

## AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

Valva D. Just for the degree of Doctor of Education in Education presented on September 30, 1996. Title: Training School Administrators in the Prevention of Child Sexual Abuse in the School Setting.

Abstract approved: Redacted for Privacy

Mark L. Merickel

School administrators are required by law to report suspected cases of child abuse. They create serious legal and moral consequences for their school districts when they fail to report suspicions of child abuse occurring in the school setting. Studies consistently find that child sexual abuse is under-reported and that allegations of sexual abuse by school personnel are increasing. School administrators may not be responding effectively to the abuse that does occur in schools because they have not been trained to recognize indicators of abuse nor to effectively investigate allegations of abuse.

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether specially designed training would significantly improve school administrators' performance on child sexual abuse case simulations.

Subjects were from a convenience sample of 40 practicing administrators from five school districts in Yamhill County, Oregon. A one-group pretest-intervention-post-test (A-B-A) design was used, and data were collected using three instruments: (1) an administrator questionnaire

developed through a Delphi Process, (2) a pre-evaluation case simulation, and (3) a post-evaluation case simulation. The  $t$  test of alpha was used to examine the correlated means and determine the significance in changes in performance between the pre- and post-test results. A standard level of significance ( $p < .05$ ) was employed throughout the study.

This study confirms that the administrators in this sample were lacking in knowledge in the six areas addressed by the training modules and that the gains they made were significant in each of the six training areas and on the overall post-test. No significant differences were found among the subjects on the basis of gender, age, experience level, and longevity in their current positions.

This study concludes that school administrators may lack sufficient knowledge about child sexual abuse to adequately protect children in their schools. It also suggests that specially designed training sessions will increase reporting and reduce the number of child sexual abuse cases occurring in public schools. Districts may better fulfill their moral and legal obligations to protect children and reduce their legal costs and exposure to liability by providing specialized training in child sexual abuse for administrators.

**Training School Administrators  
in the Prevention of  
Child Sexual Abuse in the School Setting**

**by**

**Valva D. Just**

**A DISSERTATION**

**submitted to**

**Oregon State University**

**in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of**

**Doctor of Education**

**Completed September 30, 1996  
Commencement June 1997**

©Copyright by Valva D. Just  
September 30, 1996  
All Rights Reserved

Doctor of Education dissertation of Valva D. Just presented on September 30, 1996.

APPROVED:

*Redacted for Privacy*

Major Professor, representing Education

*Redacted for Privacy*

Director of School of Education

*Redacted for Privacy*

Dean of Graduate School

I understand that my dissertation will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my dissertation to any reader upon request.

*Redacted for Privacy*

Valva D. Just, Author

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Special thanks and recognition go to the many individuals who provided the support, motivation, encouragement, and cooperation needed for me to complete this dissertation. My appreciation goes to the following people for their contributions to this effort:

- Dr. Mark L. Merickel, my major professor and mentor, for providing the greatest encouragement and support and for spending hours of time editing my work, meeting with me, and guiding this process to a culmination.
- Dr. Jodi Engel, director of the Middle-Level Cohort Program, for having the vision and tenacity to pioneer an innovative doctoral program for working professionals in education and for creating the possibility for me to obtain my doctorate while continuing to work full-time.
- Dr. Barbara McEwan, member of my doctoral committee, for providing the inspiration for this research topic and special expertise in legal and ethical standards.
- Dr. Bruce DeYoung, the Graduate School Representative on my committee, for providing the technical assistance to complete the dissertation process and for the recognizing the value of using statistical analyses in this study.

- Dr. Ray Lindley, member of my doctoral committee, for sharing his insights and providing assistance to help me obtain my ERIC searches through the services of the Oregon Department of Education.
- Dr. Deborah Weiner, member of my doctoral committee and a district colleague, for the many hours she spent reading and editing my work, for sharing her expertise, and for her unqualified support and confidence in my abilities.
- The members of the Middle-Level Cohort Group who provided the interpersonal elements, the support, the friendship, and the encouragement to make the doctoral program fun and meaningful.
- My family, but especially my new granddaughter Chloe Alexis Just, for providing the inspiration and encouragement for me to complete this work. (Chloe was born on Saturday, August 17, 1996, the same day I completed writing this dissertation!)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Review of the Literature .....	3
Purpose of This Study .....	11
Research Questions.....	12
Definitions of Terms .....	14
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	19
Introduction.....	19
Child Abuse Reporting Laws .....	21
Indicators of Child Abuse Victims .....	30
Characteristics of the Child Molester.....	34
Reporting of Child Abuse .....	38
School Policy, Ethical Standards, and Legal Implications .....	41
Investigations of Child Sexual Abuse .....	48
Discussion .....	63
III. METHODOLOGY .....	68
Study Sample .....	68
Research Instruments .....	69
Procedure.....	72



## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Delphi Process .....	75
Pre-Evaluation Case Study A.....	81
Intervention.....	84
Post-Evaluation Case Study B .....	85
IV. RESULTS.....	86
Demographic Results .....	87
Content Validity Results .....	95
Pre- and Post-Test Results .....	112
Summary.....	131
V. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ....	137
Conclusions.....	139
Implications .....	151
Recommendations .....	155
REFERENCES .....	158
APPENDICES.....	162

## LIST OF TABLES

<b><u>Table</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
1. Reported Sex Abuse Victims by Age and Sex in Oregon in 1994 .....	4
2. Comparison of Age-Appropriate Characteristics and Indicators of Sexual Abuse in the Pre-Adolescent.....	32
3. Gender, Age, and Ethnic Categories of Subjects .....	88
4. Number of Years in Administration and Number of Years in Current Position.....	90
5. Current Type of Administrative Position for Subjects in the Study.....	92
6. Size of District and School by Numbers of Students and Numbers of Teachers .....	94
7. Summary of Pretest Results for Females, Males and Total Group.....	97
8. Summary of Gains on Six Individual Questions and on the Overall Test .....	114
9. Summary of Overall Gains for Females and Males .....	117
10. Comparison of Differences in Gains for Females and Males .....	119
11. Summary of Overall Gains for Administrators by Age.....	121
12. Comparison of Gains for Younger and Older Administrators.....	123
13. Summary of Overall Gains Based on Experience.....	125

## LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

<b><u>Table</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
14. Comparison of Gains for Less Experienced Versus More Experienced Administrators.....	127
15. Summary of Overall Gains for Administrators Based on Longevity in a Position.....	129
16. Comparison of Gains for Administrators Based on Longevity in a Position.....	132

## LIST OF APPENDICES

<b><u>Appendix</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
A: Letter to Superintendent.....	163
B: Delphi Process .....	166
C: Administrator Questionnaire.....	173
D: Questionnaire Results.....	182
E: Pre-and Post-Evaluation Case Studies .....	200
F: Pre- and Post-Test Coding Sheets.....	205
G: Pre- and Post-Test Results.....	210

This dissertation is dedicated to

***Chloe Alexis Just***

my first grandchild, who was born on

Saturday, August 17, 1996

the same day I finished writing the final chapter.

# **Training School Administrators in the Prevention of Child Sexual Abuse in the School Setting**

## **CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION**

### **Statement of the Problem**

The Children's Services Division of Oregon (1995), reported that there were 26,436 child abuse and neglect reports received by their department in 1994. This figure represents an increase of 5 percent from 1993 and 58 percent from 1984. From these reports, there were 10,703 founded incidents of child abuse in 1994, and 16.7% or 1,791 of these cases were incidents of child sexual abuse. Public and private officials in Oregon, who are required by law to report child abuse and neglect, made 68 percent of all the referrals to CSD in 1994; and nearly 40 percent of those referrals came from schools and law enforcement agencies.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Report (1995) notes that the national trend in child reporting rates from 1976 to 1992 was one of steady growth and that, on a national level, about 14 percent of all child abuse victims were sexually abused. Approximately 58 percent of all child abuse reports came from professionals including educators, law enforcement and justice officials, medical professionals, social service

professionals, and child care providers. These percentages have remained constant over the years during which data were collected, and educators account for 16.3 percent of the total reports.

Studies consistently find that child sexual abuse is under-reported. Barton (1990) reports that one boy in six, and one girl in four, is the victim of sexual abuse by the time he/she is sixteen. According to Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995), on a national average only 2 to 6 percent of sexual abuse cases are ever reported to an official. Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995) found that few studies of sexual abuse in schools exist and, even when cases are reported, many school districts are unwilling to make this data available to researchers. They found that newspaper accounts of sexual abuse by school personnel are among the few sources of information on the subject, and it appears significant that newspaper accounts of such incidents are on the increase.

Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995) also found that few school districts have training programs for staff members or written policies about how to deal with sexual abuse by staff members. While the vast majority of teachers and other staff members do not sexually abuse students, it is estimated that 3% to 5% of them do. The concern is that school officials may not be responding effectively to the abuse that does occur in the schools because procedures for investigating allegations of sexual abuse

have not been developed and staff training in the prevention of child sexual abuse has not occurred in most school districts.

With an estimated 94 to 98 percent of child sexual abuse cases going unreported (Shakeshaft & Cohan, 1995) and with increasing litigation against school districts for failing to protect children (McGrath, 1994), it is apparent that there exists a significant problem in preventing child sexual abuse in the school setting. Based on recognition of the problem, there is a growing need for school personnel, particularly school administrators, to be trained in the identification of victims of sexual abuse, recognition of pedophile behaviors, the procedures to follow in reporting suspected child sexual abuse, and the procedures to follow in conducting an investigation into allegations against school personnel.

### **Review of the Literature**

Finkelhor (1979) has documented the high incidence of sexual abuse and concluded that between 70 and 85 percent of sexual abuse is committed by someone known by the child. Children may be sexually abused at any age, but those who are prepubescent may be more at risk, due to their budding sexuality. Finkelhor (1984) cites the period between ages 8 and 12 as the time when children are most vulnerable to sexual abuse. This appears to show that those students who are in grades 4 to 10 may be at the greatest risk of sexual abuse.



According to the Children's Services Division (1995), 1,791 children in Oregon were identified as victims of sexual abuse in 1994 (see Table 1). Nearly 40 percent of the referrals came from schools and law enforcement agencies. Of these cases, approximately 20% of the victims were male and 80% were female.

Table 1

Reported Sex Abuse Victims by Age and Sex in Oregon in 1994

Age (years)	Male	Female	Total
0-1	4	13	18
2-5	111	260	371
6-9	136	388	524
10-13	100	426	527
14-17	40	312	352
Totals	391	1399	1791

Note. From "Sex Abuse Victims by Age & Sex," by Children's Services Division, 1995, 1994 Child Abuse and Neglect Report, p. 6.

Myths and stereotypical notions about child abuse are common; and stories that support these myths and stereotypes are replete in the media. Often these myths have been inappropriately translated by educators into educational practices that cause teachers to make inaccurate diagnoses about child sexual abuse. According to Tower (1993), the most classic myth

is that sexual abuse is perpetrated by strangers. As noted earlier, Finkelhor (1979) found that between 70 and 85 percent of sexual abuse is committed by someone known by the child. Tower (1993) found that it is easier for teachers to ignore or deny the symptoms of sexual abuse than it is for them to overlook physical abuse and neglect. Tower (1993) found that many of the indicators of child sexual abuse and of pedophile behavior are overlooked, especially if the perpetrator is an educator or a school employee.

Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995) found that the teachers who sexually abuse their students are often judged to be among the best teachers in a district and are very popular with students and parents. They found that allegations of sexual abuse were most likely to be made against staff members who worked with students in extracurricular activities or who had frequent one-to-one contact with students. A disproportionate number of accusations are made against coaches, drama teachers, art teachers, music teachers, and gym teachers because they often work with students off the school premises, outside of the regular school day, and frequently on a one-to-one basis.

Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995) found that 96 percent of the abusers in their study were males. Of the students who were sexually abused by male school employees, 76 percent were female, and 24 percent were male. Of

the students who were sexually abused by female school employees, 86 percent were female, and 14 percent were male.

Although many public school professionals have become aware that child sexual abuse is a serious problem, the magnitude of child sexual abuse that occurs in the school setting is still largely unrecognized. Much of the current literature on child sexual abuse is marked by poor samples, lack of longitudinal studies, conflicting findings, and evidence of misinformation and confusion among school personnel. In addition, Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995) found that school administrators tend to keep information about allegations against school personnel confidential.

Tower (1993) cites the effects of abuse on children and emphasizes the need for eliminating child abuse:

According to the psychoanalyst Erik Erikson, "the worst sin is the mutilation of a child's spirit." Abuse and neglect of children are heinous not only because youngsters are vulnerable and relatively powerless, but also because the effects of such maltreatment are so deep, so broad, and so long-lasting. (p. 11)

Milgram (1984) found that even though there is a growing awareness and sensitivity among teachers to the problem of sexual abuse at the middle school level, many still find it difficult to intervene or report suspected sexual abuse to the appropriate authorities. The extent of child abuse in schools is not known, but experts such as McGrath (1994) and Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995) agree that coerced sex between school personnel and students is not rare. They found that students are reluctant to report such

crimes because of fear of reprisal and because they have been coerced or bribed to keep such crimes secret. School officials who become aware of child sexual abuse cases often handle matters quietly to avoid publicity (American Association of University Women Educational Foundation, 1993).

Barton (1990) reports that one percent of the general population are pedophiles and that it is not uncommon for each pedophile to have hundreds of victims. In educational settings, estimates of school employees who may be pedophiles range from 3 to 5 percent (Slowik, 1993).

According to Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995), the higher estimates of pedophiles who are school employees can be attributed to the fact that pedophiles often seek employment with agencies that serve children and give them direct access to youth.

Certain people are required by Oregon law to report suspected cases of child sexual abuse to the local State Office for Services to Children and Families (SOSCF, formerly known as Children's Services Division) or a law enforcement agency. These people are termed "mandatory reporters" and such mandatory reporters are required to report child sexual abuse because they have frequent contact with children and should be able to identify children who are at risk from abuse and neglect (Children's Services Division, 1995).

School employees are designated mandatory reporters who must inform either SOSCF or a law enforcement agency "if there is reasonable

cause to believe that they have had contact with a child who has suffered abuse or a person who has abused a child” (ORS 419B.005). Prior to 1993, that contact had to be in the mandatory reporter’s official capacity as a school employee; but the 1993 Legislature changed the law to apply to any contact a mandatory reporter may have with an abused child or person who abuses a child. This expanded the requirement for school employees to report suspected child abuse occurring both at school and outside of the school setting and increased the school employee’s responsibility.

Every state in the United States has adopted similar mandatory reporting laws that require school employees to report suspected child abuse. In 1994, mandatory reporters in Oregon made 68 percent of all the abuse referrals to the State Office for Services to Children and Families. During that period, approximately 40 percent of the referrals for child sexual abuse came from schools and law enforcement agencies (Children’s Services Division, 1995). It appears that school employees may be willing to report suspicions of child sexual abuse if the suspicions do not include allegations about another school employee (Milgram, 1984).

Recent court decisions show that mandatory reporting laws have an especially strong impact on school employees whose daily contact with students gives them unique opportunities to detect possible abuse (Sendor, 1995). School employees have been held liable for failure to report child abuse under four different standards:

- 1) Oregon's Mandatory Reporting Law: A school employee is a mandatory reporter and may be held liable for failure to report personal knowledge of any "reasonable suspicion of child abuse" by any individual to state or local law enforcement officers or to Children's Services Division (Children's Services Division, 1995).
- 2) Doctrine of Negligent Hiring: A school supervisor and the district may be held liable for negligent hiring if the employer knew, or should have known, of an employee's incompetence or previous criminal record and the employer breached the duty to protect the child by neglecting to do an adequate background check before hiring the employee (Regotti, 1992).
- 3) Doctrine of Deliberate Indifference: In *Doe v. Taylor Independent School District*, the court found that a school supervisor may be held liable under Title 42, Section 1983, of the U. S. Code, if he/she acted with deliberate indifference to a school employee's violation of a student's constitutional right to physical integrity and if such deliberate indifference contributed to the school employee's violation (McGrath, 1994).
- 4) Responsibility of Non-Supervisory Colleagues: In the most recent precedent-setting case of *Doe v. Rains Independent School District*, the Fifth Circuit court found that a non-supervisory colleague of a teacher who abused a student may be held liable if state law requires

such non-supervising colleagues to take action that could prevent or stop the abuse and they fail to do so (Fossey, 1995; Sendor, 1995).

Educators can make significant contributions to improving the lives of school children by successfully identifying suspected cases of sexual abuse, bringing them to the attention of appropriate agencies, and interacting with abuse victims in a supportive capacity. The concern and efforts of educators to stop such abuse may be the first step in ending a child's tragic experience of sexual victimization (Roscoe, 1984).

One of the most important decisions that school administrators make is deciding who will be hired to teach, train, coach, counsel, and lead children in educational settings. Keeping child molesters and pedophiles out of classrooms and schools is a major task. Many school officials fail to conduct adequate background checks or to appropriately screen, supervise, and remove employees who may cause a risk to children (Clifton, 1981; Regotti, 1992). Failure to do background checks before hiring and failure to adequately supervise employees during their employment is defined as negligence and is a concern for public school systems. Although courts are hesitant to require criminal background checks for all employees, this practice is becoming more acceptable in public education. Many states now have mandatory fingerprinting laws for this purpose. Administrators can meet the requirement of reasonable prior investigation and prevent future

charges of negligence against their public school employers if they conduct background checks (Butterfield, 1994; McGrath, 1994; Slowik, 1993).

Increasing litigation by parents of abused children against school districts makes it financially prudent for school administrators to address the problem of child sexual abuse whenever allegations arise against a school employee. According to Regotti (1992), there is reason for alarm because the sexual abuse of students by teachers is increasing in our society and the number of state appellate court opinions of teacher dismissals for improper touching and sexual misconduct has increased over past decades.

Valente (1992) found that the alarming increase in reported cases of sexual molestation of public school students by teachers or student peers has caused school officials to recognize the need for improved monitoring and control measures and the need for enhanced training on child sexual abuse.

A review of the literature underscores the need for school administrators to be trained in child sexual abuse issues and the need for them to adhere to appropriate investigation procedures when allegations arise against school employees.

### **Purpose of the Study**

School employees are categorized as mandatory reporters who are required by law to report suspected cases of child abuse or any suspicion



that a person has abused a child. School employees, and particularly school administrators, are being held liable for failure to report sexual abuse of students by school personnel. Such failure to report sexual abuse creates serious legal consequences for school districts and emphasizes a need for specially designed training for school administrators to effectively reduce or prevent such abuse in the school setting.

A major problem encountered in the literature is the lack of research in the areas related to child sexual abuse: failure to recognize pedophile behaviors, failure to do background checks before hiring, failure to adequately supervise employees in school settings, failure to follow appropriate investigation procedures and failure to provide training to school administrators in child sexual abuse issues. Legal research by Sorenson (1991) provides case studies related to these topics, but virtually no quantitative data are available.

The purpose of this study is to examine a set of six specially designed training modules which prepare school administrators with strategies to prevent child sexual abuse in the school setting.

### **Research Questions**

Six specially designed modules will be created and used to train administrators about child sexual abuse issues in this study. From the six training modules, six questions emerge and become the questions to be

assessed in the pre- and post-evaluation case studies used in the administrator training sessions. These six questions are as follows:

- 1) Does the administrator know how to comply with the Oregon Child Abuse Reporting Law?
- 2) To what degree can the administrator recognize indicators of sexual abuse by observing a possible victim?
- 3) To what degree can the administrator recognize the characteristics of pedophile behavior?
- 4) Does the administrator know the information that is needed to justify reporting suspicion of child abuse to the appropriate agency?
- 5) Does the administrator understand how professional ethics and district policies apply to employees who are alleged to be sexual abuse perpetrators?
- 6) Does the administrator know what steps are to be followed in an investigation when allegations of child sexual abuse are made against a school employee?

The answers to each of these six questions should provide data to assist in testing the primary question of this study: Will training based on these specially designed modules significantly improve a school administrator's performance on child sexual abuse case simulations?

## **Definitions of Terms**

- 1) **Child abuse**: Oregon Revised Statute 419B.005 defines child abuse as “any assault, as defined in ORS chapter 163, of a child and any physical injury to a child which as been caused by other than accidental means, including any injury which appears to be at variance with the explanation of the injury.
- 2) **Children’s Services Division**: Often abbreviated as CSD, Children’s Services Division is the state agency responsible for child protective services. The CSD caseworker is responsible for assessing the risk to the child, the family’s ability to provide safety, and supportive resources available to the family. In 1995, this state agency’s name was changed to State Office for Services to Children and Families.
- 3) **Child sex abuse**: Sexual abuse is any incident of sexual contact including, but not limited to, rape, sodomy, incest, and sexual penetration with a foreign object, as those acts are defined in ORS chapter 163. Sexual abuse includes all of those contacts and interactions in which a child is used to sexually stimulate or gratify another person and includes, but it not limited to: exposing oneself before a child, exposing the genitals of a child, fondling, sexual harassment, and forcing, permitting, or encouraging a child to watch pornography or sexual activities.

- 4) Deliberate indifference: Failure to act in a reasonable manner to known or reasonably discoverable sexual abuse of students so as to project a policy, practice or custom that condones and consequently causes the sexual abuse to occur or recur.
- 5) Founded report: A type of investigation disposition that is used when the allegation of maltreatment or risk of maltreatment was supported or founded by State law or State policy.
- 6) Law enforcement agency: A law enforcement agency can be defined as a local police department, county sheriff, county juvenile department, or Oregon State Police.
- 7) Maltreatment: An action or failure to act by a parent or other person as defined under State law, having caused or allowed to cause physical abuse, neglect, medical neglect, sexual abuse, emotional abuse, or risk of harm to a child.
- 8) Mandatory reporter: Mandatory reporters are listed in ORS 419.005(3). A mandatory reporter must inform either SOSCF (formerly CSD) or a law enforcement agency if they have reasonable cause to believe they have had contact with a child who has suffered abuse or a person who has abused a child.
- 9) Negligent hiring: Failure to conduct an adequate background check that would have provided information of the employee's

incompetence or previous criminal record before hiring the employee.

- 10) Non-supervisory colleague: A co-worker or fellow employee who has no responsibility to supervise or evaluate the performance of the other employee.
- 11) Not substantiated: A type of investigation disposition that determines that there is not sufficient evidence under State law or policy to conclude or suspect that a child has been maltreated or is at-risk of being maltreated.
- 12) Pedophile: A person who engages in sexual activity with pre-pubertal children.
- 13) Pedophilia: Recurrent, intense, sexual urges and sexually arousing fantasies, of at least six months duration involving sexual activity with a prepubescent child.
- 14) Perpetrator: The person who has been determined to have caused or knowingly allowed the maltreatment or abuse of a child.
- 15) School personnel: An employee of a public educational institution or program including teachers, teacher assistants, administrators, and others directly associated with the delivery of educational services.

