self	12	29.3	29	70.7	.5447	41	1.4
Sibling	10	52.6	9	47.4	.1704	19	.6
Other Relatives	67	27.2	179*	72.8	.0129	246	8.3
Neighbor	160	30.5	364*	69.5	.0360	524	17.7
Child Care Provider	51**	49.5	52	50.5	.0028	103	3.5
Foster Parent	4	66.7	2	33.3	N/A	6	.2
Attorney	9	47.4	10	52.6	.3736	19	.6
Law Enforcement	266**	67.0	131	33.0	.0001	397	13.4
Youth Court	6	37.5	10	62.5	1.0000	16	.5
Human Services	37	33.6	73	66.4	.8416	110	3.7
Educators	78	27.1	210**	72.9	.0059	288	9.8
Hospital Staff	19	32.2	40	67.8	.7536	59	2.0
Other Medical	29*	50.0	29	50.0	.0240	58	2.0
Residential Staff	1	25.0	3	75.0	N/A	4	.1
Legal Guardian	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Economic Assistance	5	35.7	9	64.3	1.0000	14	.5
Other	227	28.3	575**	71.7	.0001	802	27.2
Total	1,034	35.0	1,919	65.0		2,953	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 46. Reporters of Physical Neglect of Female Victims

REFERRAL SOURCE	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Mother	20	22.7	68*	77.3	.0270	88	3.2
Father	19	13.6	121**	86.4	.0001	140	5.1
Self	23*	51.1	22	48.9	.0287	45	1.6
Sibling	12	42.9	16	57.1	.4645	28	1.0
Other Relatives	75	31.9	160	68.1	.4443	235	8.5
Neighbor	145	30.7	328	69.3	.0872	473	17.1
Child Care Provider	41**	51.3	39	48.8	.0024	80	2.9
Foster Parent	6	66.7	3	33.3	N/A	9	.3
Attorney	4	40.0	6	60.0	N/A	10	.4
Law Enforcement	229**	68.4	106	31.6	.0001	335	12.1
Youth Court	13*	59.1	9	40.0	.0277	22	.8
Human Services	32	29.6	76	70.4	.3353	108	3.9
Educators	76	28.9	187	71.1	.0648	263	9.5
Hospital Staff	22	37.3	37	62.7	.7538	59	2.1
Other Medical	24	41.4	34	58.6	.3350	58	2.1
Residential Staff	1	16.7	5	83.3	N/A	6	.2
Legal Guardian	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Economic Assistance	4	30.8	9	69.2	N/A	13	.5
Other	208	26.1	589**	73.9	.0001	797	28.8
Total	954	34.5	1,815	65.5		2,769	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

More cases fell into the other or unidentified category than into any of the identified referral sources. Of physical neglect cases involving female victims, 28.8% were in the other category as were 27.2% of the physical neglect cases involving male victims.

Perpetrators

Parents were reported as the perpetrators in 95.8% of all physical neglect cases involving males and 95.6% of all physical neglect cases involving females. Other caretakers had a higher than expected substantiation rate for both genders (see Tables 47 and 48).

Table 47. Perpetrators of Physical Neglect of Male Victims

PERPETRATOR RELATIONSHIP	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Parent	973	34.4	1,852	65.6	.4761	2,825	95.8
Other Caretaker	38	48.7	40	51.3	.0163	78	2.6
Other Household Member	5	29.4	12	70.6	1.0000	17	.6
Licensed Care Provider	5	45.5	6	54.5	.6865	11	.4
Caretaker Substitute	6	75.0	2	25.0	N/A	8	.3
Other	7	70.0	3	30.0	N/A	10	.3
Total	1,034	35.1	1,915	64.9		2,949	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Table 48. Perpetrators of Physical Neglect of Females

PERPETRATOR RELATIONSHIP	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi- Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Parent	894	33.8	1,753	66.2	.4525	2,646	95.6
Other Caretaker	42*	47.7	46	52.3	.0125	88	3.2
Other Household Member	3	33.3	6	66.7	N/A	9	.3
Licensed Care Provider	1	16.7	5	83.3	N/A	6	.2
Caretaker Substitute	10	83.3	2	16.7	N/A	12	.4
School	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Other	4	50.0	4	50.0	N/A	8	.3
Total	954	34.5	1,815	65.5		2,769	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Summary

Significant differences existed between substantiated and unsubstantiated reports of physical neglect based on the demographic attributes contained in those reports.

Gender: There was a significant difference in the ratio male-to-female victims as compared to the representation of each gender in the general population. Other significant differences between genders were found when that variable was viewed in conjunction with the variables of age, ethnicity, referral source, and perpetrator relationship.

Age: Physical neglect reports decreased as the age level of victims increased. Physical neglect of males was significantly less likely to be substantiated as the age of the victim increased.

Ethnicity: Cases involving Native American victims represented a higher proportion of the total physical neglect cases than expected. Physical neglect cases involving either gender were significantly more likely to be substantiated if the victim was Native American and significantly less likely if the victim was Caucasian.

Referral Source: Substantiation rates varied significantly depending on the source of the report.

Perpetrators: Physical abuse cases involving females with other caretakers as the alleged perpetrators were significantly more likely to be substantiated than would be expected.

Significant demographic differences were demonstrated between cases in which physical neglect was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated. Therefore, the fifth null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 6 - Emotional Neglect

The sixth null hypothesis stated that there was no significant demographic difference between cases in which

emotional neglect was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated.

Emotional neglect included inadequate nurturance or affection, chronic or extreme spouse abuse, permitted drug or alcohol abuse, permitted maladaptive behavior such as delinquency, refusal or delay of psychological care, and neglect of developmental or emotional needs. There were 773 cases of emotional neglect investigated by DFS during 1991. The substantiation rate of 54.7% for emotional abuse was greater than that of any other type of abuse or neglect.

An evaluation of the data regarding sexual abuse was conducted in order to determine if there were differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated cases based on age, gender or race of the victim, the identity of the referral source, or the relationship of the perpetrator to the victim. Chi-square formulae were used to determine whether substantiation rates for categories within these independent variables differed significantly from the average or mean substantiation rate for that variable.

Gender

Gender was not a significant variable by itself in the evaluation of substantiation rates of emotional neglect. Cases were fairly evenly divided between male and female victims (see Table 49).

Table 49. Emotional Neglect Reports by Gender

Gender	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Male	205	53.5	178	46.5	383	49.5
Female	218	55.9	172	44.1	390	50.5
Total	423	54.7	350	45.3	773	100.0%

Age

No firm trends appeared in analysis of the age variable for victims of emotional neglect. The number of reports involving boys dropped for the two oldest age categories, but substantiation rates did not differ significantly from the mean. The boys 10-11 age group had the highest number of reports and the highest rate of substantiation. Girls of the same age had the fewest reports and the lowest substantiation rate. Of all age groups for both genders, only the male 6-7 category differed significantly from the mean. This group had the lowest substantiation rate for male victims of emotional neglect (see Tables 50 and 51).

Table 50. Emotional Neglect Reports by Male Victim's Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
0-1	29	60.4	19	39.6	.4803	48	13.0
2-3	28	60.9	18	39.1	.4554	46	12.4
4-5	23	54.8	19	45.2	1.0000	42	11.4
6-7	18	37.5	30*	62.5	.0284	48	13.0
8-9	26	59.1	18	40.9	.6265	44	11.9
10-11	34	58.6	24	41.4	.5970	58	15.7
12-13	20	50.0	20	50.0	.6986	40	10.8
14-15	11	44.0	14	56.0	.4048	25	6.8
16-17	12	63.2	7	36.8	.5859	19	5.1
Total	201	54.3	169	45.7		370	100.0

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

Table 51. Female Emotional Neglect Reports by Victim Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
0-1	25	59.5	17	40.5	.8512	42	11.0
2-3	31	63.3	18	36.7	.4499	49	12.8
4-5	18	56.3	14	43.8	1.0000	32	8.4
6-7	32	58.2	23	41.8	1.0000	55	14.4
8-9	24	53.3	21	46.9	.7394	45	11.7
10-11	16	55.2	13	44.8	1.0000	29	7.6
12-13	20	46.5	23	53.5	.2219	43	11.2
14-15	33	61.1	21	38.9	.6259	54	14.1
16-17	19	55.9	15	44.1	1.0000	34	8.9
Total	218	56.9	165	43.1		283	100.0

Ethnicity

Reports of emotional neglect involving Native American children were substantiated more often than expected (see Table 52).

Table 52. Emotional Neglect by Ethnicity of Victim

ETHNICITY OF VICTIM	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total	
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		Cases	Percent
Caucasian	285	53.6	247	46.4	.2387	532	80.0
Native American	70*	67.3	34	32.7	.0289	104	15.6
Hispanic	10	62.5	6	37.5	.7980	16	2.4
Black	7	70.0	3	30.0	N/A	10	1.5
Asian	1	50.0	1	50.0	N/A	2	.3
Vietnamese	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0
Alaskan	1	100.0	0	0	N/A	1	.2
Total	374	56.2	291	43.8		665	100.0

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Referral Source

Educators with 146 and law enforcement with 97 were the two major identified reporters of emotional neglect. Law enforcement and nonhospital (other) medical personnel filed reports which were substantiated significantly more often than was expected. Fathers were the only identified category with a significantly lower than expected substantiation rate. The other or unidentified category contained 184 or 23.6% of the reports of emotional neglect (see Table 53).

Table 53. Referral Sources for Reports of Emotional Neglect

REFERRAL SOURCE	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Chi-Square p	Total Cases	Percent of Cases
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent			
Mother	13	50.0	13	50.0	.7761	26	3.4
Father	13	33.3	26*	66.7	.0117	39	5.0
Self	21	65.6	11	34.4	.2873	32	4.1
Sibling	8	80.0	2	20.0	N/A	10	1.3
Other Relatives	22	41.5	31	58.5	.0733	53	6.9
Neighbor	41	66.1	21	33.9	.0929	62	8.0
Child Care Provider	13	61.9	8	38.1	.6570	21	2.7
Foster Parent	0	0	2	100.0	N/A	2	.3
Attorney	6	85.7	1	14.3	N/A	7	.9
Law Enforcement	74**	76.3	23	23.7	.0001	97	12.5
Youth Court	6	46.2	7	53.8	.7375	13	1.7
Human Services	20	43.5	26	56.5	.1673	46	6.0
Educators	81	55.5	65	44.5	.9155	146	18.9
Hospital Staff	5	38.5	8	61.5	.3694	13	1.7
Other Medical	15*	88.2	2	11.8	.0113	17	2.2
Residential Staff	1	100.0	0	0	N/A	1	.1
Economic Assistance	3	75.0	1	25.0	N/A	4	.5
Other	81	44.0	103	56.0	.0046	184	23.8
Total	423	54.7	350	45.3		773	100.00

** Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .01

* Significantly greater than expected at alpha < .05

N/A = Expected value < 5 in one or more cells in this row

Perpetrators

Parents were reported as the perpetrators of emotional neglect in 93.7% of the cases involving male victims and in 93.6% of the cases involving female victims. Emotional neglect of males by their parents was substantiated in 52.9% of the cases and in 55.8% of the cases with female victims. There were too few reports in the other categories of perpetrators to draw meaningful information.

Summary

Significant differences existed between substantiated and unsubstantiated reports of emotional neglect based on the demographic attributes contained in those reports.

Gender: Gender itself was not a significant variable by itself in the evaluation of substantiation rates for emotional neglect. Significant differences between genders were found when that variable was viewed in conjunction with the variables of age and referral source.

Age: Only minor variations in substantiation rates based on age existed for emotional neglect.

