

Percent of Child Abuse Cases Reopened for Same Type of Abuse

**Research Findings
Of
Christa Prather and Monique Shanks**

Spalding University

Spring Semester, 2007

Research Question

After reviewing all the data our research question has been modified to; What percentage of children of substantiated child abuse cases are reopened for the same type of abuse as the first time the case was opened?

While conducting our research we found that gender, age, and educational level were irrelevant for our findings. Also we could not find any information about our intervening variables of outside support system, preventative programs and follow up care. Our hypothesis was also changed to:

H₀: There is no difference in why a CPS child abuse and neglect case is opened from the first case to the second case.

H_a: There is a difference in why a CPS child abuse and neglect case is opened from the first to the second case.

Findings

For the first cases of abuse 56% were for neglect, 22% were for physical abuse, and 20% were for physical and neglect, and 2% were for sexual abuse. For the second cases of abuse 68% were for neglect, 12% were for physical abuse, 16% were for physical and neglect, 2% was for sexual abuse and 2% was for sexual and physical abuse. This shows that there was an increase of 12% from first case of abuse to the second case of abuse which was neglect. Physical abuse from the first case to the second case dropped 10% (See Tables 1 & 2).

With a significance of .000 the Pearson chi-square test shows significance between the first reported case and the second reported case of child abuse this rejects the null hypothesis (See Table 7). The one way ANOVA test shows that when you add the other variables of race,

employment, income, and whether or not substance abuse was involved there is no significance between the first case and the second case. This leaves the researchers with the question what causes the significance between the first and the second case of abuse.

Secondary Findings

Out of the 50 cases reviewed for the first report of abuse 60% involved substance abuse, compared to 72% for the second reported case involving substance abuse. That leaves 40% of the first reported cases with no substance abuse involvement and 28% for the second reported case (See Tables 5&6).

Out of the 50 cases reviewed 50% were unemployed, and 2% were missing from data collection leaving the other 48% employed (See Table 3). With 50% of the cases being unemployed that put the income level of \$0-15,000 showing at 74%, 22% of the cases reviewed having an income level between \$15,001-25,000 and the remaining 4% with an income level of 35,001 and over(See Table 4).

Discussions and Implications

As a result of our findings from comparing the first case to the second case of reported child abuse we found a significant difference between the two reports. In addition we don't know what causes the difference. We do think since such a significance was found that there should be a way to find out what causes the difference in reports. We ruled out income level, substance abuse, employment, and race as being one reason behind the difference. With the significance being that the second case is neglect maybe we can find some ways of red flagging case that could potentially be reported again later and put preventative measures in place, longer monitoring periods, or a yearly follow up for the first two years after the case is closed. More research needs to be conducted in order to figure out what causes the second case to almost

always be opened as neglect. What can we as future CPS workers be looking for in order to help our clients be successful in maintaining an abuse free home. This research doesn't show us that maybe future research will.

TABLES

Table 1

1st case of abuse

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Physical	11	22.0	22.0	22.0
	Neglect	28	56.0	56.0	78.0
	Sexual	1	2.0	2.0	80.0
	Physical and Neglect	10	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 2

2nd case of abuse

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Physical	6	12.0	12.0	12.0
	Neglect	34	68.0	68.0	80.0
	Sexual	1	2.0	2.0	82.0
	Physical and Neglect	8	16.0	16.0	98.0
	Physical and Sexual	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 3

Whether or not the parents are employed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	24	48.0	48.0	48.0
	No	25	50.0	50.0	98.0
	Missing	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 4

How much money do they make

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-15,000	37	74.0	74.0	74.0
	15,001-25,000	11	22.0	22.0	96.0
	35,001 and over	2	4.0	4.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 5

Substance Abuse for Report 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	30	60.0	60.0	60.0
	no	20	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 6

Substance Abuse for Report 2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	36	72.0	72.0	72.0
	no	14	28.0	28.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 7

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	69.314(a)	12	.000

Table 8

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1st case of abuse	Between Groups	1.204	3	.401	.378	.769
	Within Groups	48.796	46	1.061		
	Total	50.000	49			
2nd case of abuse	Between Groups	4.080	3	1.360	1.564	.211
	Within Groups	40.000	46	.870		
	Total	44.080	49			
Substance Abuse for Report 1	Between Groups	.329	3	.110	.432	.731
	Within Groups	11.671	46	.254		
	Total	12.000	49			
Substance Abuse for Report 2	Between Groups	1.543	3	.514	2.770	.052
	Within Groups	8.538	46	.186		
	Total	10.080	49			