- 16) Sexual abuse: A type of maltreatment that refers to the involvement of the child in sexual activity to provide sexual gratification or financial benefit to the perpetrator, including contacts for sexual purposes, prostitution, pornography, exposure, or other sexually exploitative activities.
- 17) Sexual abusers: Sexual abusers manifest deviant behaviors which result in sexual assault of children. Sexual abusers use manipulation, threats, bribery, coercion, and sometimes force in sexual assaults.
- 18) Sexual exploitation: Sexual exploitation generally refers to the use of children for pornography and prostitution.
- 19) Sexual offenders: Sexual offenders exploit the power and authority of their position as a trusted adult in order to sexually misuse a child.
- 20) State Office for Services to Children and Families: Often abbreviated as SOSCF, this is the new title given to the state agency responsible for child protective services. The title was changed from Children's Services Division to the State Office for Services to Children and Families in 1995.
- 21) Substantiated: A type of investigation disposition that is used when the allegation of maltreatment or risk of maltreatment was supported or founded by State law or State policy.

- 22) Victim: The victim of child abuse is an unmarried person under the age of 18, who has been non-accidentally physically or mentally injured, negligently treated or maltreated, sexually abused or exploited, or who dies as a result of abuse or neglect.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **Introduction**

Sexual abuse is possibly the most traumatic form of abuse for its victims. It is also the most under-reported category of abuse in the documentation of child protective services according to Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995). It would be commendable to be able to report that the public schools adequately train school personnel to recognize the characteristics of sexual abuse and prepare them to act effectively. Unfortunately, school officials cannot make such a claim.

One of the most important decisions that school officials make involves deciding who will be hired to teach, train, coach, counsel, and lead children when they are at school. Keeping child molesters and pedophiles out of classrooms, schools, and youth-serving organizations is an important and major task in the hiring process.

Increasing litigation against school systems creates a financial reason to address this problem. The obligation of school personnel to protect children from abuse also creates a moral reason to address the problem. Yet, the literature shows that many school systems fail to appropriately screen, supervise, and remove employees who may cause a risk to children.



Districts must balance the right of the employee with the rights of the child and provide a safe and secure environment at school for both. This process begins at the hiring phase when school officials may have an opportunity to identify potential child molesters and pedophiles by conducting an adequate background check. After an employee has been hired, school officials have the responsibility of following procedures for monitoring and responding to allegations of sexual abuse that may emerge in the school setting.

School employees are obligated to protect the youth in our schools from sexual abuse. To achieve this, school employees should be trained to understand the legal reporting requirements; to recognize the indicators of victims of sexual abuse; to identify the characteristics of the child molester; to report suspected child abuse to the proper agencies; to apply appropriate policy provisions, ethical standards, and legal standards to reports of abuse; and to conduct appropriate investigations of child abuse allegations.

There exists a lack of research studies in the areas of negligent hiring and litigation against school districts for failure to supervise employees who sexually abuse children. Legal research provides a number of case studies related to these topics but virtually no quantitative research is available in this area.

A second problem encountered in the literature search was the difficulty in finding the most recent court decisions relating to sexual abuse.

However, some educational journals have recently begun reporting on the topic of child sexual abuse in the school setting because of the impact it is having on schools across the nation.

This literature review covers a wide range of issues relating to child sexual abuse in the public schools, particularly at the middle level age group of students in grades 4 through 10, and focuses on the responsibilities of school professionals to ensure a safe and secure environment for students. This chapter is organized to review the relevant research focusing on the six questions in this study:

- the child abuse reporting laws;
- the indicators of the sexually abused child;
- the characteristics of the child molester;
- the information needed to report suspicion of child abuse;
- the school policy, ethical standards, and legal implications; and
- the steps in conducting an investigation of alleged child abuse.

### **Child Abuse Reporting Laws**

The Scope and Statistics of Child Sexual Abuse. Sexual abuse has always been a human problem, but there has perhaps never been more awareness of it than today. The greatest myth regarding sexual abuse is that it is perpetrated by strangers. According to the National Center on Child

Abuse and Neglect (1995), child sexual abuse is defined as “involvement of the child in sexual activity to provide sexual gratification or financial benefit to the perpetrator, including contacts for sexual purposes, prostitution, pornography, exposure, or other sexually exploitative activities” (p. B-6).

According to Bridgeland and Duane (1990) and Abrams and Abrams (1993), child abuse is an important social problem that was rediscovered by medical researchers in the early 1960’s with the battered-child syndrome. As a consequence, legislatures in all states have required everyone with responsibility for children to discover and report abuse. The schools are particularly important sites to make these discoveries and reports; and the elementary and middle schools should be the major targets of child abuse detection since child protective agencies find that a greater percentage of sexual abuse occurs with children of these ages (Children’s Services Division, 1995).

Finkelhor (1979) has documented the high incidence of sexual abuse and pointed out the fact that between 70 and 85 percent of sexual abuse is committed by someone known by the child. Children may be sexually abused at any age, but those who are prepubescent may be more at risk, due to their budding sexuality. Finkelhor (1979) cites the period between ages 8 and 12 as the most vulnerable time, which means that middle level students may be at the greatest risk.

The results of a related study documented high levels of victimization of street prostitutes before and following their entrance into prostitution (Silbert & Pines, 1983). This study's findings indicate an urgent need to provide services for juvenile victims of sexual exploitation and suggests different points at which victim-oriented intervention services are needed.

The Committee for Children (1994) has provided training materials to assist school employees in identifying, reporting, and handling disclosure of the sexually abused child. These materials and the research by Slowik (1993) give common statistics relating to child sexual abuse:

- At least one girl in four and one boy in six will be sexually abused by the age of 16.
- The actual incidence of child sexual abuse could be much higher than 25% for girls and 16% for boys.
- It is estimated that 80 percent of child sexual abuse goes unreported, often because the child is too afraid to tell or feels guilty.
- Approximately 90 percent of all child sexual abuse is perpetrated by someone known to and trusted by the child.
- Of the offenders known to the child, almost half are the father or stepfather.
- Children can be molested at any age.

- Sexual abuse usually begins when a child is in early childhood, and the average “incident” of child sexual abuse is four years long.
- The typical offender is a male using his position of power to take advantage of a child’s trust, need for affection, and innocence.
- In rare instances, women may be offenders.
- Child sexual abuse occurs in all socio-economic and racial groups.
- Children rarely lie about sexual abuse incidents.
- One percent of the general population are considered to be child molesters or pedophiles.
- Three to five percent of school employees may be child molesters.

This higher incidence is attributed to the fact that public schools attract adults with pedophilic propensities.

Recognizing that the physical, sexual and emotional maltreatment of youth is a social illness of major proportion, McIntyre (1987) used a self-report survey to assess teachers’ actual knowledge about child abuse and neglect. According to this researcher, school personnel themselves often engage in physical abuse of children and the data indicated that most teachers believed that they had never had an abused or neglected student in their classes. Twenty-four percent had not, to their knowledge, either taught or seen an abused or neglected child. Most teachers were particularly unaware of the signs of sexual abuse, with only four percent indicating that they were very aware of the signs.

State Mandatory Reporting Laws. Under Oregon's mandatory reporting law (ORS 419B.005), a school employee is a mandatory reporter and may be held liable for failure to report personal knowledge of any "reasonable suspicion of child abuse" by any individual to state or local law enforcement officers or to Children's Services Division. Both sexual abuse and sexual harassment are crimes that must be reported by mandatory reporters.

The American Association of University Women (1993) commissioned a survey research firm to assess the extent of sexual harassment in America's schools and the effects of that harassment on our children. The key findings of this research indicate that sexual harassment in schools is an experience common to the vast majority of 8th to 11th grade students. The most alarming finding of this survey is that four out of five students (81%) report that they have been the target of some form of sexual harassment during their school lives. They also found that adult-to-student harassment is considerable and that students usually do not report incidents to adults.

These findings are important because Oregon identifies both sexual abuse and sexual harassment as crimes to be reported by school employees, and the Oregon Teachers and Standards Practices Commission identifies these two crimes as examples of "gross neglect of duty" for which a teacher's certificate may be suspended or revoked.

Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995) documented the kinds of sexual abuse children have experienced at the hands of those who are supposed to protect them and the responses of school districts to such incidents. In a four-year study of 225 cases in which students were sexually abused by teachers or other professional staff members, they reported the following findings:

- Patterns of Abuse: These researchers found that 89% of all cases in their study (92% of the cases reported by males, and 88% of the cases reported by females) involved allegations of contact abuse, thus confirming the suspicion that reported cases were more likely to be cases of physical abuse than cases of sexual abuse. Thirty-eight percent of all cases were at the elementary level, 20% were at the middle school level, 36% were at the high school level, and 6% fell into other categories.
- Who the Abusers Are: Often the teachers who sexually abused their students were judged to be among the best teachers in the district and were very popular with students and parents. The allegations of abuse were most likely to be made against staff members who worked with students in extracurricular activities or who had frequent one-to-one contact with students, such as coaches, drama teachers, art teachers, music teachers, and gym teachers because they often work with students in unsupervised

capacities. Ninety-six percent of the abusers in the study were males, and 76% of their victims were female.

- Types of Abusers: According to Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995), the abusers tended to be either pedophiles who preyed on children or romantic/bad judgment abusers who saw their actions as harmless or romantic affairs with consenting students. The pedophiles reported being sexually attracted to children, and many had chosen to work in schools so that they could be close to children. Their victims were primarily students in elementary and middle schools. The romantic/bad judgment abusers were teachers who were romantically attracted to students and who targeted older female middle and high school students.
- Targets: Of those students who reported being sexually abused, 22% were male and 78% were female.
- Investigations: After investigating a report, a number of superintendents found that earlier allegations had been made against the same staff member without having been formally reported to the superintendent. Most districts did not have procedures for reporting sexual abuse or policies for dealing with allegations once they were made. Investigations tended to be poorly carried out.



- Superintendent Responses: Although the majority of victims of abuse were females, superintendents seemed to consider abuse of males a more serious offense and tended to take action more quickly when a male student was purported to be a victim of sexual abuse. They reported that they found themselves unable to believe charges when they were first presented because the accused was often an outstanding teacher or administrator and the target was often a marginal or troublesome student.
- Staff Members' Responses: Superintendents reported that other teachers rallied to the defense of the accused teacher, often in ways that the superintendents felt jeopardized the investigation and intimidated the students. Teachers often believed that the allegations were lies or that the administration was "going after" a good teacher. Staff members and superintendents tended to overreact and were likely to focus on the consequences that might result for themselves rather than on the needs of the student when schools did address the problem.
- Community Responses: Communities tended to also rally around the accused teacher. Angry groups of parents and community members often came to the school or to a school board meeting to demand that the persecution be stopped.

- Outcomes for the Alleged Abusers: A number of cases were reported in which a teacher facing allegations of sexual abuse in one district turned up teaching in another district, without the hiring district knowing about the allegations. This practice was common enough that the superintendents referred to it as “passing the trash.”
- Revocation of Teaching License: In only 1% of the cases reported in the study did the superintendent attempt to have the teaching license of a teacher who sexually abused students revoked.
- Outcomes for Students: Few superintendents seemed to have a clear understanding of the long-term effects of sexual abuse on children and the importance of intervention. Little was done to provide students with necessary counseling and support to regain their self-esteem, their sense of safety, and their personal dignity.

These cases clearly demonstrate that educators are not well-trained in detecting cases of child sexual abuse nor do they always follow the requirements of the state mandatory reporting laws when sexual abuse incidents are identified. This seems to be particularly true when the allegations are against a colleague.