Ethnicity: Cases involving Native American victims were substantiated at a higher than expected rate.

Referral Source: Substantiation rates vary greatly depending on the source of the report.

Perpetrators: No meaningful differences.

Significant demographic differences were demonstrated between cases in which emotional neglect was reported and substantiated and those in which it was reported and not substantiated. Therefore, the sixth null hypothesis was rejected.

Summary of Major Significant Findings

Gender Proportions in Reports

Female victims were overrepresented and males underrepresented based on their respective proportions of the overall population in reports of abuse and neglect. The major contributor to this imbalance appeared to be in the category of sexual abuse where female victims outnumber male victims almost 3 to 1.

Effect of Age on Reporting

The number of incidents reported declined reliably in steps as the age of the children increased. The overall substantiation rate remained fairly stable without regard to age.

Substantiation Rates

The average substantiation rate for reports of child abuse and neglect was 37.9%. Only emotional abuse and

emotional neglect were substantiated over half the time. Physical abuse was the least likely to be substantiated.

Effect of Ethnicity

Overall, Native Americans were overrepresented in reports and Caucasians were underrepresented. Much of this difference was accounted for by the higher than expected representation of Native Americans in physical and emotional neglect reports.

Differences by Referral Source

Mandated professional reporters accounted for 40% of all reports. Family members accounted for 12.7% of the total reports. Other relatives were responsible for 7.1% of all reports. Neighbors were responsible for 12.8% of all reports. Other/anonymous reporters were responsible for 27.1% of all reports. The last three categories mentioned above all had lower than expected rates of substantiation.

Non professional and unidentified reporters accounted for 60% of all reports. Mandated reports from professionals were substantiated 47.2% of the time. Nonmandated reports were substantiated only 33.1% of the time. Fathers of victims were the least reliable of all reporting sources in terms of substantiation.

Perpetrator Relationship

Parents were alleged to be the perpetrators in 85% of all cases. For sexual abuse, parents were accused in only 42.7%

of the cases involving female victims and 36.1% of the cases involving male victims.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The analysis of the data used for this study showed that there is a significant difference between cases in which child abuse or neglect is reported and substantiated and those cases in which it is reported and not substantiated. The first purpose of this chapter is to assimilate that finding and the specific data from which it was derived into the context of an ecological model of child abuse and neglect. The second purpose is to compare and contrast the findings of this study to the findings and conclusions reached by other studies. The third purpose of this chapter is to describe implications which the findings of this study may have for future research and ways in which these findings may be used to enhance investigation, intervention, and data collection by the Department of Family Services and other professionals.

Theoretic Assimilation

The ecological model has been used by several researchers to describe the context in which child abuse takes place (Belsky, 1980; Garbarino, 1977a, 1977b). The ecological model describes the manner in which different systems interact. The individual is nested within several interlocking microsystems such as the family, school, or friends. The mesosystem

consists of interactions between the child's various microsystems such as the family-school mesosystem or the school-friends mesosystem. The exosystems are those systems which affect the child but with which the child has no direct contact such as a parent's employer. The macrosystem refers to the culture as a whole and its belief systems.

Garbarino (1977b) suggested that child abuse occurs when stresses within the family microsystem reach a critical mass. Garbarino (1977a, 1977b) and Belsky (1980) pointed to a linkage between these stresses and isolation of the family microsystem from other micro, meso, and exo support systems in families where abuse occurs.

The results of this study support the hypothesis that isolation plays a role in child abuse and neglect. Because most reports come from outside the family microsystem, there is a suggestion that reports result from a breakdown in the family's isolation and secrecy. This study indicates that over 86% of all substantiated abuse and neglect is perpetrated by parents or other household members (see Table 8). Less than 12% of the substantiated cases are reported to authorities by members of the nuclear family microsystem (see Table 7). The contrast between these two percentages may support the theory of microsystem isolation as the environment of abuse and neglect. Families, those people most likely to witness abuse or neglect, are less likely to report that knowledge to outsiders.

A further support for the premise of isolation as a factor in abuse and neglect is the manner in which the number of substantiated cases of abuse and neglect decreases as age increases (see Table 5). This may suggest that as children grow older they become members of more microsystems. The interaction of these microsystems creates a larger mesosystem which decreases isolation. Hence, with decreased isolation there may be less abuse and neglect.

The neighbor-child microsystem or the teacher-child microsystem notices evidence of abuse or neglect and reports it to the authorities. These extrafamily microsystems share a mesosystem with the family. The parents as individuals, however, may have had no direct contact with the reporting microsystem. The reporting microsystem, therefore, was an exosystem for the parents. That exosystem reports to another exosystem (child protective services). An investigation is then undertaken which further reduces the family's isolation.

If the abuse or neglect is substantiated, the family is introduced to other exosystems (social workers, law enforcement, counselors, etc.) as part of an intervention. These all become microsystems for the child and other family members because of their direct contact. The interveners may interact as part of the mesosystem to discourage further abuse or neglect.

Even if the abuse or neglect is not substantiated, the reporting and investigation procedures constitute an

exosystem's merger into the micro and meso systems of the family.

In either case, substantiation or lack thereof, the ecology of the family is changed. New systems are formed and others are rearranged. Isolation is to a certain extent eroded.

The findings of this study fit well within the context of an ecological framework.

Goodness of Fit With the Literature

Some results of this study support findings already in the literature. Other results appear to contradict findings previously published. The results of this study will be compared to existing literature on a variable-by-variable basis.

Gender of the Victim

The National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (1988) reported that females were more likely to be abused than males. That finding was supported by the data evaluated for the current study (see Tables 3 and 4).

NCCAN found that females are more likely to be abused than neglected. Among males the rates were similar. The current study found substantiation rates suggesting just the opposite. Among females the rates were similar, while males were more likely to be neglected than abused (see Tables 3 and 4).

NCCAN found that females were sexually abused at nearly 4 times the rate for males. The current study revealed the substantiated rate of sexual abuse for females to be a little less than 3 to 1 compared to males (see Table 30).

Eckenrode et al. (1988) found that 79% of the sexual reports in their study involved females. Of the sexual abuse reports involving females, 42% were substantiated. The male substantiation rate was 31%. The current study found 72.3% of the sexual abuse reports involved female victims, of which 38.4% were substantiated. The substantiation rate for male victims of sexual abuse was 33.8%.

Age of Victim

NCCAN (1988) found that maltreatment overall increased reliably up through age 8. The current study found that overall substantiated cases decreased with age (see Table 5).

Ethnicity of Victim

NCCAN (1988) found that the characteristic of ethnicity of the victim was not related to the type of maltreatment. The current study identified differences in the substantiation rates of various types of abuse and neglect based on ethnicity. In the current study Caucasians had a lower than expected rate of substantiation for physical neglect. Native Americans had higher than expected rates of substantiation for physical neglect and emotional neglect (see Tables 43, 44, and 52).

Eckenrode et al. (1988) found that ethnicity had only small and statistically insignificant effects on the rate of substantiation of sexual abuse. The current study supported that finding (see Tables 33 and 34).

Relationship of Perpetrator to Victim

AHA (1988) reported that 80.8% of all abuse and neglect perpetrators fell into the parent category. The current study found that parents were the perpetrators in 82.4% of all substantiated reports.

AHA (1988) found that 42% of sexual abuse was by parents. During 1991, 30.8% of the substantiated cases of sexual abuse in Montana were perpetrated by parents.

Source of Reports

Definitions of referral sources vary greatly in the literature and make comparisons between studies unfeasible.

Summary

There are many similarities and some specific differences between this study and the existing literature. One of the more interesting differences found in this study was the significant differences in reporting and substantiation based on race which were absent in other studies. Also of interest was the lower rate of substantiation of sexual abuse perpetrated by parents found in this study. Such comparisons are interesting, but due to the sampling limitations inherent

in this study, they were not particularly meaningful. The real potential value of this study's findings comes in the implications they have for the population to which they are applicable, that is the children of the state of Montana. The final section of this chapter addresses those implications.

Implications

Implications for Future Research

There is a wealth of information still available to be mined from the data set used for this study. Because this was designed as a pilot study, the data was considered only in the broadest of ways. With the exception of gender, only one variable at a time was considered. Further studies might combine variables in a more sophisticated manner in order to draw a more complete picture of what factors substantiated reports of child abuse and neglect have in common and how they differ.

The Department of Family Services has several years of data that includes these variables. Appendices J, K, and L are summaries of child abuse and neglect reports in Montana during 1988, 1989, and 1990. Using this study as a model, additional data can be processed in order to see if the conclusions of this study hold up over time and to look for trends which may not be apparent in a single year's data. It may be possible to track individual victims or individual perpetrators over time to see if multiple reports appear

involving the same individuals. Trends may appear in which individuals involved in unsubstantiated cases are later involved in cases that are substantiated.

The data analyzed in this study is collected annually by every state in the Union. An investigation into the differences between substantiated and unsubstantiated reports from other regions of the country may deliver more generalizable findings. There are severe limitations on the generalizability of this study because the data comes from a rural, mostly Caucasian state.

This study offers a quantitative view of child abuse and neglect investigations in Montana. It does not offer much insight into why certain patterns appear in the outcomes of these investigations. In many ways, more questions are raised than answered. In order to answer many of these questions, means must be developed which will allow the researcher access to the participants in these investigations. Studies involving direct questioning through instruments or interviews of both the investigator and the investigated may open the door to enhanced understanding of the phenomena of child abuse and neglect. Such an approach would also offer enlightenment on the impact which DFS intervention has on those who have been investigated.

Implications for
Department of Family Services

The results of this study may offer some new insight to

the Department of Family Services regarding the allocation of investigatory resources. Knowing which reports are most likely to be substantiated may assist the DFS workers in establishing or revising priorities. For example, suppose two reports alleging physical abuse are received by DFS. A decision needs to be made as to which will be investigated first. Suppose the first report is filed by a father and alleges that his wife has physically abused his 9-year-old Native American daughter. The second report is filed by a hospital staff member alleging that a 15-year-old Hispanic boy has been physically abused by another household member. A chart comparing these two might look like Table 54.

Table 54. A Comparison of Physical Abuse Reports

Characteristic of Report	Likelihood of Substantiation	
	Report 1 Female Victim	Report 2 Male Victim
Victim's Age	9 years 28.6%	15 years 49.1%
Ethnicity of Victim	Native American 27.8%	Hispanic 44.0%
Relationship of Reporter	Father 15.1%	Hospital 54.5%
Relationship of Perpetrator	Parent 31.7%	Other Household Member 39.8%

The second report is more likely to be substantiated based on every characteristic and may deserve a higher priority for investigation. Of course, many other factors must be taken into consideration in making such decisions.

The severity of endangerment and future risk must be assessed through other means.

The way in which DFS reports certain information makes accurate predictions of substantiation very difficult. One variable which handicaps research into what is really going on in abuse and neglect cases is the perpetrator category. The relationships defined by DFS are too broad to establish the actual relationship between perpetrator and victim. For example, it is impossible to differentiate between mothers, fathers, and stepparents within the parent category. Such knowledge would be invaluable in helping to create a new protocol for investigators.

Another cloudy variable was the "other" category for referral sources. It was impossible to tell whether the reporters had identified themselves and do not fall into one of the established categories or if the reports are anonymous. Zuravin and Watson (1987) found that anonymous reports are less likely to be substantiated than those in which the reporter is identified. A differentiation in this category would also aid in establishing priorities for investigations.