## **Indicators of Child Sexual Abuse**

The Characteristics of the Sexually Abused Child. According to Tower (1987), it is easier to deny the symptoms of sexual abuse than it is to overlook physical abuse or neglect. For sexual abuse to occur, Tower says that several contributing factors are necessary. The first is opportunity for the abuse to occur. A second contributing factor is change in family dynamics or structure. The third element present in many sexual abuse situations is a trust relationship with an abusive adult.

Educators should be among the first professionals to identify suspected cases of sexual abuse if they are aware of the characteristics which typify these victims. In studies of the educator's role in recognizing abuse victims, researchers (Finkelhor, 1984; Roscoe, 1984; Children's Services Division, 1995; Committee for Children, 1994; Gray & Stiehl, 1994) have identified the physical, behavioral and emotional indicators of child sexual abuse.

Physical symptoms include pregnancy, genital/urinary infection, venereal disease, vaginal discharge, and any suspicious discomfort in the genital or anal region; but, these are often the least obvious symptoms.

More often sexual abuse leads to a change in a student's academic and social behavior. A decline in academic performance, accompanied by other signs may be indicative of abuse. Other more subtle indications of sexual abuse include depression, low self-esteem, and self-imposed isolation

from peers. Some professionals have noted what they describe as pseudo-mature behavior (i.e. expressing affection in ways inappropriate for a child of that age) in girls who have been sexually molested. Clinicians often report that female victims have learned to relate to men in a seductive manner. Educators who encounter this pseudomaturity should become concerned as to how or why a young girl has acquired these behaviors (Roscoe, 1984).

Table 2 compares the age-appropriate characteristics of the pre-adolescent with the indicators of sexual abuse in the pre-adolescent (Friedrich, 1990; Children's Services Division, 1995; Gray & Stiehl, 1994).

Another important indicator of sexual abuse, according to Roscoe (1984), is the child's verbal disclosure of maltreatment. Students will occasionally confide in adults whom they trust and respect. Unfortunately, many adults do not want to believe children are being treated in this manner, so they disregard their reports. Educators should recognize that most children will not fabricate incidents about which they have no knowledge.

Educators must be trained to recognize the differences in age-appropriate characteristics and the characteristics of the sexually abused child. It will only be through such training that the number of incidents of sexual abuse will be reduced in the school setting.

Table 2

Comparison of Age-Appropriate Characteristics and Indicators of Sexual Abuse in the Pre-Adolescent

AGE-APPROPRIATE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PRE-ADOLESCENT	INDICATORS OF SEXUAL ABUSE IN THE PRE-ADOLESCENT
<p><b>PHYSICAL INDICATORS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understands how male/female reproductive systems function</li> <li>• Has a realistic and positive image of his/her body</li> <li>• Understands how the body changes during pre-adolescence</li> <li>• Knows that sexual feelings are age-appropriate and natural</li> <li>• Knows his/her genital area and does not feel ashamed of it</li> <li>• Feels comfortable with bodily functions</li> <li>• Is able to discuss concerns about the body</li> </ul>	<p><b>PHYSICAL INDICATORS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulty in walking or sitting</li> <li>• Torn, stained or bloody underclothing</li> <li>• Pain or itching in genital area</li> <li>• Bruises, bleeding, or infection in external genitalia, vaginal, or anal areas</li> <li>• Venereal disease, especially in pre-teens</li> <li>• Pregnancy</li> <li>• Sits with crotch exposed</li> <li>• Tries to look at people undressing</li> <li>• Touches own sex parts in public</li> <li>• Shows sex parts to adults</li> <li>• Uses sexual words</li> <li>• Shows sex parts to other children</li> <li>• Talks about sexual acts</li> <li>• Imitates sexual behaviors with toys</li> <li>• French kisses</li> <li>• Puts mouth on sex parts</li> </ul>

Table 2 continued on next page.

Table 2 (Continued)

<b>BEHAVIORAL INDICATORS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is able to ask parents and other adults about sexuality</li> <li>• Is able to express affection</li> <li>• Understands others have different viewpoints about sexuality</li> <li>• Has respect for another's individuality</li> <li>• Takes responsibility for his/her actions</li> </ul>	<b>BEHAVIORAL INDICATORS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Withdrawal, fantasy or infantile behavior</li> <li>• Poor peer relationships</li> <li>• Delinquent or run away</li> <li>• Indirect allusions to problems at home such as "I want to live with you"</li> <li>• Reports sexual assault (children seldom lie about sexual abuse)</li> <li>• Fear of a person or an intense dislike at being left with someone</li> <li>• Unusual interest in or knowledge of sexual matters</li> <li>• Expressing affection in ways inappropriate for a child of that age</li> </ul>
<b>EMOTIONAL INDICATORS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understands that sexuality is more than just intercourse</li> <li>• Begins to understand the consequences of sexual activity</li> <li>• Is able to experience intimacy without sex play</li> <li>• Knows that one can feel aroused and yet have reasons for saying "no" to some kinds of sexual play</li> <li>• Knows that one's feelings deserve respect from others</li> </ul>	<b>EMOTIONAL INDICATORS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Behavior extremes such as aggression, violence to self or others, or withdrawal</li> <li>• Habit disorders (sucking, biting, rocking)</li> <li>• Attempted suicide</li> <li>• Conduct disorders (antisocial, runaway, firesetting, destructive)</li> <li>• Emotional neediness</li> </ul>

Note. From L. Gray and R. Stiehl, 1994, Understanding Sexual Development Across the Life Span: Pre-Adolescence, Oregon State University; Children's Services Division, 1995, Recognizing and Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect: An Explanation of Oregon's Mandatory Reporting Law, Department of Human Resources; and W. Friedrich, 1990, Psychotherapy of Sexually Abused Children and Their Families, Norton and Company.

## **Characteristics of the Child Molester**

Kenneth Lanning (1994), a supervisory special agent for the Behavioral Science Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation at the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia, completed a study which focused on the investigation of preferential child molesters from a law enforcement perspective. Lanning (1994) notes that information about the behavior patterns of pedophiles can be useful for school districts as well as law enforcement agencies as they conduct background checks, screen prospective employees, and recognize inappropriate interactions of employees with children.

Agent Lanning (1994) identified four major characteristics of the preferential child molester:

- a long-term and persistent pattern of victimizing behavior;
- a preference for children as sexual objects;
- well-developed techniques in obtaining victims; and
- sexual fantasies focusing on children.

These characteristics, together with the following list of indicators, can assist educational professionals in identifying child molesters and potential problem employees.

However, Lanning (1994) cautions that the indicators alone mean little. Their significance and weight come as they are accumulated and form

a pattern of behavior. Indicators of pedophilic behaviors include the following:

Persistent Patterns of Behavior. Lanning's research (1994) indicates that many offenders are former victims of sexual abuse themselves; that during the teen-age years, the offender may have exhibited little sexual interest in people his own age; that this type of individual is commonly separated from the military with no specific reason given; that pedophiles frequently show a pattern of living in one place, then suddenly for no apparent reason, move and change jobs; that a prior arrest record is a major indicator of previous child molestation or sexual abuse; that the molester often molests many different victims; and that the pedophile will carry out bold and repeated attempts to obtain children.

Children as Preferred Sexual Objects. The typical pedophile is over 25, single, male, and never married. The pedophile is typically referred to as male because it is rare for a female to be a pedophile. The typical pedophile usually lives alone or may still live with his parents; he has had limited dating relationships or, if married, has a "special relationship" (e.g., co-existence without sexual relationships) with his spouse; he exhibits an excessive interest in children; his associates and circle of friends are youth; he has limited peer relationships; he prefers children of a certain sex in a certain age range; and he refers to children as if they were objects, projects, or possessions.



Skill in Obtaining Victims. The pedophile is skilled at identifying vulnerable victims; he identifies better with children than with adults; he develops a method of gaining access to children by hanging around places where children congregate, by seeking employment where he will be in contact with children, or by becoming involved in youth activities; he tries to get children into situations where no other adults are present; he seduces his victims with attention, affection, and gifts; he is skilled at manipulating children; he has hobbies and interests appealing to children; and he shows sexually explicit material to children.

Sexual Fantasies Focusing on Children. The pedophile may have his home decorated to attract young people; he may photograph children; and he oftentimes collects child pornography or child erotica.

After Identification. After a child molestation case is uncovered and an offender is identified, there are certain fairly predictable reactions of the child molester. These usually include denial; minimization of what he has done; justification of his behavior by blaming the victim; fabrication of ingenious stories to explain his behavior; claiming of mental illness; expressing deep regret and attempting to show that he is a pillar of the community to gain sympathy; attacking the victims and witnesses and the reputation and personal lives of others involved in the reporting and investigation; and attempting to make a deal in order to avoid a public trial by pleading "guilty, but not guilty."

After Conviction. After being convicted and sentenced, some pedophiles may claim to have important information about more serious offenses against children; or an offender, especially from a middle-class background with no prior arrest, may be a high suicide risk.

Although a wide variety of criminals may react in similar ways when their activity is discovered or investigated, Lanning (1994) indicates that these reactions have been seen in child molesters time and time again and, when taken together, are helpful in identifying the potential child abuser.

Abrams and Abrams (1993) report that sexual abusers are usually referred to in the masculine gender because there are relatively few females who are offenders, and they categorize the types of offenders into the following four categories in an attempt to explain the sexual abuse of children:

- Those with a strong need for a relationship with a child because it satisfies a number of needs that cannot be met by adults,
- Those who have a sexual arousal toward children,
- Those with an inability to relate to age mates so that children become a viable alternative, and
- Those who have the existence of some manner of impairment that reduces the controls that ordinarily exist in most adults.

## **Reporting of Child Abuse**

If an educator suspects or knows a student is being sexually abused, a number of actions can be initiated. The first step is to notify the local Child Protective Services agency. Each state has enacted legislation mandating that professionals contact the appropriate agency when child neglect or abuse is suspected (Tower, 1987; Committee for Children, 1994).

The educator, because of his/her already existing interest and involvement with the abused student, must work collaboratively with the professionals and agencies in the community. By successfully identifying suspected victims of sexual abuse, bringing them to the attention of appropriate agencies, and interacting with abuse victims in a supportive capacity, educators will be making significant contributions to improving the lives of these children. The concern and efforts of educators may be the first step in ending a child's tragic experience of sexual victimization (Roscoe, 1984).

According to Tower (1987), all states expect educators to be involved in reporting sexual abuse. The teacher is frequently referred to as a mandated reporter who in his or her professional capacity is legally responsible for reporting to the local protective agency. Liability is an issue that is becoming of greater concern to educators. All states provide immunity for any professional who reports suspicion of child abuse, but

there may be a fine or a jail sentence for not reporting. It is highly unlikely that an educator would be sued for reporting, and it is better legally and morally to report than not to report.

It is also important that a school system have a procedure and policy for reporting. The existence of such a policy and knowledge of it will be extremely helpful to teachers. The school administration should be involved in the reporting process, but reporting is the ultimate responsibility of the person who first had knowledge of, or first suspected, the abuse.

Milgram (1984) found that even though there is a growing awareness and sensitivity among teachers about the problem of sexual abuse at the middle level, many still find it difficult to report their suspicions. Milgram (1984) noted that there are teachers who simply do not hear what is being told to them or who simply deny the problem. There are others who overreact to misinterpreted signals, or who look for symptoms of abuse where none exist. In either case, training in sexual abuse issues for school personnel appears to be the key to correcting these problems.