Implications for Mandated Reporters

Among mandated reporters, only law enforcement and foster parents have substantiation rates above 50%. Over half of the reports filed by social and human service workers, licensed child care providers, educators, economic assistance, and

medical personnel are not substantiated. It is notable that the human and social services had only a 36.2% substantiation rated. This group which includes counselors and therapists would perhaps be expected to be better educated and more sensitive than the general population in regards to what constitutes maltreatment, yet only 1 of 3 of their reports was substantiated. With enhanced training professionals may be better able to assist DFS investigators in their task of protecting Montana's children from abuse and neglect. An improved understanding of what constitutes substantiatable abuse and neglect may reduce the number of unsubstantiated cases which must be investigated thereby freeing DFS to concentrate its efforts where they are most needed.

Conclusion

This study is just a starting point. Far too little is known about what separates those families in which abuse or neglect is substantiated and those in which it is not. As governmental resources are stretched thinner, it becomes all the more important to use those resources as effectively and efficiently as possible. Interventions by child protective services workers can and do save lives. Further research into how the risk of various cases can be differentiated may help those responsible to better direct their resources toward the children who have the greatest need for those resources.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- American Humane Association. (1984). American Association for Protecting Children: Trends in child abuse and neglect: A national perspective. Denver: Author.
- American Humane Association. (1988). Highlights of official aggregate child neglect and abuse reporting 1986. Denver: Author.
- American Humane Association. (1989). Highlights of official aggregate child neglect and abuse reporting 1987. Denver: Author.
- Asen, K., George, E., Piper, R., & Stevens, A. (1989). A systems approach to child abuse: Management and treatment issues. Child Abuse and Neglect, 13, 45-57.
- Belsky, J. (1980). Child maltreatment: An ecological integration. American Psychologist, 35(4), 320-335.
- Bertsche, J., Francetich, S., & Horejsi, C. (1985). Protocol notebook for child welfare workers. Missoula: University of Montana, Department of Social Work.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development. Cambridge: Harvard Press.
- Eckenrode, J., Münch, J., Powers, J., & Doris, J. (1988). The nature and substantiation of official sexual abuse reports. Child Abuse and Neglect, 12, 311-319.
- Faller, K. C. (1985). Unanticipated problems in the United States child protection system. Child Abuse and Neglect, 9, 63-69.
- Flango, V. E. (1991). Can central registries improve substantiation rates in child abuse and neglect cases? Child Abuse and Neglect, 15, 403-413.
- Garbarino, J. (1977a). The human ecology of child maltreatment: A conceptual model for research. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39(4), 721-735.
- Garbarino, J. (1977b). The price of privacy in the social dynamics of child abuse. Child Welfare, 56(9), 565-575.
- Graham, P., Dingwall, R., & Wolkind, S. (1985). Research issues in child abuse. Social Science and Medicine, 21(11), 1217-1228.

REFERENCES - CONTINUED

- Hindman, J. (1987). Step by step: Sixteen steps toward legally sound sexual abuse investigations. Ontario, OR: AlexAndria Associates.
- Huck, S. W., Cormier, W. H., & Bounds, W. G. (1974). Reading statistics and research. New York: Harper & Row.
- Johnson, C. F., & Showers, J. (1985). Injury variables in child abuse. Child Abuse and Neglect, 9, 207-215.
- Knudsen, D. D. (1989). Duplicate reports of child maltreatment: A research note. Child Abuse & Neglect, 13, 41-43.
- Martin, S. E., & Besharov, D. J. (1991). Police and child abuse: New policies for expanded responsibilities. Washington, DC.: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
- National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect. (1988). Study findings: Study of national incidence and prevalence of child abuse and neglect: 1988. Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services.
- Seibel, D. M. (1990). Child abuse potential of a low income population in rural southwestern Montana. Unpublished master's thesis, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT.
- Thoennes, N., & Tjaden, P. G. (1990). The extent, nature, and validity of sexual abuse allegations in custody/visitation disputes. Child Abuse and Neglect, 14, 151-163.
- U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect. (1990). Child abuse and neglect: Critical first steps in response to a national emergency. Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services.
- U. S. Bureau of Census. (1991). 1990 Census of population and housing: Summary tape file #1a. Helena, MT: Montana Department of Commerce.
- Zuravin, S. J., & Watson, B. (1987). Anonymous reports of child physical abuse: Are they as serious as reports from other resources. Child Abuse and Neglect, 11, 521-529.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES POLICY MANUAL

PHILOSOPHY

CSD-SS 201-2

Department of Social and
Rehabilitation Services

SOCIAL SERVICES

SECTION:

CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

SUBJECT:

Philosophy

INTERVENTION:

ABUSE/NEGLECT--When parental failure constitutes harm to the normal physical, emotional, and/or social development of a child, the Social Worker has a duty to intervene. Intervention may be required in the following cases, particularly when there is a pattern of one or more incidents:

- Any physical injury, taking into account the age of the child, the type of injury, and how the injury occurred
- Inadequate food, clothing and shelter, with consideration given to the economic and cultural circumstances
- Excessive corporal punishment
- Lack of supervision, taking into account the age and maturity of the child, the availability of emergency assistance, and the length of time left alone
- Inadequate health care which could cause physical injury to child, and where parents are financially able to provide such care, or are offered financial or other reasonable means to provide such care
- Failure to thrive, diagnosed by a health professional
- Sexual abuse, including fondling, penetration, sexual assault, exploitation for sexual purposes and other sexual stimulation
- Emotional abuse which results in harm to the child's psychological or intellectual functioning

Oct. 1, 1984

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Page 1 of 2

CSD-SS 201-2

SECTION:

CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

SUBJECT:

Philosophy

Abandonment, surrendering physical custody of the child for a period of six (6) months or more without manifesting an intent to resume care of the child.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICE--It is the policy of the Department to provide protective services to the child in his/her own home when able to do so without risking serious injury to the child.

SUBSTITUTE CARE--Placement of a child out of his natural home should be undertaken only after careful consideration of alternatives and a determination that placement will not create more problems than it solves. When a child is in immediate or apparent danger of harm, placement of the child outside his present home is warranted.

When placement outside a child's home is necessary, relatives and family friends should be assessed as a placement resource if in the best interest of the child.

**INDIVIDUAL
DIFFERENCES:**

The Indian Child Welfare Act requires that when making a foster care placement of an Indian child, preference shall be given, in the absence of good cause to the contrary, (as defined at CSD-SS 201-11), to a placement in an Indian foster home.

o o o

JM

Oct. 1, 1984

COMMUNITY SERVICES

2

APPENDIX B

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES POLICY MANUAL
GUIDELINES FOR REPORTS OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

CSD-SS 201-3

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services SOCIAL SERVICES	SECTION: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES
	SUBJECT Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect

REFERENCES: Section 41-3-201 through 41-3-208, MCA; and
ARM 46.5.114

SOURCE OF
REPORTS:

MANDATORY REPORTERS--Professionals and officials required to report are:

1. Physician, resident, intern or member of a hospital's staff engaged in the admission, examination, care or treatment of persons;
2. A nurse, osteopath, chiropractor, podiatrist, medical examiner, coroner, dentist, optometrist, or any other health or mental health professional;
3. Christian Science practitioner and religious healers;
4. School teachers, other school officials, and employees who work during regular school hours;
5. A Social Worker, operator or employee of any registered or licensed day care or substitute care facility, or any other operator or employee of a child care facility;
6. Foster care, residential or institutional worker; or
7. A peace officer or other law enforcement official.

Anyone may report suspected incidences of child abuse or neglect.

Oct. 1, 1984

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Page 1 of 3

CSD-SS 201-3

SECTION:

CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

SUBJECT:

Reports of Child Abuse
and Neglect

REPORTS OF
SUSPECTED CHILD
ABUSE AND
NEGLECT:

REPORTS--When a report is received, the Social Worker shall record the information on the CSD 110 or the approved County Form and also the CSD 110-A.

PROCEDURES:

Form CSD 110: Request for Investigation and Other Protective Services--

Use: To be completed by the worker when a report of alleged child abuse or neglect is received from any source.

In situations where the parent requests agency intervention (self-referral), the worker should complete the CSD 110 Form and the parent should sign the form to indicate that he/she is requesting services.

The CSD 110 is retained in the case record.

Form CSD 110-A: Protective Services Information System--

Use: To be completed and returned to the State Office to be entered into the statewide computer information system. The system catalogs all reports of abuse or neglect. The worker can request a search of the system for other reports of alleged abuse or neglect concerning the child. Instructions for completing Form CSD 110-A are found in this manual at CSD-ADM 101-4.

CONFIDENTIALITY:

CONFIDENTIALITY--The identity of the reporter must not be revealed to the subject of the complaint unless:

1. The reporter gives his permission; or

Oct. 1, 1984

COMMUNITY SERVICES

2

CSD-SS 201-3

SECTION. CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES	SUBJECT. Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------

2. A court requests the information (i.e., in a hearing or by court order).

SELF-REFERRALS--Self-referrals of child abuse and/or neglect should be handled in the same manner as any other reports.

REPORT TO COUNTY ATTORNEY--The County must notify the County Attorney of all reports of child abuse and/or neglect received.

PROCEDURES:

Notice to the County Attorney--Procedures and forms to be used to notify the County Attorney shall be developed jointly by the Social Worker and the local County Attorney.

FOLLOW-UP--All reports must be followed by an appropriate investigation as outlined in the following section.

PROCEDURES:

Follow-Up Letter to Reporter--After contact has been made with the reported family, it is advised that the worker send a letter to the reporter indicating the incident has been investigated and thanking them for their interest and concern. The worker should not divulge any confidential information. A sample of such a letter is contained in this manual at Appendix.

o o o

JM

Oct. 1, 1984

COMMUNITY SERVICES

3

CSD-SS 201-4

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services SOCIAL SERVICES	SECTION: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES
	SUBJECT: Investigation of the Report

REFERENCES: Section 41-3-202, 41-3-204 through 41-3-207, MCA as amended; and ARM 46.5.114.

RESPONSE TIME: All reports indicating that there is a reasonable cause to suspect that a child is an abused or neglected child must be investigated.

IMMEDIATE RESPONSE--Any report indicating that a child may be in immediate danger of serious harm must be investigated immediately.

TIMELY RESPONSE--Investigation of reports of a less urgent nature will be investigated promptly. Montana statutes require that investigations must be completed within sixty (60) days.

24-HOUR COVERAGE: EMERGENCY SERVICES--District and County offices must develop effective methods for providing 24-hour coverage for protective services. At a minimum, law enforcement offices will have the names and telephone numbers of workers on call and available.

PERSONS CONTACTED--It is the policy of the Agency that the child and his parent(s) be contacted regarding all reports of abuse and neglect. However, in extraordinary cases it may not be in the child's best interest to contact the parents immediately. For example, all serious physical or sexual abuse reports could result in criminal charges. Because the criminal defendant is afforded certain constitutional protection, Social Workers will discuss with their County Attorney how the interview with the perpetrator will be handled and who will conduct the interview (i.e., the Social Worker or law enforcement officer).

March 1, 1986

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Page 1 of 4

CSD-SS 201-4

SECTION: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

SUBJECT: Investigation of the
Report

OTHER PROFESSIONALS--It would be helpful for the Social Worker to request information regarding the family being assessed from other professionals. This is usually done with the knowledge and consent of the family. Sometimes the family will not give its consent, or the other person of whom information is being requested will not release information. In such instances, if the Social Worker believes the information is vital to the assessment, the worker will ask the County Attorney to file a "Petition for Temporary Investigative Authority and Protective Services", asking the court for release of the information to the Social Worker.