Because school teachers often are the only professionals who see the abused child on a regular basis, they have a special responsibility to act to ensure the protection of the child. Shoop and Firestone (1988) revealed that most teachers' definitions of child abuse centered on actual physical abuse and neglect. Sexual abuse was less often defined as abuse. These researchers found that elementary school teachers were more aware of the

types of child abuse, more personally involved with their students, and more willing to report suspected abuse than their secondary counterparts.

Although teachers knew they were legally responsible to report suspected child abuse, the majority did not know the correct procedure or where to report such cases. Shoop and Firestone (1988) concluded that teachers need more training in this very important area.

In a study that conflicts with the findings of Shoop and Firestone, Zellman (1990) concluded that principals are the most committed and willing reporters of child abuse because of their positive perceptions of Child Protective Services staff, the weight they attach to compliance with district reporting policies, and their fear of prosecution for failure to report.

In a similar study, Tite (1993) conducted exploratory interviews, a survey, and focused interviews to determine how teachers define abuse, how much experience they have had in dealing with abuse situations, and what action they took in each case. The findings demonstrated that teachers include a broad range of behaviors in their own definitions of abuse and that they prefer informal intervention over formal reporting. Tite (1993) concluded that, despite the teachers' knowledge of reporting requirements, the decision to report or not report involved an interplay of definitions, institutional response, teachers' experiences with a range of reactions, and their personal bias. Reporting was also complicated by the teachers' disciplinary role, by their concerns for establishing reasonable grounds for

suspicion of abuse, and by their perceptions that some cases can be handled more effectively by the school without the intervention of Child Protective Services.

Regardless of the consequences to them, it is apparent that school employees do not report many of their suspicions of child sexual abuse.

### **School Policy, Ethical Standards, and Legal Implications**

In their research on teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs about child abuse and its prevention, Abrahams, Casey, and Daro (1992) concluded that, while school administrators establish policies on how to deal with abuse cases, they are not effectively conveying these policies to individual teachers. Abrahams, Casey, and Daro (1992) found that school administrators, either independently or in partnership with other key child abuse prevention agencies, needed to establish ongoing training programs which covered the following topics:

- The identification of child abuse and the mandate to report all suspected cases to Child Protective Services,
- The procedure in place within a given school for fulfilling the state's reporting requirements,
- Methods for effectively supporting maltreatment of victims and their families including referral to relevant treatment services in the community and establishment of peer support groups for victims,

- The purpose and content of various child assault prevention curricula.

Negligent Hiring and Supervision. School employees are in a unique position because they spend many hours each day with youth. Parents need to be assured that they can trust those who work in their children's school. They want the school to do its best to protect children from intruders who do not belong on campus. But, most of all, parents want assurance that school employees themselves are not abusing children.

Butterfield (1994) recognized that certain individuals should never be hired to work in public schools because they have demonstrated dangerous propensities. Under certain circumstances, an employer can be held liable for injury caused by a negligently hired or retained employee.

The doctrine of negligent hiring/retention states that an employer can be liable if the employer knew or should have known of an employee's dangerous propensities and this negligence was the proximate cause of the injury. The doctrine focuses on the duty of an employer to know whether an employee is unfit for a particular job.

In his legal research, Butterfield (1994) found that allegations of negligence require proof of four basic elements:

- The employer had a duty to protect the person who was injured;
- The employer either did something or failed to do something and in the process breached a duty to the injured person;

- The breach of this duty was the proximate cause of the injury; and
- The injury itself was proven.

Negligent hiring and retention is a great concern for businesses that provide services to youth and for public school systems. Teachers and youth-serving professionals are in a special relationship of trust and authority. Although courts are hesitant to require criminal background checks for all employees, this practice in youth-serving organizations is becoming more acceptable. These background checks would go far in meeting the requirement of a reasonable investigation (McGrath, 1994; Slowik, 1993; Butterfield, 1994).

According to Butterfield (1994), schools and youth-serving agencies have a moral obligation, if not a legal duty, to hire those individuals who will not endanger the ones they have been commissioned to serve. Failure to protect children is seen as a betrayal of trust that occurs when a school employee harms children placed in the school's care. When schools take the requisite steps to hire, train, supervise and retain only those who are fit to do the job, one of the most important steps toward creating a safe school environment has been taken.

McGrath (1994), an attorney who specializes in legally based training for educators, comments on liability issues:

School administrator liability for sexual abuse by employees is a rapidly developing area of the law. In recent cases, administrators have been held personally liable. Courts and administrative agencies are trying different standards for conduct as the debate continues. Until the law is settled, educators and their



lawyers will have to deal with a degree of uncertainty about their legal duties to students for sexual misconduct by school employees. (p. 1)

Under legal doctrine, a public or private school is responsible for unlawful acts of its employees that occur in the “course and scope of employment” but not for actions of employees taken for their own purposes. McGrath (1994) notes that sexual abuse of students has generally been held to be outside the “course and scope” of employment, even when committed on school grounds or while engaged in school-related activities unless school officials are found to be guilty of negligent hiring.

McGrath (1994) found that administrators may be legally responsible for their own action or inaction in these cases. State courts are now awarding money damages in cases involving various administrators’ failure to perform their duties, such as:

- Failure to adequately supervise employees,
- Failure to investigate allegations against employees,
- Failure to train teachers regarding policies and procedures,
- Failure to hire carefully and conduct adequate background checks,
- Failure to warn others of an employee’s misconduct, and
- Failure to report incidents of child sexual abuse after the incidents are reported to the administrators.

McGrath (1994) cites a recent case in which the United States Court of Appeals held that a principal could be personally liable when he ignored a

series of rumors and reports about a teacher who was having sexual intercourse with a student. In the case of *Doe v. Taylor Independent School District*, the court said that supervisors are liable for “deliberate indifference” to constitutional violations by subordinates. According to the court, a supervisory school employee can be held personally liable for a subordinate’s violation of a student’s constitutional right to bodily integrity in sexual abuse cases under the following circumstances:

- The administrator learned of facts or a pattern of inappropriate sexual behavior by a subordinate pointing plainly toward the conclusion that the subordinate was abusing the student.
- The administrator demonstrated “deliberate indifference” toward the constitutional rights of the student by failing to take action that was obviously necessary to prevent or stop the abuse.
- The failure caused a constitutional injury to the student.

McGrath (1994) notes that the best policy for school districts is to treat sexual abuse as a serious matter entitled to high priority. Prompt, thorough investigation followed by appropriate, effective remedial action is the best protection against liability for school administrators.

Hiring someone without a proper investigation can also lead to legal problems if the employee turns out to have a record of misconduct on the job. If the employee abuses a student, the administrator could be sued for negligent hiring on the theory that, with a proper background investigation,

the employee would not have been hired and the injury to the third party would not have occurred (Lanning, 1994).

When a teacher is accused of abusing children, the grounds for dismissal are clear. Teachers who have been proven to engage in sexual or physical abuse of children may be discharged immediately. Statutes which require due process or policies which require the district to give the teacher warning or to place the teacher on a plan of improvement do not apply in child abuse situations because of the seriousness of the crime.

Nevertheless, Fossey (1990) indicates that school districts are often reluctant to move forward with formal dismissal proceedings against teachers accused of abuse. It is common for such accusations to be resolved with a termination agreement, whereby dismissal charges are withdrawn and the teacher resigns his employment. Fossey (1990) notes that the legal restrictions of open records statutes, child abuse reporting laws, and public policy may prevent a school district from entering into such confidential termination agreements with teachers accused of child abuse.

An analysis of a four-year sample of reported cases dealing with the actual or alleged sexual abuse of students by teachers, administrators, and other school employees shows that a wide variety of legal issues tended to appear in the various decisions (Sorenson, 1991). A majority of the claims in the 51 cases revolved around tort law, criminal law, and constitutional law, with a substantial number of claims arising in the areas of teacher

dismissal and insurance law. Among the most important public policy considerations were those derived from issues surrounding state freedom of information and child abuse reporting statutes. The study concluded that enlightened educational policy will best be effected when more is known about the incidence, causes, and outcomes of school-based abuse. This study confirms the need for school districts to review and revise their policies to encourage more reporting of suspected child abuse.

All 50 states have adopted mandatory reporting laws that require school employees to report suspected child abuse. Recent court decisions show that such mandatory reporting laws have an especially strong impact on school employees whose daily contact with students gives them unique opportunities to detect possible abuse (Sendor, 1995). School employees are now being held liable for failure to report child sex abuse under four different standards:

- 1) State Mandatory Reporting Laws
- 2) Doctrine of Negligent Hiring
- 3) Doctrine of Deliberate Indifference
- 4) Failure to Take Action to Prevent Abuse

Training of school administrators in these four areas may go far in reducing the school district's exposure to liability.

## **Investigations of Child Sexual Abuse**

**Doctrine of Negligent Hiring.** Under the doctrine of negligent hiring, a school supervisor and the district may be held liable for negligent hiring if the employer knew, or should have known, of an employee's incompetence or previous criminal record and the employer breached his duty to protect the child by neglecting to do an adequate background check.

According to Regotti (1992), there is reason for alarm that the sexual abuse of students by teachers is increasing in the United States. The number of state appellate court opinions of teacher dismissals for improper touching and sexual misconduct has increased over past decades. Graves (1994) found that increasing legal pressure on teachers and superintendents to report complaints of child sexual abuse has contributed to the dramatic upsurge of charges against educators. One can conclude that the problem is far more prevalent than data report, yet there is no way of knowing how many teachers resign each year when their dismissal is threatened for sexual abuse of students. Countless cases are settled out of court through unchallenged dismissals, and many incidents go unreported. Young victims of sexual abuse are afraid to disclose occurrences because they fear teacher retaliation. Older students may remain silent because they are intimidated, fearing they will not be believed.

Regotti (1992) states that the rise in sexual abuse of students does not suggest that teachers are no longer appropriate role models within the

communities; but school districts should ensure that they are hiring and employing highly ethical teachers whose actions children can emulate.

Shakeshaft and Cohan (1995) found that school districts frequently hired teachers who had a history of sexually abusing students. These situations occurred for two main reasons:

- First, there is a reluctance on the part of past employers to give detailed, documented information about an employee because they wish to avoid defamation suits.
- Second, school districts fail to investigate thoroughly a teacher's background or examine "rumors" of a teacher's sexual misconduct.

For many years, student victims could not hold a school district liable for the sexual misconduct of a teacher because of the doctrine of *respondeat superior*, under which depraved actions do not fall within the scope of employment, and are far removed from the goals of education. But today, students are successfully holding districts liable for teacher sexual abuse when evidence exists that shows negligence in hiring, supervision, or retention of a teacher.

Regotti (1992) found that students who are victimized by teachers may hold the district liable on the grounds that such abuse amounts to a deprivation of the student's constitutional right to bodily security and that a liberty interest is violated when the district fails to investigate adequately a

teacher's background before hiring him/her. Cases which demonstrate these points include:

- 1) *School Board of Orange County, Florida v. Coffey*: The court found that the school board has a common law duty to protect others from the result of negligent hiring, supervision, or retention which duty is identical to the duty upon private employers who hire, retain, or supervise employees whose negligent or intentional acts in positions of employment can forcibly cause injuries to third parties.
- 2) *Doe v. Durtschi*: This case involved a fourth grade teacher who transferred within the same district from one elementary school to another after allegedly sexually abusing students at the first school. The parents of a sexually abused child at the second school sued the teacher and the district on the grounds that school officials knew or should have known of the teacher's past.
- 3) *Doe v. Blandford*: A teacher/guidance counselor was hired by a Massachusetts school district even though he had been placed on probation for the alleged assault and battery of a female student at a Connecticut school where he had also worked as a teacher/guidance counselor.
- 4) *Oklahoma Case*: In this case, the superintendent contacted previous employing school districts concerning a teacher and was informed that the teacher was an "outstanding" educator. Because the former

districts feared that the teacher might bring a defamation action against them, they withheld information from the superintendent. Consequently, more children were abused.

- 5) *Cohen v. Wales*: In this case, the courts concluded, "the mere recommendation of a person for potential employment is not a proper basis for asserting a claim of negligence where another party is responsible for the actual hiring."
- 6) *Collins v. School Board of Broward County*: This case found a district liable for the negligent supervision of one of its substitute teachers when an emotionally handicapped student was allegedly sexually abused by another student in a partitioned section of the classroom.
- 7) *Stoneking Case*: This case epitomizes the disregard by a school's administration of rumors about a teacher who was allegedly permitted to sexually molest female students over an eight-year period. Personnel records maintained by the district lacked any mention of disciplinary action taken.

In looking at the expansion of the doctrine of negligent hiring, Arnold (1990) finds that a negligent hiring claim must include the following elements:

- The plaintiff must demonstrate that the employer owes the plaintiff a duty and there must be a sufficient nexus between the employer's business and the plaintiff to create such a duty of care.



- The plaintiff must show that the employer breached his duty to the plaintiff and that the employer knew or should have known of the employee's incompetence.
- The plaintiff must demonstrate that his injury was caused by the employee's incompetence.
- The plaintiff must show that damage was suffered.

According to Arnold (1990), at least 39 states now recognize some form of the tort of negligent hiring. Plaintiffs have alleged that the employer should have been aware of the characteristics of the employee causing harm. In many cases, psychological testing could be used to determine an employee's fitness for the position and protect an employer from future claims of negligent hiring.

Arnold (1990) concludes that his research does not provide an exhaustive survey of all issues relating to negligent hiring. However, there are numerous legal, ethical, and economic reasons for embracing the use of psychological tests, not the least of which is the applicant's right to objective, non-invasive, and fair assessment.

Doctrine of Deliberate Indifference. In *Doe v. Taylor Independent School District*, a school supervisor was held liable under Title 42, Section 1983, of the U.S. Code, because he acted with deliberate indifference to a school employee's violation of a student's constitutional right to physical integrity and such deliberate indifference contributed to the school

employee's violation. In this case, failure of the administrator to investigate allegations of child sexual abuse against a teacher led to the administrator being found liable in both personal and professional capacities.

According to Valente (1990), suits by students to recover monetary compensation for sexual abuse by school employees have not been extensively reported for several obvious reasons. Students, their parents, or school authorities are understandably reluctant to publicize incidents of student sexual abuse through litigation or to incur the risks of potential stigmatization, countercharges and countersuits. These deterrents appear to be waning under recent federal law developments which provide distinct incentives for students to bring such suits.

Valente (1990) reviewed the general bases of supervisory responsibility from four different legal perspectives: (1) the entity liability of the school district and official liability of school administrators, (2) the official policy or custom, (3) the personal liability of school superiors, and (4) the effect of official inaction.

Valente (1990) found that, in order to establish entity liability, the complainant must allege and prove three elements, namely, (1) the possession of an existing protected federal right; (2) that the claimant was deprived of that right; and (3) that such deprivation was caused by an official policy or custom. Since the right of public school students to be free from teacher sexual abuse, as an aspect of the constitutional right to bodily

security, is not disputed, then the principal issues turn upon the existence of a relevant official policy or custom that condoned or encouraged the sexual abuse to the extent of having, in law, caused the constitutional infringement.

Valente (1990) cites legal cases to demonstrate two prominent theories of constitutional tort from failure to act:

- One case argues that public school districts and supervisors have a constitutional duty affirmatively to protect students from sexual abuse by reason of the special relationship to students and that the failure to meet that duty constitutes a deprivation of the student's constitutional right to bodily security.
- The second case argues that, independent of any special relationship, liability falls upon school districts and policymaking officials where they act with such deliberate or reckless indifference to known or reasonably discoverable sexual abuse of students, as to project a policy, practice or custom that condones and consequently causes the sexual abuse to occur or recur.

These cases demonstrate that it is incumbent upon school administrators to learn everything they can about child sexual abuse and use that knowledge to prevent such abuse from occurring in the school setting.

Sorenson's (1991) study involved a review of each issue of the Education Law Reporter from 1987 through 1990, supplemented by a

Westlaw computer search for the same period. This review revealed a steady increase in the number of reported cases dealing with sexual abuse in schools: 6 such cases in 1987, 10 in 1988, 16 in 1989, and 19 by the end of 1990, for a total of 51 decisions in a four-year period. The existence of these reported judicial decisions and their increasing prevalence suggests the existence of a serious problem that cannot be ignored by educators and policymakers.

According to Sorenson (1991), this exploratory study and analysis is intended to be suggestive rather than definitive and confirms that there are enormous problems in almost all attempts to accurately illustrate the existence and extent of child sexual abuse. Even more problematic was the fact that previous legal research related to sexual abuse occurring in schools, with the exception of research dealing with teacher dismissal, was virtually nonexistent.

This research by Sorenson (1991) is not a study specifically about sexual abuse in schools. The major purpose of the study is to illustrate the types of legal issues involved in situations where employee sexual abuse of students was an issue. Secondary purposes were to document the presence of sexual abuse in the school context and thus to suggest the existence of a salient problem for researchers, educators, and policymakers and to note for future social science investigation any unique questions or problems that might be suggested by the factual posture of the cases considered. Even

though the study's focus on legal issues was central, an important ancillary purpose was to record the existence of a problem that is often a well-kept secret.

To increase the probability of high credibility of this research, Sorenson's study also compares suggestive case-based incidence data with survey and study data from other contexts. Sorenson (1991) researched areas focusing on the following aspects of sexual abuse:

- Child sexual abuse: incidence and prevalence
- Reported school cases: 1987-1990
- Common law tort
- Criminal law
- Constitutional law
- Civil Rights Liability: Section 1983
- Insurance law
- Teacher dismissal
- Miscellaneous child sexual abuse cases

Sorenson (1991) documented that the number of court cases dealing with child sexual abuse in the schools is increasing dramatically. Valente (1992) found that the alarming increase in reported cases of sexual molestation of public school students by teachers or student peers has sensitized school authorities to the need for improved monitoring and control measures. The court decisions in lawsuits by student victims against

school district employers and superiors of employees who molest students present a confusing mix of tort liability theories, and an equally unsettling mix of court reactions to those respective theories. Under prevailing tort law of most states, school superiors and school districts continue to enjoy immunity for the torts of errant subordinates. Under federal statutory tort law, the major barriers to recovery arise from uncertainties regarding the substantive elements required to establish a cause of action for monetary relief under various federal antidiscrimination statutes. Valente (1992) reports on two recent decisions that illustrate the clouded state of the law under two prominent federal rights statutes.

The first decision, *D.R. v. Middle Bucks Area Vo-Tech School* from the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, appears to further reduce opportunities for recovery for many sexual molestation claims under Section 1983; while the second, still more recent decision of the United States Supreme Court, *Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools and William Prescott*, appears to provide greater opportunities for monetary liability for student sexual molestation under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. This complaint alleged that the school principal and authorities, having been notified of alleged misconduct, took no corrective action other than to initiate, then drop, an investigation when a teacher resigned. The court unanimously held that the student was entitled to recover monetary damages under Title IX for intentional sexual discrimination. These cases

demonstrate that school administrators are being held liable for the acts of their employees.

Failure to Take Action to Prevent Abuse. In *Doe v. Rains Independent School District*, the courts found that non-supervisory colleagues of teachers who abuse students may be held liable if state law requires such non-supervising colleagues to take action that could prevent or stop the abuse and they fail to do so (Fossey, 1995; Sendor, 1995). As a general rule, U.S. law does not require people to inform one another by reporting suspected crimes to government agencies. An exception exists in state laws that require people to report suspected child abuse. Such mandatory reporting laws have an especially strong impact on school employees whose daily contact with students gives them unique opportunities to detect possible abuse. Both Fossey (1995) and Sendor (1995) report on this case which shows how important it is to make sure school employees understand and obey mandatory reporting laws that affect the school district.

This case involved an alleged sexual relationship between a high school teacher and coach and a teenage student called "Sarah Doe." The facts are in dispute, but according to the claims of the girl's parents, Sarah Doe first told another teacher in June of 1992 that Doe was having a sexual relationship with the coach. Doe's parent sued the coach, the school district, and the teacher who failed to report in Federal District Court under Texas law and under Title 42, Section 1983, of the U.S. Code, which deals

with violations of constitutional rights by state officials. Doe's parents said the teacher's failure to report the abuse amounted to negligence under the state law, and they claimed the teacher's violation of the state's reporting law had enabled the coach to violate their daughter's constitutional right to bodily integrity under federal law.

Judgments that are made and recommendations for procedures to follow in investigating child abuse and child exploitation are well-supported in the literature; and cases in the literature describe how to develop a trial case on behalf of a sexually abused child.

Barton (1990) cites the work by Dr. David Finkelhor in A Sourcebook on Child Sexual Abuse which presents a thorough inventory of the symptoms and signs of abuse in children and adolescents. Finkelhor explains how the significant events of the total exploitation experience should be presented visually during the trial or in the closing argument with a timeline. According to Finkelhor, such a presentation should include:

- When the plaintiff first joined the organization.
- When the plaintiff first met the defendant pedophile.
- When the abuse began.
- When the incidents of abuse ended.
- When the initial disclosure was made.
- When complete disclosure was made.
- When counseling began.



- Plaintiff's projected life expectancy.
- Any other significant events.

There is no question that this is an area in which public schools are experiencing great difficulty, and the problem for the public schools is compounded by the fact that most children do not clearly and promptly reveal the abuse. A thorough investigation often reveals a host of previously ignored and discounted complaints that should have indicated the possibility of a problem. The problem is exacerbated by the pervasive ignorance of administrators about the predictable behavior and characteristics of child sexual abusers and their victims.

Barton (1990) emphasizes that the law does not require perfection, only reasonableness, in investigating allegations of sexual abuse. Even with the growing number of cases litigated, no public organization has been held liable for failing to know the unknowable--only for failure to act reasonably in response to previous complaints. Responsible risk reduction is expected and professional administrators must become part of the solution, not part of the problem.

Barton (1990) points out that numerous cases where children have alleged Section 1983 claims have arisen against school districts and that the advantages to a federal 1983 action are that:

- It is unfettered by the limitations a state may impose upon claims brought against it, such as tort claim notice requirements or limits on the amount of any award.
- An award of attorney's fees is permitted.
- Punitive damages are recoverable in jurisdictions that permit them.
- There is concurrent jurisdiction in both state and federal court.
- All other pending state causes can be joined with the federal claims.

Such advantages increase the likelihood that a child claiming to be sexually abused in the school setting will bring charges in federal court rather than in state court.

Some disadvantages are that there is no agency or *respondeat superior* liability, and mere negligence alone is insufficient to prove liability. The courts describe the standard of proof in various ways, though it is usually expressed as proof sufficient to support an inference of deliberate or reckless indifference, gross negligence, unconcern, or callous disregard for the child's safety.