HOME VISITS:

It is preferable that the Social Worker shall attempt to contact the family prior to the first visit. Circumstances which might preclude the contact of the family before the first visit are:

- There is reason to believe that the child may be coerced by the parents;
- Parents might flee;
- There is reason to believe evidence of abuse or neglect might be suppressed or tampered with;
- When the mailing address or telephone number of the parent is not available;
- When there is reason to believe the child in the home is in immediate danger of harm;
- When the parent fails to respond to letter or telephone call within a reasonable amount of time considering the circumstances of the child and the nature of the case.

March 1, 1986

COMMUNITY SERVICES

2

CSD-SS 201-4

SECTION: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

SUBJECT: Investigation of the
Report

When conducting the initial home visit, the Social Worker shall identify him/herself, and shall advise the parents of the nature of the report as specifically as possible without revealing the source of the report, to the extent possible. The Social Worker shall solicit the parents cooperation in conducting the investigation.

When conducting an investigation at the child's home, the worker will be respectful of the family's privacy to the extent possible. It is not appropriate for the social worker to go into any room without the parent's permission and shall not look into refrigerators, drawers, etc., unless necessary to conducting the investigation and then only with the parent's consent.

DUTY OF
SOCIAL WORKER:

WHEN REFUSED ENTRY--If the Social Worker conducting the investigation is refused entry by the parent, and if the worker has reason to believe the child is in danger of being abused or neglected, the worker must contact the County Attorney and request that the County Attorney seek an appropriate court order to gain entry into the home unless there is immediate or apparent danger of harm to the child.

See CSD-SS 201-7 for procedures to be used when an emergency removal of the child from the home is necessary.

SOCIAL WORKER
RISK:

When a worker has concern about his/her own personal safety, the worker will request that a law enforcement officer accompany him/her on the home visit.

March 1, 1986

COMMUNITY SERVICES

3

CSD-SS 201-4

SECTION: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

SUBJECT: Investigation of the
ReportTHE
INVESTIGATION:

In conducting the investigation of a report, the Social Worker shall collect information regarding the child, the circumstances surrounding the injury to the child, and any other matters relevant to the circumstances described in the report. The thirteen (13) children's Risk Assessment Factors (found in Case Record Management Section CSD-ADM 107-90, page 6,) shall be the workers guide to the investigation. The Social Worker may not inquire into the financial status of the child's family or custodian.

THE CHILD:

The child will be examined by a physician when there is reason to believe the child is a victim of serious physical or sexual abuse, unless the child is of a mature age and refuses, or no evidence of abuse can be gathered because the incident occurred too long ago, or a physician is not available.

SOCIAL WORKER/
SUPERVISOR:

ACTION--Based upon the facts gathered and conclusions drawn as a result of the investigation, the Social Worker shall determine whether the report is substantiated.

The Social Worker shall continue to gather facts until a decision can be reached as to whether or not the report is substantiated.

o o o

JM

March 1, 1986

COMMUNITY SERVICES

4

CSD-SS 201-5

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services	SECTION. CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES
COMMUNITY SERVICES	SUBJECT: Reports of Suspected Medical Neglect of Handicapped Infants

References: 45 CFR § 84.55
49 Fed. Reg. 1622, Thursday
January 12, 1984

REPORTERS: Under Section 41-3-201, MCA, health care providers must report suspected instances of unlawful medical neglect of handicapped infants.

Medical neglect of handicapped infants constitutes harm to the child in health or welfare as defined in Section 41-3-102(4) and (5) MCA.

MAKING OF REPORTS: Reports of suspected medical neglect shall be made in the same manner as all reports of suspected child abuse and neglect (i.e. county welfare department or by state hot-line 800-332-6100 or the HHS hot-line 800-368-1019.) Pursuant to Section 41-5-302, MCA, the county welfare department shall respond to emergency reports of suspect child abuse or neglect 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

INVESTIGATION: Reports of suspected medical neglect shall be investigated by the Social Worker promptly pursuant to the requirements of Section 41-3-202, MCA. Where appropriate, the Social Worker shall conduct an on-site investigation of reports of suspected medical neglect of handicapped infants.

LEGAL ACTION: If the report is substantiated after investigation, or if more information is needed to substantiate the report, the Social Worker shall contact the county attorney and request that she/he file a petition for temporary investigative authority or other legal remedy. Where necessary, the petition shall request an order from the court compelling the provision of nourishment and necessary medical treatment.

Oct. 1, 1985

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Page 1 of 2

CSD-SS 201-5

SECTION:
CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICESSUBJECT:
Reports of Suspected
Medical Neglect of
Handicapped InfantsNOTIFICATION
OF DIVISION:

Upon receipt of a report of suspected medical neglect of a handicapped infant, the county welfare department staff shall notify the Administrator of the Community Services Division. Contact should be made by telephone and followed with a confirmation in writing.

DIVISION ACTION:

The Administrator of the Community Services Division shall be responsible for contacting the responsible HHS official of each report of suspected medical neglect of handicapped infants.

o o o

JM/

Oct. 1, 1985

COMMUNITY SERVICES

2

CSD-SS 201-6

Department of Social and
Rehabilitation Services
SOCIAL SERVICES

SECTION.

CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

SUBJECT

Documentation of
Investigation

CASE RECORDING:

PREPARATION--The Social Worker must prepare a case record for each family served. A case number is assigned to each case record (see CSD 107-5).

FREQUENCY--Case records should be updated after each contact.

INFORMATION
INCLUDED:

ALL REPORTS--Case records regarding each investigation of a report of child abuse and/or neglect must contain the following information and forms:

1. CSD-110, or approved county form completed;
2. CSD-110-A completed;
3. An investigation recording (or current narrative) including:
 - a. An assessment of danger to all children in the home using the thirteen (13) factors on the CHILD RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT (SRS-CSD 120).
 - b. A finding of low, intermediate or high risk for the highest assessed child.
 - c. Facts substantiating or unsubstantiating the reports and findings.
 - d. A listing of all household members.
 - e. A conclusion that the report is substantiated or unsubstantiated.

SUBSTANTIATED REPORTS--These cases must also include an identification of problems to be resolved.

March 1, 1986

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Page 1 of 2

CSD-SS 201-6

SECTION: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

SUBJECT: Documentation of
InvestigationWORKER/SUPERVISOR
DECISIONS REGARDING
ASSIGNED LEVEL OF
RISK AND INSTRUCTION
ACTIONS

The level of assigned risk is based upon the professional judgment of the worker and/or social worker supervisor. The risk assessment instrument provides assistance in making the decision. Similarly the decision to intervene with clients within their home environment or not is a professional decision based upon experience and judgment. The risk assessment instrument assists in making this decision. It does not determine the decision.

March 1, 1986

COMMUNITY SERVICES

2

CSD-SS 201-6A

Department of Social and - Rehabilitation Services SOCIAL SERVICES	SECTION: CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES
	SUBJECT Child Protection Team

CHILD PROTECTION
TEAM:

Interdisciplinary child protection teams assist in assessing the needs of the family, formulating and monitoring a treatment plan for the family and coordinating services for the family. Where child protection teams exist, this resource are to be used by the worker. In those counties where such teams do not exist, the worker may wish to convene a team with the assistance of the County Attorney.

o o o

JM

March 1, 1986

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Page 1 of 1

		DFS 201-6B
Department of Family Services	SECTION:	CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES
	SUBJECT:	Intervention Services

**SOCIAL WORKER
RESPONSIBILITY:**

All open protective service cases shall have a written case plan.

The Social Worker shall be responsible for developing and assisting the client in carrying out the case plan.

The case plan should include minimally:

1. The reason for social services intervention.
2. Services which have been offered to the family and services which will be offered.
3. The goals and objectives for rehabilitation of and maintaining the family unit.
4. If the child is placed outside the home, the requirements of the Substitute Care Section, CSD-SS 300 shall be followed.

**HEALTH RELATED
SERVICES:**

Health related service as part of a CPS case plan may include the following:

1. Arranging for services such as medical, dental, hospital or mental health services covered by Medicaid.
2. Providing transportation or arranging for transportation to said service.
3. Providing social work counseling to help the client and family accept and follow thru with needed health related services.
4. Helping clients apply for Medicaid or medically needy programs offered by SRS.

DFS 201-6B

SECTION:
CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICESSUBJECT:
Intervention Services

CASE OPENING

Cases to be opened for intervention should include Home Based Services when a child remains at home or could be returned to the home from placement.

PROCEDURE:

Intervention cases must include a written case plan as noted above.

A written agreement between the agency and the parent (as stated in Section 303-4) must also be included.

This agreement should be related to the issues regarding the safety of the child and explaining what is expected and required of the parent and the agency.

This agreement shall be completed within 30 days of the determination of need for protective services and must be time limited and revised every 90 days.

CASE CLOSURE:

Protective Services cases may be terminated when the parent and agency representative agree that the case plan and written agreement have been successfully completed or concern for the safety of the child is no longer valid. This shall be done in conjunction with a supervisory review of the case to determine that protective services are no longer required.

SOCIAL WORKER ACTION:

Once this decision is reached, the Social Worker shall notify the parent in writing that the agency has terminated services to the family. A copy of a sample letter to parents is found on the following page.

o o o

JM

Nov. 1, 1987

FAMILY SERVICES

2

APPENDIX C

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES

RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

DFS-122 (Part A)
Rev. 7/87

State of Montana Department of Family Services
CHILD RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

1. ASSESSMENT

- Formal Investigation
- Other (specify) _____

2. CLIENT/CASE NAME: _____

K NUMBER: _____

SW NAME: _____ DATE: _____

CODING INFORMATION

- NA - Not Applicable
- 0 - Insufficient Information
- 1 - Low Risk
- 2 - Intermediate Risk
- 3 - High Risk

a. Child Name	b. Child Name	c. Child Name	d. Child Name	e. Child Name	f. Child Name	HIGHEST ASSESSED CHILD
/	/	/	/	/	/	

3. CLIENT ASSESSMENT FACTORS (I-IV)

RESPONSES FOR FACTORS I THRU IV MUST BE PROVIDED FOR EACH INVOLVED CHILD (WHEN APPLICABLE):						HIGHEST ASSESSED CHILD
I. Child's Age, Physical and/or Mental Abilities	II. Severity and/or Frequency of Abuse	III. Severity and/or Frequency of Neglect	IV. Location of Injury	Child Name	Child Name	FACTORS
I. _____ Comments: _____	II. _____ Comments: _____	III. _____ Comments: _____	IV. _____ Comments: _____			I. _____ II. _____ III. _____ IV. _____

4. FAMILY ASSESSMENTS FACTORS (V-XIII)

FOR FACTORS V THRU XIII, IDENTIFY THE VARIABLE WHICH REFLECTS THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF RISK TO CHILD(REN):		HIGHEST ASSESSED CHILD
V. Caretaker's Physical, Intellectual or Emotional Abilities/Control Comments: _____		V. _____
VI. Caretaker's Level of Cooperation Comments: _____		VI. _____
VII. Caretaker's Parenting Skills and/or Knowledge Comments: _____		VII. _____
VIII. Perpetrator's Access to Child Comments: _____		VIII. _____
IX. Presence of a Paramour or Parent Substitute in the House Comments: _____		IX. _____
X. Previous History of Abuse/Neglect Comments: _____		X. _____
XI. Environmental Condition of the Home Comments: _____		XI. _____
XII. Strength of Family Support Systems Comments: _____		XII. _____
XIII. Stresses Comments: _____		XIII. _____

5. SUMMARY OF CODES BY TYPE FOR HIGHEST ASSESSED CHILD

- Not Applicable
- Insufficient Information
- Low Risk
- Intermediate Risk
- High Risk

6. NO. OF FACTORS

7. ASSIGNED LEVEL OF RISK

- LOW
- INTERMEDIATE
- HIGH

FACTORS	LOW RISK	INTERMEDIATE RISK	HIGH RISK
I. Child's age, physical and mental abilities	10 years and over; and/or cares for and protect self without or with limited adult assistance; no physi- cal or mental handi- caps/limitations	5 thru 9 years of age; and/or requires adult assistance to care for and protect self; emotionally withdrawn; minor physical illness/ mental handicap; mile to moderately impaired development	Less than 5 years of age; and/or unable to care for or protect self without adult assistance; severe physical illness/ mental handicap; over-active; is difficult or pro- vocative; severely impaired develop- ment
II. Severity and/or frequency of abuse	No injury or minor injury; no medical attention required; no discernable effect on child; isolated incident	Minor physical injury or has an unexplained injury; requiring some form of medical treatment/diagnosis; ongoing history or pattern of punishment/ discipline to the child	Child requires immediate medical treatment and/or hospitalization; abuse of a sibling that resulted in death or permanent dysfunction of organ/limbs; ongoing history or pattern of harsh punishment/ discipline to the child; or child at severe risk of harm; or any sex abuse
III. Severity and/ or frequency of neglect	No discernable effect on child; isolated incident	Caretaker suspected of failing to meet minimum medical, food and/or shelter needs of child; unconfirmed history or pattern of leaving child unsupervised	Caretaker is unwilling to meet minimal medical, food and/or shelter needs of child; confirmed his- tory or pattern of leaving child un- supervised or unpro- tected for excessive periods of time; or child at severe risk of harm
IV. Location of injury	Bony body parts; knee, elbows, and buttocks	Torso	Head, face or geni- tals

(Continued on Next Page)

FACTORS	LOW RISK	INTERMEDIATE RISK	HIGH RISK
V. Caretaker's physical, intellectual, or emotional abilities/control	No intellectual/physical limitations; realistic expectations of child; in full control of mental faculties	May be physically/emotionally handicapped; moderate intellectual limitations; past criminal/mental health record/history; poor reasoning abilities; needs planning assistance to protect child	Severely handicapped; poor conception of reality; unrealistic expectations/perceptions of child's behavior; severe intellectual limitations; incapacity due to alcohol/drug intoxication
VI. Caretaker's level of cooperation	Demonstrated willingness and ability to work with agency to resolve problem and protect child	Overly compliant with investigator; presence/ability of nonperpetrating adult to assure minimal cooperation with agency	Doesn't believe there is a problem; refuses to cooperate; uninterested or evasive
VII. Caretaker's parenting skills and/or knowledge	Caretaker exhibits appropriate parenting skills and knowledge pertaining to child rearing techniques or responsibilities	Inconsistent display of the necessary parenting skills and/or knowledge required to provide a minimal level of child care	Caretaker is unwilling/incapable of providing the necessary parenting skills and/or minimal knowledge needed to assure a minimal level of child care
VIII. Perpetrator's access to child	Out of home, no access to child	In home, access to child is difficult; child is under constant supervision of other adult in the house	In home, complete access to child; uncertainty if other adult will deny access to child
IX. Presence of a paramour or parent substitute in the home	No paramour or parent substitute in the home; paramour/parent substitute in the home is viewed as supportive/stabilizing influence	Paramour or parent substitute is in the home on an infrequent basis and assumes only minimal caretaker responsibility for the child	Paramour or parent substitute resides with the family and is the alleged perpetrator
X. Previous history of abuse/neglect	No previous reported history of abuse/neglect	Previous substantiated report of abuse/neglect; no protective services provided to the child, family or perpetrator	Pending child abuse/neglect investigation; previous substantiated abuse/neglect report of a serious nature; multiple reports of abuse/neglect involving the child, family or perpetrator

(Continued on Next Page)

FACTORS	LOW RISK	INTERMEDIATE RISK	HIGH RISK
XI. Environmental condition of the home	Home is relatively clean with no apparent safety or health hazards	Trash and garbage not disposed; water and/or electricity inopera- tive; infestation of ants, roaches or other vermin	Living on condemned and/or structurally unsound residence; exposed wiring and/or other potential fire/ safety hazards present
XII. Strength of family support systems	Family, neighbors, or friends available and committed to help; membership in church, community, or social group	Family supportive but not in geographic area; some support from friends and neighbors; limited community services available	Caretaker/family has no relatives or friends available and is geographically isolated from com- munity services; no phone or means of transportation available
XIII. Stresses/ crises	Stable family; steady employment or income; means of transporta- tion available; strong relationship with relatives	Pregnancy or recent birth of a child; insufficient income and/or food, inadequate home management skills/ knowledge; relationship with relatives char- acterized by mutual hostility	Death of spouse; recent change in marital or relation- ship status; acute psychiatric episodes; spouse abuse/marital conflict; drugs/ alcohol dependency; chaotic life-style

APPENDIX D

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES
FORM USED TO REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES REFERRALS
AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF FORM

DFS-110A
(Rev. 8/1/87)

State of Montana
Department of Family Services
REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES REFERRAL

REFERRAL INFORMATION									
(1) Family Name					(2) K Number		(5) Family Phone:		
(3) Street Address					City		Zip Code		
(4) Relationship of Referral Source to Client: <small>(Circle up to 4)</small>							(6) County No.:		
1 Mother 6 Neighbor 11 Youth Court 16 Residential Staff 2 Father 7 Child Care Provider 12 Human Services 17 Legal Guardian 3 Self 8 Foster Parent 13 School 18 Economic Assistance 4 Sibling 9 Attorney 14 Hospital Staff 19 Other (specify) 5 Other Relative 10 Law Enforcement 15 Other Medical Professional							(7) Case Worker No.:		
							(8) Referral Date: (MMDDYY)		
							(9) Central Search Requested? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
CLIENT INFORMATION									
<i>Please provide the following information on all children involved in the investigation.</i>									
Memb. No.	(10) SSN	(11) Last Name	First Name	MI	(12) Birth Date (MMDDYY)	(13) Sex (M/F)	(14) ETHN. *	(15) AKA Last Name First Name	
1.									
2.									
3.									
4.									
5.									
Upon referral, fill in the above as completely as possible. Detach and mail to Department of Family Services. ***** Please mark envelope "Confidential" *****							* Ethnicity codes: 1. Caucasian 5. Vietnamese/Cambodian 2. Black 6. Asian/Pacific Islander 3. American Indian 7. Hispanic 4. Alaskan Native 0. Unknown		
CASE DETERMINATION									
(16) Complaint	(17) Children Involved (by Memb. No.)	(18) Case Determin.	(19) Perpetrator	(20) Investigation Start Date: (MMDDYY)			(21) Investigation Completion Date: (MMDDYY)		
				(22) Services Provided: (Circle all that apply) A. Limited to Investigation Only B. Social Work Counseling C. Resource Referral D. Emergency Shelter Care E. Day Care F. Foster Care G. Referral - Law Enforcement H. Referral - County Attorney - Civil I. Referral - County Attorney - Criminal J. Home Attendant O. Other					
List each reported complaint type separately. List all involved children for each complaint type entered.				(23) Current Case Status: (Circle one) A. Case Open E. Case Closed B. Case Closed After Investigation C. Unable to Locate					
CODING FOR ABOVE SECTION Complaint Codes ABUSE PA - Physical EA - Emotional SA - Sexual NEGLECT PN - Physical EN - Emotional MN - Medical ED - Educational OTHER F - Fatality				Case Determination Codes S - Substantiated U - Unsubstantiated Codes for Relationship of Perpetrator to Client: A - Parent B - Other Caretaker C - Other Household Member D - Licensed/Registered Care Provider E - Caretaker Substitute F - School G - Other					
				(24) Investigating Worker's Signature/Title/Worker No.					
				(25) Secondary Worker's Name/Title/Worker No.					
				(26) Date Submitted (MMDDYY)					
				(State Office Use Only) Data Entry Initials: Date:					
THIS INFORMATION IS CONFIDENTIAL AND IS USED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM SERVICES ACCORDING TO POLICY SECTION DFS 104 OF THE DIVISION'S ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL.									

Original - County File

Copy - Dept. of Family Services

CSD-ADM 101-4

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services ADMINISTRATION	SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES REFERRAL
	SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A

References: 41-3-201, 41-3-202(4) and 41-3-205, MCA; and ARM 46.5.116

PURPOSE: The CSD-110A, "Report on Child Protective Services Referral" is used to report all child protective service cases/referrals related to complaints of alleged neglect and/or abuse.

THIS FORM SHOULD BE SUBMITTED ONLY IN THOSE PROTECTIVE SERVICE CASES IN WHICH AN INVESTIGATION IS INITIATED IN RESPONSE TO A REFERRAL OF ALLEGED ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND/OR EXPLOITATION.

The CSD-110A functions as an input or source document for the Protective Services Information System (PSIS), also referred to as a central file. PSIS will store only client-related information; no information will be stored on the alleged perpetrator.

The Protective Services Information System (PSIS) has a central search capability in which retrieval of information on previous referrals can be performed upon request.

GENERAL
DESCRIPTION:

The information contained on the CSD-110A summarizes the nature of referral, investigation results, and types of services being provided during and after the investigation. The information will be used to identify previous referrals as well as produce management reports relevant to the operation of Montana's protective service delivery system.

RESPONSIBILITIES: SOCIAL WORKER--Complete and submit CSD-110A.

MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS BUREAU--Input selected data onto the database information system. Perform central file searches as requested. Insure appropriate disposal of source documents after entry onto PSIS. Provide systems support.

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Page 1 of 15

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE
SERVICES REFERRAL

SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A

MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS BUREAU-- (Continued)

Statistical reports will be provided as determined appropriate.

GENERAL
INSTRUCTIONS:

The CSD-110A is completed in two stages: the referral stage and case determination stage.

ACTION UPON RECEIVING A REFERRAL--

1. The referral information and client information section (Items 1 through 15 inclusive) are to be completed at the time a referral is received. Specific instructions for each item are provided below.
2. Upon completion, detach the top partial page and send in a sealed envelope to:

Management Operations Bureau - SRS
P.O. Box 4210
Helena, Montana 59604

Please mark "Confidential".

3. The above information should be submitted within 24 hours of receiving the referral.
4. Please print all information clearly and in ink to insure accurate entry onto the central file.
5. Management Operations Bureau will input the client information onto database. A central file search for previous referrals will be performed if requested (see Item 9). This information will be sent to the worker indicated in Item 7 within 24 hours after request is received.

CENTRAL SEARCH
REQUEST:

In Emergency Situations: In those instances in which immediate retrieval of central file information is necessary, the Social Worker may phone in items 1 to 15 to the Management Operations Bureau and central file information will be provided by telephone. No written report will be sent.

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

2

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES REFERRAL	SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A
-------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------

ACTION UPON CASE DETERMINATION--

1. Call out numbers 16 through 26 are to be completed at the point a case determination is made. Specific instructions for each item are provided below.
2. Distribution--The Social Worker should retain the second page copy in the case file.

The third, self-addressed copy (yellow) of the CSD-110A should be sealed and submitted to the Management Operations Bureau.

3. Sixty-day Limitation--In all cases, the CSD-110A must be submitted within sixty (60) days of receiving the referral.

A monthly, system-generated report will be provided to all counties having cases in which case determination has not been completed within sixty (60) days.