Educators are often reluctant to confront the fact that some children are abused at school by teachers or other adults. Several recent court decisions underscore the urgent need for teachers and administrators to deal directly with these issues. The catastrophic effects of such abuse on students are the main reason to prevent such abuse whenever possible.

Another is the legal liability. Courts have become more willing in recent years to hold co-workers responsible for an abusive employee's action if it is shown that they knew about the abuse and did nothing.

For many years, state courts have ruled that school employees act outside the scope of their employment when they commit a sexual assault on a student, and school districts were not held accountable. In many jurisdictions, school boards and employees are also immune from negligence suits. In recent years, abused children and their families have begun suing school boards and employees in the federal courts, with some success. A federal appellate court ruled, in *Stoneking v. Bradford Area School District (1989)*, that a public school principal could be held liable for damages in a case where a former high school student charged that she had been assaulted by the school band director for three years and that the principal was aware of the accusations but failed to investigate them.

In *Doe v. Taylor (Texas) Independent School District (1994)*, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals issued a similar ruling to the Stoneking case. In this case, a student claimed that the principal failed to protect her from a teacher's sexual advances in spite of reports to the principal about the teacher's sexual misconduct from the school librarian, a counselor, two community members, and at least one student. A school employee who sexually assaults a student violates Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the federal law that prohibits sex discrimination in schools that

receive federal funds. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1992, in a case involving accusations of sexual harassment and abuse by a teacher, that school districts could be sued under Title IX for the full range of compensatory and punitive damages.

Until recently, most questions of liability involved supervisors and school boards. But a federal court in Texas ruled in *Doe v. Rains Independent School District (1994)* that the colleagues of a sexual molester can also be held liable if they knew that a student was being sexually abused and failed to report it in accordance with state law.

School leaders are obligated to respect and protect children in their care. Schools must train all employees to comply with the mandatory reporting law and nurture school cultures that are intolerant of adults who exploit children.

## **Discussion**

There is an increasing need for school employees, but especially school administrators, to be trained in the prevention of child sexual abuse. Many child abuse programs have been forced by financial cutbacks to adapt to a minimum treatment approach for clients regardless of the severity or chronicity of their problems. At the same time, the incidence of reported child abuse has risen rapidly, accompanied by increased reporting in the media.

According to Tower (1987), prevention intervention can take place at any of three different points in time: before the phenomenon has ever occurred; before it has occurred to a serious degree but after certain warning signals have appeared; and after it has occurred, to keep it from recurring.

Tower (1987) indicates that prevention programs must have certain characteristics and school personnel must receive specialized training for implementing the programs. Despite the information that is available regarding the alarming occurrence of sexual abuse of children, Wurtele and Miller-Perrin (1984) report that child sexual abuse prevention programs are still not being implemented in many schools.

According to Land (1986), it is incumbent upon the professional educational and social service communities to document the need for appropriate treatment for both the child abuser and the victim. Although public school professionals have become aware of abuse as a complex problem besetting children, the scope of sexual abuse against children is still largely unrecognized. Much of the current literature is marked by poor samples, lack of longitudinal studies, conflicting findings, and the cloaking of moral positions with scientific attitudes.

This study is important because it attempts to demonstrate how a training program can improve administrators' performance in preventing child sexual abuse in the school setting.

The results of most of the studies previously cited indicate that increased knowledge about child sexual abuse, gained from more extensive training, would be valuable in increasing report rates. Concerns have been raised about the ability of child protective agencies and the schools to interact effectively to protect children when their policies are in apparent conflict. The lack of communication between Child Protective Services agencies and mandated reporters and the lack of clarity about what the agencies expect of school staff have led to repeated calls for written guidelines about what should, or should not, be reported. These communication problems show a need for further research.

McIntyre (1987) found that inservice training in the areas of identifying and reporting of all kinds of child abuse provides school professionals with increased knowledge and is a viable method for educating such professionals about abuse and neglect. Considering that schools provide an environment where professionals familiar with child behavior and appearance regularly come into contact with children, the reporting figures are currently extremely low. Educators, having more contact with children than professionals in other service agencies, should play a major role in the detection of abuse and neglect. Involvement of school administrators is important for numerous reasons: legislation mandates it, professionalism demands it, and human compassion for children subjected to cruelty and pain morally commits them.

The literature indicates that prevention of child sexual abuse is vital for the following reasons:

- Public awareness about abuse helps parents and educators recognize their need to better supervise children.
- Prevention empowers children to protect themselves. Part of prevention is teaching children not only how to recognize that they are being exploited, abused, or neglected, but also whom to tell when they feel in need of help.
- School employees are morally, ethically, and professionally obligated to provide a safe and secure school setting for the children they serve.

It is recognized that prevention programs broaden children's conceptions of the resources available and clarify for school employees their responsibilities in investigating and reporting suspected abuse. Despite progress in these efforts, there is still a need for improvement.

School administrators, teachers and staff need to focus on ways to protect children in the public schools by developing effective employee screening procedures, by ensuring adequate supervision of employees, and by removing employees who are abusers. Although there have been a significant number of studies relating to sexual abuse issues, no studies have been found which relate specifically to the protection of children through effective training programs for school employees. This review of the

literature has shown a need for research which specifically focuses on the improvement in administrators' performance in dealing with sexual abuse issues after participation in a specially designed training session. This study is designed to test the primary premise that such training will improve administrators' performance.



## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

Systematic procedures were developed to determine if training sessions based on six specially designed training modules will significantly improve a school administrator's performance on child sexual abuse case simulations. The training modules focused on training school administrators in the areas of child sexual abuse.

#### **Study Sample**

Subjects for the study were from a convenience sample of practicing administrators from five school districts in Yamhill County. These subjects were chosen for the study because of their proximity to the researcher, because of their availability for the study, and because of their district superintendent's willingness to allow them to participate in the study.

Whenever convenience samples are used, generalization is made more plausible if data are presented to show that the sample is representative of the intended population on relevant variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). Although convenience samples cannot be considered to be representative of any general population, the training sessions were replicated in five districts to decrease the likelihood that the results obtained in any one district were a one-time occurrence.

Subjects were solicited through the superintendents of each of the five school districts. A letter explaining the purpose of the study was sent to these superintendents. Follow-up telephone contact was made with each superintendent to schedule the date for the training sessions and to confirm the number of administrators who would be participating in the child sexual abuse training.

A copy of the letter seeking approval from school superintendents is included in Appendix A.

### **Research Instruments**

Three research instruments were designed to gather data from a Delphi panel and from the subjects who participated in this study. These instruments included the following:

- 1) an Administrator Questionnaire,
- 2) a Pre-Evaluation Case Study A, and
- 3) a Post-Evaluation Case Study B.

The purpose of each instrument is explained below:

- 1) The Administrator Questionnaire was developed through a Delphi Process and designed to be administered to all participants in the study. The results of the questionnaire were used as a needs assessment to identify the specific topics about which school administrators need specialized training in the areas of child sexual

abuse. The results were also used to identify and subsequently refine the information presented in the six training modules and to develop the six questions for the pre- and post-test evaluation case studies used in the training sessions. The questions on the questionnaire were randomly arranged to avoid familiarizing participants with the six focus areas for the training sessions. By using a random arrangement in the questionnaire, the correlation factors were better controlled for bias and threats to internal validity were minimized.

- 2) The Pre-Evaluation Case Study A was a simulated scenario taken from an actual child sexual abuse incident. The names, dates, locations and specific occurrences of the actual incidents were changed to protect the identities of those involved in the original incidents. The case study scenario was followed by six specific questions to be answered by the subject about the incident. Each question directly corresponded to one of the six modules used in the training sessions. The subject's responses to these six questions were used to assess the level of knowledge about the six child sexual abuse issues prior to the subject participating in the training sessions.
- 3) The Post-Evaluation Case Study B was a simulated scenario of a second child sexual abuse incident followed by the same six

questions used in the pretest. Again, the names, dates, locations, and specific occurrences of the actual incidents were changed to prevent identification of those involved in the original cases. The post-test was given to each subject after completion of the six training sessions. The results of the post-test were used to assess each subject's gain in knowledge after participating in the training sessions.

The subjects' responses on the three research instruments were used to assess the subjects' awareness of reporting procedures and their level of knowledge about child sexual abuse issues in the school setting.

Specifically, the participants' awareness was measured by scoring responses to the following six questions:

- 1) Does the administrator know how to comply with the Oregon Child Abuse Reporting Law?
- 2) To what degree can the administrator recognize indicators of sexual abuse by observing a possible victim?
- 3) To what degree can the administrator recognize the characteristics of pedophile behavior?
- 4) Does the administrator know the information that is needed to justify reporting suspicion of child abuse to the appropriate agency?

- 5) Does the administrator understand how professional ethics and district policies apply to employees who are alleged to be sexual abuse perpetrators?
- 6) Does the administrator know what steps are to be followed in an investigation when allegations of child sexual abuse are made against a school employee?

These three research instruments were developed and validated using information from the literature on child sexual abuse and a Delphi Process during which 22 experts in the field of child sexual abuse provided input. The Delphi Process adapted from Samahito (1984) and Courtney (1988) was used to reach consensus on the six major topics to be taught in the training sessions and the six questions on the pre- and post-tests used to evaluate this research study. The administrator questionnaire results and the pre- and post-test results were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical procedures.

### **Procedure**

A one-group pretest post-test (A-B-A) design in which a single group was measured before and after being exposed to a treatment was used for this study. The process was replicated five times in the five participating districts to increase internal validity. This research design included the following steps:

- 1) The six item, supply-type, pre-evaluation case study was administered to the subjects at the beginning of each of the five training sessions. The supply-type items included short-answer questions to allow for more individualized responses. Although open-ended types of questions are more difficult to interpret and are harder to tabulate and synthesize, they allow more freedom of response by the participant and avoid limiting the responses that may be given (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). No introductory information about the topics and/or discussion of the topics were provided to the subjects prior to the pretest. Subjects were asked to respond based on their current knowledge and beliefs about child sexual abuse. To facilitate completion of the training sessions within the allocated time period, a time limit of 20 minutes was allowed for completion of the six questions.
- 2) The six training session modules were presented by the researcher over a three-hour period of time. The content of these sessions were varied to include lecture, discussion, overhead presentations, commercial video tape, journal articles, and guided practice sheets. A variety of content presentation formats was used with the intent to provide the information about child sexual abuse in several different learning modalities to enhance the learning opportunities for the subjects.

- 3) At the end of the training sessions, the post-evaluation case study was administered to the subjects. The post-test included the exact six supply-type, short-answer questions that were on the pretest. Subjects were again asked to respond to the six questions based on their knowledge and beliefs about child sexual abuse within the same 20 minute time limit used in administering the pretest.
- 4) Each subject in the study was assigned a code number. All of the evaluation instruments used in this study were pre-coded with the assigned numbers to allow the researcher to match the three instruments for each participant. Strict standards of confidentiality were maintained throughout the research.
- 5) The pre- and post-test results were analyzed and compared to determine the mean scores, their relationships to the demographic data, the relationships between the overall gain scores, and the relationships between the pre- and post-test scores on the six questions.

Although the one-group pretest and post-test design is inherently weak due to the lack of a control group, the results are strengthened by replication of the design at five different sites. If random sampling is not feasible, a study that is repeated several times, using different subjects and under different conditions of geography may have additional confidence about generalizing the findings (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

The researcher recognizes that uncontrolled-for threats to internal validity may exist with a one-group pretest post-test design. These threats include history, maturation, instrument decay, data collector characteristics, data collector bias, testing, statistical regression, attitude of subjects, and implementation (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). Any or all of these threats influence the outcome of the study. However, by presenting all of the training sessions in the same manner, allowing the same time limit, and repeating the process at five different district sites, it is believed that these threats have been minimized and that internal validity was greater in this one-group pretest post-test design.