CONFIDENTIALITY:

All input documents will be destroyed after entry onto the computer file. All information on unsubstantiated referrals will be purged annually from the central file. Confidentiality will be maintained in accordance with Division Policy (Manual Section CSD-ADM 104).

REFERRAL INFORMATION SECTIONINSTRUCTIONS:

Responsibility
Social Worker

Call Out No.

ACTION

- ① Enter family (case) name.
- ② Enter K (County) number assigned by the county to identify this family on ACE.

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

3

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE
SERVICES REFERRAL

SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A

Call Out No.

- ③ Enter the family's street address, city of residence, and zip code.
- ④ Circle one of the listed responses to indicate the relationship between the referring party and the alleged victim(s).

<u>Code</u>	<u>Response</u>
1.	<u>Mother</u> : Mother of the alleged victim(s).
2.	<u>Father</u> : Father of the alleged victim(s).
3.	<u>Self</u> : Alleged victim.
4.	<u>Sibling</u> : Brother or sister of alleged victim(s).
5.	<u>Other Relative</u> : Includes all relatives not specified above.
6.	<u>Neighbor</u> : Any person who is living in close proximity to the alleged victim(s).
7.	<u>Child Care Provider</u> : Includes day care and nursery/preschool providers; also babysitters.
8.	<u>Foster Parent</u> : Licensed foster care home provider.
9.	<u>Attorney</u> : May include county attorney.
10.	<u>Law Enforcement Personnel</u> : Includes police and sheriff or his deputies.
11.	<u>Youth Court</u> : Includes referral by court order as well as those made by parole or probation officers.

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

4

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES REFERRAL

SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A

12. Human Services Personnel: Includes social workers, mental health workers, and the staff of social service agencies, and county welfare offices.
13. School Personnel: Includes teachers, principals, school nurses, learning specialist, school librarian, or other individuals who report the abuse/neglect as a result of their involvement in a school setting.
14. Hospital Staff: Includes any employee of a hospital.
15. Other Medical Professionals: Includes physicians, physician's assistants, osteopaths, dentists, chiropractors, medical examiners, ambulance attendants and other medical professionals not included above.
16. Residential Staff: Includes any person who maintains or is employed by a group home or institutional care facility.
17. Legal Guardian: Person so appointed to act on behalf of the alleged victim(s).
18. Economic Assistance: Includes any SRS Economic Assistance staff, i.e., Eligibility Technicians.
19. Other (Specify): If referral source is not described in any of the above, circle "other" and describe the relationship.

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

5

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE
SERVICES REFERRAL

SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A

Call Out No.

- ⑤ Enter family's telephone number, if available. (County office use only.)
- ⑥ Enter the numeric code representing the county (01 through 56) submitting the report.
- ⑦ Enter position number of the primary investigating/reporting worker.
- ⑧ Enter the date the referral was made (MMDDYY).
- ⑨ A database search may be requested by checking "yes". A search may be indicated if the alleged victim(s)/family is/are new in the community or has/have not received social services in the community prior to the alleged complaint or in the recent past. The reporting worker may wish to consult with his/her supervisor if the appropriateness of a search request is questioned.

CLIENT INFORMATION SECTIONSPECIAL
INSTRUCTIONS:

All children in the family unit who have been identified as alleged victim(s) should be listed in the following section. If more than five (5) children must be listed, attach another CSD-110A with the additional client information.

- ⑩ Enter each child's (henceforth referred to as alleged victim) Social Security number. If none exists, leave blank and the Management Operations Bureau will assign a unique number.
- ⑪ Enter each alleged victim's legal last name, first name and middle initial (if any).

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

6

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE
SERVICES REFERRAL

SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A

Call Out No.

- (12) Enter each alleged victim's date of birth (MMDDYY).
- (13) Enter the appropriate code ("M" or "F") indicating the sex of each alleged victim listed.
- (14) Enter the numeric code (as listed under "Ethnicity Codes") to indicate each alleged victim's primary racial group, as perceived by the community.

<u>Code</u>	<u>Response</u>
1.	<u>White:</u> A person of European, North African, or Middle Eastern origin and <u>NOT</u> Hispanic.
2.	<u>Black:</u> A person whose ancestry is associated with any of the original black racial groups of Africa and is <u>NOT</u> Hispanic.
3.	<u>American Indian:</u> A person whose ancestry is associated with the original peoples of North America (exclusive of Alaska), and who maintains tribal affiliation or is so recognized in the community.
4.	<u>Alaskan Native:</u> American Indian (as defined above) whose origin is in Alaska rather than the contiguous U.S.
5.	<u>Vietnamese/Cambodian:</u> A persons whose ancestry is associated with the original peoples of Southeast Asia, including Hmongs, Laotian, Cambodian and Vietnamese.

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

7

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE
SERVICES REFERRAL

SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A

6. Asian/Pacific Islander: A person whose ancestry is associated with the original peoples of the Far East, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands.
7. Hispanic: A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central, South American or other Spanish cultural origin, regardless of race.
0. Unknown.

- (15) List other nonlegal AKA (also known as) names of each alleged victim listed. Inclusion of all possible AKA will facilitate a more complete central file search.

CASE DETERMINATION SECTIONSPECIAL
INSTRUCTIONS:

List each identified complaint on a separate line using the "complaint codes" defined below:

Please Note: If a particular complaint is determined to be substantiated on one or more family members but unsubstantiated on other family members, enter the complaint twice so that this distinction can be made.

If space is insufficient, attach another CSD-110A with the additional information.

- (16) ABUSE is generally defined as a nonaccidental act by another individual that harms or threatens to harm another's physical or mental well-being.

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

8

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE
SERVICES REFERRAL

SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A

PA - Physical Abuse: Abuse of this nature includes but is not limited to brain damage, skull fracture, subdural hemorrhage or hematoma, bone fractures, dislocations/sprains, internal injuries, poisoning, minor and severe burns, lacerations, and/or bruises.

EA - Emotional Abuse: Active, intentional berating or disparaging behavior toward the alleged victim that impacts upon his/her emotional well-being.

SA - Sexual Abuse: The involvement of a child in any sexual act or situation for the purpose of providing sexual gratification or financial benefit to the perpetrator. All sexual activity between an adult and a child is considered sexual abuse including but not limited to incest, exploitation, rape, intercourse, molestation, exposure, photography, and fondling.

PN - Physical Neglect: Failure to provide basic necessities, including appropriate and adequate nutrition, protective shelter from the elements, appropriate clothing in terms of weather conditions and/or cleanliness and general supervision. Failure to thrive is included in this definition as well as abandonment by parent or caretaker.

EN - Emotional Neglect: Passive or passive/aggressive inattention to the alleged victim's emotional needs, nurturing or well-being.

MN - Medical Neglect: Failure to provide for appropriate medical or dental care which adversely affects or could adversely affect the physical well-being of the person.

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

9

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE
SERVICES REFERRAL

SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A

EN - Educational Neglect: Child is reported as not enrolled or not in regular attendance in an education program.

F-Fatality: Indicate if fatality has been reported. Include those cases in which no referral was made but Social Services presumably would have been indicated.

(17) Indicate by family number assigned in the client information section who was/were involved in each complaint. This item must be indicated for each complaint reported.

(18) Indicate the case determination on each reported listed complaint using the following codes:

S - The Complaint is Substantiated if upon completion of the investigation, the reporting worker has determined that the complaint has occurred or is occurring. (Does not require that all evidence be court acceptable.)

U - The Complaint is Unsubstantiated if upon completion of the investigation, the reporting worker determined that the complaint did not occur OR is unable to make a determination due to lack of evidence.

(19) Circle the response that most clearly indicates the relationship between the perpetrator of the listed complaint and the alleged victim(s).

A. Parent: The natural, adoptive, or stepparent who has assumed the responsibility for insuring the alleged victim's day-to-day welfare in a residential setting.

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

10

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE
SERVICES REFERRAL

SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A

- B. Other Caretaker: An individual who is not the parent as specified above but who has assumed the responsibility for insuring the alleged victim's day-to-day welfare in a residential setting, such as a legal guardian. Does not include substitute providers, as defined in category D.
- C. Other Household Member: Any individual residing in the same household as the alleged victim(s) but who has not assumed the caretaker role.
- D. Licensed/Registered Care Provider: Limited to licensed/registered care providers, such as day care, foster home, group home, and institutional care providers.
- E. Caretaker Substitute: Limited to temporary caretakers, e.g., baby-sitters or unregistered day care providers, as delegated by the caretaker.
- F. School: Includes teachers, principals, and others who have been identified as a perpetrator in their role as school personnel.
- G. Other: All other individuals who do not fit into any of the above categories.

(20) Enter date the investigation was initiated (MMDDYY). Please refer to SS 201-4 which states the Division policy regarding response guidelines for emergent and non-emergent referrals.

(21) Enter date the investigation was completed, i.e., case determination was made and the case plan, if indicated, was initiated. (MMDDYY).

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

11

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES REFERRAL SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A

Call Out No.

(22)

Circle all appropriate responses that reflect all services that have been or are being provided to the alleged victim and/or family.

Please Note: The following codes may not be listed in sequence since they are a part of a master database listing.

<u>Code</u>	<u>Definition</u>
A.	<u>Limited to Investigation Only:</u> Inquiry into the circumstances and events surrounding the alleged complaint. Marking this box indicates that investigation is the <u>only service that was provided.</u>
B.	<u>Social Work Counseling:</u> The provision of specialized counseling by the worker to correct conditions of neglect/abuse so as to strengthen and stabilize family life.
C.	<u>Resource Referral:</u> Assisting in locating, developing and using relevant community and agency resources.
D.	<u>Emergency Shelter Care:</u> Any temporary placement (less than 48 hours) of a child(ren) out of the home that is specifically for the protection or care of the child(ren) during intervention in a family crisis.
E.	<u>Day Care:</u> Child care for less than 24 hours a day. These services may be merely custodial or include therapeutic, educational and/or recreational activities for children.

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

12

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES REFERRAL	SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A
-------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------

- F. Foster Care: Placement of alleged victim(s) in a licensed foster care facility or home for more than 48 hours.
- G. Referral to Law Enforcement: Referral to police, sheriff, parole or probation officers.
- H. Referral to County Attorney/Civil: Case has been referred to County Attorney for civil action.
- I. Referral to County Attorney/Criminal: Case has been referred to County Attorney for criminal action.
- J. Home Attendant Services: Services involving the visit of a qualified home attendant to the alleged victim's home to provide assistance with general household activities, including household management, meal preparation, personal care activities, transportation, health support services, and instruction therein, when appropriate.
- O. Other: Specify any other service provided that is not included above.

(23)

Circle the response that most accurately describes the case status.

- A. Case Open: Alleged victim(s)/family remains on caseload and services are currently being provided and/or planned.
- B. Case Closed After Investigation: Investigation is complete and no other services are planned or provided.

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

13

CSD-ADM 101-4

SECTION: REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES REFERRAL	SUBJECT: Completion of CSD-110A
-------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------

C. Unable to Locate: Principal adults or caretakers cannot be found at current known address.

- ②4 Enter investigating worker's signature/
title/worker number.
- ②5 Enter secondary worker's name/title/
worker number.
- ②6 Enter date the report was submitted
(MMDDYY).

SEE NEXT PAGE FOR REDUCED COPY
OF FORM CSD-110A, REPORT ON
CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES
REFERRAL

BB/

o o o

Dec. 1, 1983

COMMUNITY SERVICES

14

APPENDIX E

DEFINITION OF AN INDIAN CHILD

STATE OF MONTANA
DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES
INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO: Gary

Date: January 5, 1988

FROM: Bea *Bo*

RE: Definition of an Indian Child

The Indian Child Welfare Act (Public Law 95-608) describes an "Indian Child" to mean any unmarried person who is under age eighteen and is either (a) a member of an Indian tribe or (b) is eligible for membership in an Indian tribe and is the biological child of a member of an Indian tribe.

However, the Federal Register dated November 26, 1979 under Section B. Pretrial requirements addresses B.1. Determination That Child Is an Indian: I will highlight the important criteria as I perceive it, as follows;

B.1.

- (c) Circumstances under which a state court has reason to believe a child involved in a child custody proceeding is an Indian include but are not limited to the following:
- (i) Any party to the case, Indian tribe, Indian organization or public or private agency informs the court that the child is an Indian child.
 - (ii) Any public or state-licensed agency involved in child protection services or family support has discovered information which suggests that the child is an Indian child.
 - (iii) The child who is the subject of the proceeding gives the court reason to believe he or she is an Indian child.
 - (iv) The residence or the domicile of the child, his or her biological parents, or the Indian custodian is known by the court to be or is shown to be a predominantly Indian community.
 - (v) An officer of the court involved in the proceeding has knowledge that the child may be an Indian child.

Since enrollment is not always required in order to be a member of a tribe; some tribes do not have written rolls. Others have rolls that

list only persons that were members as of a certain date. Enrollment is the common evidentiary means of establishing Indian status, but it is not the only means nor is it necessarily determinative. (*United States v. Broncheau*, 597 F.2d 1260,1263 (9th Cir.1979))

The guidelines also list several circumstances which shall trigger an inquiry by the court and petitioners to determine whether a child is an Indian for purposes of this Act. This listing is not intended to be complete, but it does list the most common circumstances giving rise to a reasonable belief that a child may be an Indian.

Given the position by the Department of the Interior and given the draft of proposed amendments to the Indian Child Welfare Act dated 07/09/87 which include as Indian all children considered to be part of the Indian community but do not technically meet the criteria for membership, I recommend that this memo be widely circulated to placing staff to alleviate the confusion over who is an Indian child.

I further recommend that this policy directive be shared with every Judicial District Judge in the state to enhance their decision making authority as it relates to notification requirements under the Indian Child Welfare Act.

APPENDIX F

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES
DATA TRANSMITTAL COVER LETTER

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES



STAN STEPHENS, GOVERNOR

(406) 444-5900
FAX (406) 444-5956

STATE OF MONTANA

TOM L. OLSEN, DIRECTOR
JESSE MUNRO, DEPUTY DIRECTORP.O. BOX 8005
HELENA, MONTANA 59604

February 21, 1992

TO: Thom Curtis, MSU

FR: Pat Gaydos, Chief *Pat*
Information Systems Bureau

RE: Raw Data Extract From PSIS

Per your request, I am providing you with a file of raw data from PSIS named MSUEXTR.ASC. The file is in ASCII fixed field format, contains 10,476 records, has a record length of 42 and includes a record for each child in all investigations completed between 1/1/91 and 12/31/91. The file is sorted by county number (1-56 alphabetically by county name), client age, sex and race.

The client age is calculated by subtracting the birthdate from the investigation start date. There are some problems with the birthdates entered into PSIS. For some clients, the birthdate entered was greater than the investigation start date, resulting in a value of -1 for age. When not known, the birthdate was entered 10101, resulting in a value of 90 for age.

The appropriate codes for each of the coded fields are listed on the 110A Report on Child Protective Services Referral previously provided to you.

The following fields are included in each record:

Field	Begins	Ends	Values
County number	1	2	1 - 56
Client age at start of investigation	3	4	-1 - 90
Sex	5	5	M F
Race	6	6	1 - 7
Investigation start date	7	12	YYMMDD
Investigation end date	13	18	YYMMDD
Current case status	19	19	A - E
Referral source	20	21	1 - 19

MSU Data Extract
 February 21, 1992
 Page 2

Report type - Abus - Phy	22	22	X or " "
Report type - Abus - Emo	23	23	X or " "
Report type - Abus - Sex	24	24	X or " "
Report type - Negl - Phys	25	25	X or " "
Report type - Negl - Med	26	26	X or " "
Report type - Negl - Emo	27	27	X or " "
Report type - Negl - Educ	28	28	X or " "
Report type - Expl	29	29	X or " "
Report type - Fatal	30	30	X or " "
Invest rslt - Abus - Phy	31	31	U S or " "
Invest rslt - Abus - Emo	32	32	U S or " "
Invest rslt - Abus - Sex	33	33	U S or " "
Invest rslt - Negl - Phys	34	34	U S or " "
Invest rslt - Negl - Emo	35	35	U S or " "
Invest rslt - Negl - Med	36	36	U S or " "
Invest rslt - Negl - Educ	37	37	U S or " "
Invest rslt - Expl	38	38	U S or " "
Invest rslt - Fatal	39	39	U S or " "
Invest rslt - Cmplt	40	40	U S or " "
Perpetrator relationship	41	41	A - G
Fill	42	42	" "

Good luck with your analysis and please call Frank or myself if you have any questions.

c: Doug Matthies
 Frank Kromkowski

APPENDIX G

ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT

EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT

Table 55. Educational Neglect Reports by Victim's Gender

Gender	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent of Total
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Male	38	45.2	46	54.8	84	46.2
Female	49	50.0	49	50.0	98	53.8
Total	87	47.8	95	52.2	182	100.0%

Table 56. Educational Neglect Reports by Victim's Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent of Total
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
0-1	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	1.7
2-3	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	2.8
4-5	10	50.0	10	50.0	20	11.3
6-7	15	50.0	15	50.0	30	16.9
8-9	10	35.7	18	64.3	28	15.8
10-11	10	45.5	12	54.5	22	12.4
12-13	18	54.5	15	45.5	33	18.6
14-15	15	51.7	14	48.3	29	16.4
16-17	1	14.3	6	85.7	7	4.0
Total	85	48.0	92	52.0	177	100.0

Table 57. Educational Neglect by Victim's Ethnicity

Ethnicity of Victim	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent Total
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Caucasian	52	47.7	57	52.3	109	78.4
Native American	12	48.0	13	52.0	25	18.0
Hispanic	1	25.0	3	75.0	4	2.9
Black	1	100.0	0		1	.7
Asian	0		0		0	
Vietnamese	0		0		0	
Alaskan	0		0		0	
Total	66	47.5	73	52.5	139	100.0

Table 58. Referral Sources for Reports of Educational Neglect

Referral Source	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent of Total
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Mother	1	25.0	3	75.0	4	2.2
Father	0	0	2	100.0	2	1.1
Self	1	100.0	0	0	1	.5
Sibling	1	100.0	0	0	1	.5
Other Relatives	5	35.7	9	64.3	14	7.7
Neighbor	7	43.8	9	56.3	16	8.7
Child Care Provider	1	100.0	0	0	1	.5
Foster Parent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attorney	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	1	100.0	0	0	1	.5
Youth Court	2	100.0	0	0	2	1.1
Human Services	1	16.7	5	83.3	6	3.3
Educators	44	53.7	38	46.3	82	44.8
Hospital Staff	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	1.6
Other Medical	0	0	0	0	0	0
Residential Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legal Guardian	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economic Assistance	0	0	2	100.0	2	1.1
Other	23	47.9	25	52.1	48	26.2
Total	88	48.1	95	51.9	183	100.0

Table 59. Educational Neglect by
Perpetrator's Relationship to Victim

Perpetrator's Relationship	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent of Total
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Parent	84	48.0	91	52.0	175	95.6
Other Caretaker	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	1.6
Other Household Member	0	0	0	0	0	0
Licensed Care Provider	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caretaker Substitute	0	0	1	100.0	1	.5
School	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	1.1
Other	2	100.0	0	0	2	1.1
Total	88	48.1	95	51.9	183	100.0

APPENDIX H

ANALYSIS OF MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE

MEDICAL NEGLECT

Table 60. Medical Neglect Reports by Victim's Gender

Gender	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent of Total
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Male	49	30.6	111	69.4	160	47.6
Female	69	39.2	107	60.8	176	52.4
Total	118	35.1	218	64.9	336	100.0%

Table 61. Medical Neglect Reports by Victim's Age

Age	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent of Total
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
0-1	28	30.1	65	69.9	93	8.6
2-3	12	26.1	34	73.9	46	14.2
4-5	14	60.9	9	39.1	23	7.1
6-7	10	32.3	21	67.7	31	9.5
8-9	13	43.3	17	56.7	30	9.2
10-11	8	30.8	18	69.2	26	8.0
12-13	15	45.5	18	54.5	33	10.2
14-15	14	53.8	12	46.2	26	8.0
16-17	4	23.5	13	76.5	17	5.2
Total	118	36.3	207	63.7	325	100.0

Table 62. Medical Neglect by Victim's Ethnicity

Ethnicity of Victim	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent Total
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Caucasian	84	35.4	153	64.6	237	81.4
Native American	19	45.2	23	54.8	42	14.4
Hispanic	1	12.5	7	87.5	6	4.1
Black	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	.7
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vietnamese	0	0	1	100.0	1	.3
Alaskan	1	100.0	0	0	1	.3
Total	106	36.4	185	63.6	291	100.0

Table 63. Referral Sources for Reports of Medical Neglect

Referral Source	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent of Total
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Mother	2	11.8	15	88.2	17	5.0
Father	1	10.0	9	90.0	10	3.0
Self	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	.9
Sibling	1	100.0	0	0	1	.3
Other Relatives	5	21.7	18	78.3	23	6.8
Neighbor	8	40.0	12	60.0	20	5.9
Child Care Provider	3	30.0	7	70.0	10	3.0
Foster Parent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attorney	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	.9
Law Enforcement	8	72.7	3	27.3	11	3.3
Youth Court	1	100.0	0	0	1	.3
Human Services	3	18.8	13	81.3	16	4.7
Educators	33	44.6	41	55.4	74	22.0
Hospital Staff	9	36.0	16	64.0	25	7.4
Other Medical	12	30.0	28	70.0	40	11.9
Residential Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legal Guardian	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economic Assistance	0	0	3	100.0	3	.9
Other	31	38.8	49	61.3	80	23.7
Total	119	35.3	218	64.7	337	100.0

Table 64. Medical Neglect by
Perpetrator's Relationship to Victim

Perpetrator's Relationship	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated		Total Cases	Percent of Total
	Cases	Percent	Cases	Percent		
Parent	110	34.3	211	65.7	321	95.5
Other Caretaker	4	57.1	3	42.9	7	2.1
Other Household Member	0	0	1	100.0	1	.3
Licensed Care Provider	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caretaker Substitute	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	.6
School	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	1.5
Total	119	35.4	217	64.6	336	100.0

APPENDIX I

1990 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING

SUMMARY TAPE FILE 1A

Printout provided by Montana Department of Commerce

08/07/91

1990 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING - SUMMARY TAPE FILE 1A
PROFILE 2 - PERSONS BY AGE, RACE, SEX AND HISPANIC ORIGIN

2

STATE NAME: MONTANA		COUNTY:		AREA NAME: MONTANA		MCD/CDD:		PLACE:		TRACT/BNA:		BG/BLOCK:		SLVL CODE: 040		IND RES:		ANV:			
P12. PERSONS BY AGE, RACE AND SEX (UNIVERSE: PERSONS)																					
AGE		---WHITE---				---BLACK---				AM IND, ESK, ALEU ASIAN OR PAC IS.				---OTHER RACE---				P13. HISPANIC ORIGIN (UNIVERSE: HISPAN. PERSONS)			
		TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE		
TOTAL		741,111	374,214	2,381	957	47,679	24,087	4,259	2,406	3,635	1,632	12,174	5,911								
UNDER 1		8,930	4,354	57	34	1,075	525	78	37	54	24	271	130								
1 - 2		21,141	10,307	125	60	2,598	1,280	218	119	166	82	610	288								
3 - 4		21,785	10,558	127	59	2,477	1,187	240	131	186	91	609	290								
5		11,590	5,642	60	29	1,181	595	111	61	81	39	322	156								
6		11,421	5,522	61	25	1,186	563	83	52	74	27	310	133								
7 - 9		35,480	17,325	146	73	3,456	1,715	209	93	238	123	919	451								
10 - 11		23,623	11,537	96	38	2,129	1,048	133	75	149	88	555	295								
12 - 13		22,559	10,877	74	35	2,035	1,002	117	62	147	77	543	257								
14		10,709	5,146	35	13	962	477	60	29	71	32	246	115								
15		10,648	5,117	38	18	966	443	63	35	68	35	242	110								
16		10,346	4,885	35	13	889	443	83	46	72	27	242	92								
17		10,284	4,948	27	12	926	466	67	39	59	21	247	100								
18		9,872	4,769	53	19	910	398	81	45	81	34	234	115								
19		10,190	5,040	65	24	842	391	88	46	60	26	207	98								
20		9,472	4,663	70	18	768	360	88	43	63	19	215	90								
21		8,872	4,345	38	11	735	347	90	37	67	23	210	99								
22 - 24		24,674	12,254	198	69	2,193	1,147	265	112	176	72	543	260								
25 - 29		51,004	25,783	257	86	4,096	2,112	391	221	363	167	1,025	529								
30 - 34		61,961	31,593	229	87	4,040	2,128	386	234	343	144	1,045	509								
35 - 39		64,014	31,877	178	65	3,295	1,699	377	223	308	123	905	462								
40 - 44		55,317	26,919	92	24	2,667	1,335	281	173	227	99	731	360								
45 - 49		42,779	20,995	63	22	1,962	990	186	125	143	54	458	225								
50 - 54		35,153	17,547	66	22	1,693	885	146	102	115	56	346	175								
55 - 59		32,402	16,365	48	20	1,344	736	128	88	83	40	304	160								
60 - 61		13,370	6,882	21	13	424	234	41	30	38	17	121	57								
62 - 64		19,681	10,002	23	11	610	358	59	40	49	19	137	63								
65 - 69		31,530	16,422	29	16	790	406	80	48	67	33	237	112								
70 - 74		27,669	15,094	32	14	603	350	50	33	34	15	137	75								
75 - 79		20,908	12,014	14	10	431	246	33	14	22	13	92	53								
80 - 84		13,261	8,098	11	8	227	133	13	6	17	9	59	27								
85+		10,466	7,334	13	9	169	108	14	7	14	3	52	25								
P12. PERSONS BY AGE, RACE AND SEX (UNIVERSE: PERSONS)																					
SCHOOL AGE: TOTAL		---WHITE---				---BLACK---				AM IND, ESK, ALEU ASIAN OR PAC IS.				---OTHER RACE---				P13. HISPANIC ORIGIN (UNIVERSE: HISPAN. PERSONS)			
		TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE	TOTAL	FEMALE		
5 - 11		82,114	40,026	363	165	7,952	3,921	536	281	542	277	2,106	1,035								
12 - 14		33,268	16,023	109	48	2,997	1,479	177	91	218	109	789	372								
15 - 17		31,278	14,950	100	43	2,781	1,352	213	120	199	83	731	302								
WORKING AND VOTING AGE:																					
16+		563,225	287,829	1,562	573	29,614	15,252	2,947	1,712	2,401	1,014	7,547	3,686								
16 - 64		459,391	228,867	1,463	516	27,394	14,009	2,757	1,604	2,247	941	6,970	3,394								
18+		542,595	277,996	1,500	548	27,799	14,343	2,797	1,627	2,116	966	7,058	3,494								
18 - 64		438,761	219,034	1,401	491	25,579	13,100	2,607	1,519	2,116	893	6,481	3,202								
OTHER AGE GROUP:																					
0 - 4		51,856	25,219	309	153	6,150	2,992	536	287	406	197	1,490	708								
5 - 17		146,660	70,999	572	256	13,730	6,752	926	492	959	469	3,626	1,709								
18 - 44		295,376	147,243	1,180	403	19,546	9,917	2,047	1,134	1,688	707	5,115	2,522								
45 - 64		143,305	71,791	221	88	6,033	3,183	560	385	428	186	1,366	680								
62+		123,515	68,964	122	68	2,830	1,581	249	148	203	92	714	355								
65+		103,834	58,962	99	57	2,220	1,243	190	108	154	73	577	292								

DATA IS FINAL. COMPILED BY U.S. BUR. OF CENSUS; PROCESSED BY CENSUS & ECONOMIC INFORMATION CENTER, MONTANA DEPT. OF COMMERCE. 7/91

161

APPENDIX J

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES

1990 REPORT TO

THE NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT DATA SYSTEM

FK

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES



STAN STEPHENS, GOVERNOR

(406) 444-5900
FAX (406) 444-5956

STATE OF MONTANA

TOM L. OLSEN, DIRECTOR
JESSE MUNRO, DEPUTY DIRECTORP.O. BOX 8005
HELENA, MONTANA 59604

September 11, 1991

National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS)
P.O. Box 2668
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20886-2668

Dear NCANDS Project Staff:

Attached, in response to a request from the HHS Administration for Children and Families, are Summary Data Component (SDC) reports for calendar year 1990, calendar year 1989 and calendar year 1988, prepared by the Montana Department of Family Services (DFS).

As you will notice in reviewing these Montana DFS SDC reports, the Montana Protective Services Information System provides only certain portions of the data NCANDS requests. Montana DFS is currently beginning the development of a new management information system to address (a) a variety of new federal requirements concerning foster care data and also, as time and funds allow, (b) some voluntary information requests (such as NCANDS) concerning data about child protective/investigative services. We hope to be in a better position to provide more of the NCANDS data at the time of the next request.

Please contact me at (406) 444-5911 if you have any questions about the data contained in these SDC Reports.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Kromkowski, Chief
Research and Planning Bureau
Protective Services Division

FK/jl

Enclosures: SCD Reports (3)

c: Betty Bay, Chief, DFS Program Bureau
John Madsen, Program Officer, DFS Program Bureau
Gary Walsh, Administrator, DFS Protective Services Division
Pat Gaydos, Chief, DFS Data Processing Bureau
Tom Olsen, Director
Carl Slatt, Child Welfare Specialist, HHS/ACF, Region VIII, Denver

NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT DATA
SYSTEM

SECTION I - GENERAL INFORMATION

	State/Territory
	MONTANA
	Reporting Period
	January - December Year: 1990
	Contact
Name	Frank Kromkowski
Title	Chief, Research and Planning Bureau
Address	Protective Services Division
	Montana Department of Family Services (DFS)
	P.O. Box 8005
	Helena MT 59604
Phone/FAX	(406) 444-5900; FAX (406)444-5956

Comments
(Describe the sources of data used and how the State collected the data)
Data source is the Montana DFS PSIS (Protective Services Information System) report for the calendar year indicated. Montana CPS workers complete a DFS-110A "Report on Child Protective Services Referral" for all completed CA/N investigations. The PSIS computer system records the data from these 110A reports and generates a variety of reports with summary data similar to the data requested by the NCANDS system. (The Montana PSIS system does not currently generate all the NCANDS data.)

NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
DATA SYSTEM

SUMMARY DATA FORM

SECTION II REPORT DATA

This section requests data on reports of child abuse and neglect that were received by the child protective services agency during the reporting period and were referred for investigation.

	Child Based	Incident or Family Based
1. NUMBER OF REPORTS	NA	7,236

Enter here the number of reports alleging child abuse and neglect or risk of maltreatment received during the reporting period and referred for investigation. Reports that were screened out prior to an investigation should not be included.

2. NUMBER OF CHILDREN WHO WERE SUBJECT OF A REPORT	11,029
----------------------------------------------------	--------

Enter here the number of children who were the subject of reports counted in Item 1. Indicate whether you are providing an unduplicated number or a duplicated number. An unduplicated number counts each child only once, even if she/he is the subject of multiple reports. A duplicated number counts a child each time she/he is the subject of a report.

Check one:

Unduplicated number provided

Duplicated number provided

3. NUMBER OF REPORTS BY SOURCE

Of the reports counted in Item 1, enter the number made by each source listed below. Count the primary source who made the report to the CPS agency. Enter 'N/A' if a specific category is not applicable in your State.

A. Social Service Professionals [Montana DFS includes human services and economic assistance staff] Social workers, counselors, mental health workers, etc.	406
B. Medical Professionals [Montana DFS includes hospital staff and other medical professionals.] Physicians, nurses, emergency medical technicians, dentists, chiropractors, etc.	516
C. Law Enforcement Officers [Montana DFS includes law enforcement and youth court/probation staff.] Sworn officers in local, county, State or Federal law enforcement agencies.	803
D. Educators Teachers, principals, school counselors, pupil personnel workers, etc.	1,224
E. Child Care Providers Day care workers, foster parents, residential center staff, babysitters, etc.	216
F. Victims Children who allege they have been maltreated.	194
G. Parents Birth, adoptive, or stepmother or father of the child.	680
H. Other Relatives Siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, etc.	543
I. Friends and Neighbors Non-relatives who interact with the family or who live nearby.	772
J. Perpetrators Self-reported abusers.	N/A
K. Anonymous Reporters Individuals who did not identify themselves.	N/A
L. Other [Montana DFS includes Attorneys, Legal Guardians and Other in this category.] Other sources not included above, including unknown and missing data.	1,882
1990 Montana Total:	7,236

SECTION III - INVESTIGATION DATA

This section requests data on all investigations of child abuse and neglect completed during the reporting period. The number of investigations will not necessarily equal the NUMBER OF REPORTS in Item 1. Enter N/A if a category is not applicable in your State. SECTION III NOTE: The Montana DFS PSIS system tracks substantiated or unsubstantiated CA/N incidents — not investigations.

4. NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY DISPOSITION

A. Number of Investigations in Which the Allegation of Maltreatment or Risk of Maltreatment Was Substantiated

5,051

Enter here the number of investigations in which the allegation of maltreatment or risk of maltreatment was substantiated according to State law or State policy

Number in A = CA/N incidents found to be substantiated during (7,236) completed investigations this calendar year.

B. Number of Investigations in Which Allegations of Maltreatment Were Indicated or There Were Reasons to Suspect Maltreatment

N/A

Enter here the number of investigations for which allegations of maltreatment were indicated, or there were reasons to suspect maltreatment under State law or State policy.

C. Number of Investigations in Which Allegations of Maltreatment Were Not Substantiated

8,361

Enter here the number of investigations for which the alleged maltreatment was not substantiated.

Number in C = Alleged CA/N incidents found to be not substantiated during 7,236 completed investigations this calendar year.

Optional

Enter here the number of Not Substantiated Allegations which were determined to be intentionally false allegations. (This number is included in C above).

N/A

D. Number of Investigations That Were Closed Without a Finding

N/A

Enter here the number of investigations in which the case was closed although it was not possible to complete the investigation (e.g., family moved, investigation time exceeded that allowed).

E. Number of Other Dispositions

N/A

Enter here the number of completed investigations for which the dispositions are not included in the above categories.

F. Number of Unknown Dispositions

N/A

Enter here the number of completed investigations in which the disposition is not known.