### **Delphi Process**

The Delphi Process (Samahito, 1984 and Courtney, 1988) is a technique used to survey experts to obtain an opinion based upon consensus. The Delphi panel members who were chosen to participate in this process were considered to be experts in the particular field of study. In the present study, the area of expertise is child sexual abuse.

A list of potential panel members was compiled from a variety of sources including the current literature review, local agencies that deal with child sexual abuse, local and state law enforcement agencies, legal authorities that deal with sexual abuse in the schools, and professionals in psychology and school services. Potential members were contacted by



telephone and by letter explaining the process and requesting their participation. Participation in the process was on a voluntary basis and a total of 26 experts initially agreed to participate in the study.

Although 26 experts were selected for the first step in the Delphi Process, only 22 members completed the entire process. These 22 Delphi panel members represented the various areas of expertise and specialized knowledge in child sexual abuse that were identified as important resources for the study, including child psychology, school personnel services, child protective services, human resources, school counseling, school legal services, and law enforcement. A list of the Delphi Panel of experts is included in Appendix B.

The Delphi Process involved controlled feedback to the respondents during several rounds of questioning. The following ten steps in the Delphi process were adapted from Samahito (1984) and Courtney (1988):

- 1) A systematic plan to monitor the process was developed by the researcher. It was determined: (a) that the experts would be identified and contacted by telephone and written communication to request their participation in the process, (b) that two rounds of questioning would be used to survey the Delphi Panel, (c) that the results from each round of questioning would be used to revise the questionnaire, (d) that the final questionnaire would be given to each participant in the study, and (e) that the

questionnaire results would be used to revise the training modules for the training session.

- 2) Experts who were willing to participate in the process were selected to serve on the Delphi Panel. These individuals are recognized experts in their field of interest, indicated their willingness to be flexible and open-minded, and were willing and able to revise their thinking in the interest of consensus.

According to Samahito (1984) and Courtney (1988), there should be between 10 and 25 participants on the Delphi panel. There were 22 participants in this study who represented local, regional, and national experts.

- 3) A clear, unambiguous set of questions relating to child sexual abuse issues was developed for the first round of questioning. In this first questionnaire, some of the items were open-ended, short-answer, supply-type questions which allowed for more general responses. Other items were closed-ended, selection-type questions including checklists and attitude scales.
- 4) The original questionnaire was based on the literature and presented in an open-ended format to allow panel members to provide additional questions and comments if they felt they were needed. The intent was to determine if the right questions were

being asked in the area of child sexual abuse and to ascertain that the wording of the questions was clear and easy to understand.

- 5) The first questionnaire was distributed to the 26 experts on the Delphi Panel. The panel members were asked to respond to each of a series of 20 questions with one of the following comments:

- I agree that this question is critical and approve of the wording.
- I believe this question is critical, but would reword it.
- I do not believe it is important to include this question.
- I would recommend rewording or revising the question in this manner.

Panel members were also asked to identify additional questions that they believed should be included on the questionnaire.

- 6) The results of the questionnaires were analyzed by the researcher. In this first round, no panelist was told the identity or the responses of any other panel member.
- 7) A second round of questions was developed using the responses from the panelists to make any necessary modifications, to narrow the focus of the questions, to make the questions more precise, and to expand the number of questions on the original questionnaire.

8) The revised questionnaire was disseminated to all participants to elicit further feedback on the second round of questioning.

Panelists were asked to reconsider their own responses in an effort to reach consensus.

9) The results of the second round of questionnaires were received from 22 of the panel members and analyzed by the researcher.

Items on which consensus was reached were retained in the final questionnaire and three additional questions were added through consensus.

10) The final 23-item questionnaire was developed using feedback from the second round of questioning. Each panel member was provided with a copy of the final questionnaire and a list of the experts who had served on the Delphi Panel. The final questionnaire was administered to all of the subjects who participated in the training sessions.

Specific criteria for evaluating and retaining a trial question was used to determine when consensus had been reached. Panel members were asked to review each question for content-related evidence of validity on the basis of the following questions:

- a) How appropriate is the content?
- b) How comprehensive is the question?
- c) Does it logically get at the intent of the question?

- d) How adequately does the question sample the domain of content?
- e) Is the format appropriate?

When 80% of the experts had rated a revised question as critical information about child sexual abuse needed by school administrators, and when the revised wording of a question was approved through consensus, the question was retained in the final questionnaire. According to Samahito (1984) and Courtney (1988), a consensus level of 80% is considered to be an acceptable level.

The Delphi Process was designed to get reliable answers from experts. By completing the above steps, the final questionnaire was based on a consensus of these experts. According to Samahito (1984) and Courtney (1988), consensus in this process is recognized to be valid because (a) the respondents are chosen for their expertise in the field of child sexual abuse, and (b) an opinion reached through group study is likely to be more valid than the opinion of one person alone. The Delphi Process is recognized as a valid and logical method of developing a survey instrument.

The final questionnaire, shown in Appendix C, incorporated a dual-method approach which included demographic data questions and 23 questions on the issues of child sexual abuse. The questionnaire required various types of responses from the subjects: (a) some questions were open-ended, short-answer, supply-type questions which allowed for more general responses and (b) other questions were selection-type items

including checklists and attitude scales. Specifically, the final questionnaire included:

- Ten items of critical demographic information.
- Thirteen questions requiring selection responses.
- Three questions requiring specific numerical responses.
- Seven attitude questions requiring responses on a modified Likert scale ranging from 0 to 3. By providing no middle point, this four-point scale required subjects to respond about their attitudes either toward the positive or the negative end of the scale rather than being undecided.

The final questionnaire was disseminated to the group of 40 subjects (N = 40) who would be participating in the training sessions at the five school district sites. The questionnaire data were reviewed and used by the researcher to develop and refine the materials in the six training modules. These modules were modeled after the training design process of Gray and Stiehl (1994).

The Delphi Process was used in the study to establish content validity and to validate the format of the instruments.

### **Pre-Evaluation Case Study A**

The Pre-Evaluation Case Study A was developed by the researcher from an actual case of child sexual abuse that had occurred within a school

district in Oregon. The names, dates, and locations were changed to protect the identities of those involved in the actual case. The scenario presented an incident of possible child sexual abuse occurring in a school setting and was followed by six questions about the incident to which participants were asked to respond. Adequate information was provided in the scenario for the subject to address the six areas on which the training sessions were based.

Before participating in the training session, each subject was asked to read the scenario on the pretest and complete the six open-ended questions within a 20 minute time period. The six questions corresponded directly to the six training session modules and specifically asked the following questions:

- 1) What does the law require you to do in this case?
- 2) What signs of sexual abuse would you look for in the students who may be victims in this case?
- 3) What are some of the signs of pedophile behavior you would look for in the perpetrator?
- 4) What information do you need to justify reporting suspicion of child abuse to the appropriate agency?
- 5) How would school policy and ethical standards apply in this case?
- 6) What steps do you take to investigate these allegations?

To provide adequate time for the training sessions, subjects were allowed only 20 minutes to complete the pretest before the instruments were collected by the researcher. The tests were scored using the coding sheet developed by the researcher. Each question was given an equal value of 10 points with a total score of 60 points possible for the six questions.

On the coding sheet, the researcher identified the responses that corresponded to the six topic areas in the study and that the Delphi Panel had identified as the critical information to be incorporated in the training sessions. Because the content for the questions had been validated through the Delphi Process, it was expected that subjects would use these responses in answering the supply-type questions if they had accurate knowledge about child sexual abuse.

An overall list of response categories was compiled for each question and a score assigned to each category. This overall coding scheme was then used to code each subject's pre- and post-test responses and determine the raw scores for each of the six questions. See Appendix E for a copy of Case Study A and Appendix F for the Coding Sheet used to derive the scores.



## **Intervention**

The purpose of the training sessions was to improve a school administrator's performance on the child sexual abuse case simulations. The training model design was based on the work of Gray and Stiehl (1994).

In the present study, six detailed training modules were developed by the researcher and organized in a manual. The manual was printed and bound in coded sections which addressed the six areas of emphasis corresponding to the six questions in the pre- and post-tests. A set of overheads was developed and used in the training sessions to visually illustrate the information on child sexual abuse that was provided in the modules.

A series of five training sessions were conducted by the researcher at five school district sites in Yamhill County during the months of January and February, 1996.

A multi-media approach was used by the trainer to provide for differences in learning modalities among the subjects. Each training session consisted of three hours of concentrated lecture, discussion, overhead presentations, a video-tape presentation, reading of journal articles, and completion of study guides on the six topics relating to child sexual abuse. Immediately following the training sessions, each subject completed Post-Evaluation Case Study B.

### **Post-Evaluation Case Study B**

The Post-Evaluation Case Study B was developed by the researcher using a different child sexual abuse scenario but the same six questions used in Case Study A. The post-test was administered immediately following the training session, and subjects were given the same amount of time as the pretest (20 minutes) to complete the six questions.

Post-tests were scored using the same Coding Sheet and point values as those used on the pretest. See Appendix E for a copy of Case Study B.

In order to determine the effectiveness of the training and to examine the differences between the pre- and post-tests, three groups of data were analyzed:

- 1) Descriptive data from the demographic information derived from the questionnaires,
- 2) Content validity data derived from the questionnaire results, and
- 3) Statistical data from the pre- and post-test results based on *t* test scores for correlated means.

The raw scores attained by each subject on the six pre- and post-test questions were used for comparative analyses between groups.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

The focus of the study was to investigate whether specially designed training will significantly improve a school administrator's performance on child sexual abuse case simulations.

In order to investigate this question, data were collected using three instruments: (1) an administrator questionnaire developed through a Delphi Process, (2) a pre-evaluation case simulation, and (3) a post-evaluation case simulation.

From the Delphi Process, six questions which specifically addressed child sexual abuse issues emerged and were used to assess the pre- and post-intervention case simulations. Subgroups emerged from the demographic data from the administrator questionnaire results, and these subgroup data were statistically correlated to the six questions on the pre- and post-evaluations to assess significant outcomes on the basis of these subgroups.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the results of the answers to the questionnaire; inferential statistics were used to analyze the pre- and post-test results on case simulations; and *t* tests were used to identify significant gains. A standard level of significance ( $p = .05$ ) was employed throughout the study. The results were statistically analyzed to provide the

means and *t* test scores for correlated means for each of the six questions. These results were analyzed for the total group scores and subgroups within the study sample.

### **Demographic Results**

A total of 40 subjects ( $N=40$ ) completed the demographic information and the questions on the Administrator Questionnaire. Of these 40 subjects, only 37 participated in the training sessions and completed the pre- and post-tests ( $n=37$ ). The following tables provide the demographic data relative to the sample population used in this study. See Appendix D for the detailed results from the Administrator Questionnaire.

Gender. Table 3 reports the distribution by gender of the 40 participants who completed the demographic information and responded to the 23 questions on the Administrator Questionnaire. This questionnaire was administered prior to the subjects participating in the training sessions. Over half of the subjects were female (57.5%), and 42.5% were male.

Age. The subjects were categorized in age groups clustered in five-year increments. These groups ranged from *Between 30 - 35* to *Older than 56*. Forty-five percent of the group were under the age of 45, and 55 percent were 45 or older. The median age group for the overall group was between 46 - 50. For females, the median age group was between 41 - 45, and for males, between 46 - 50. Females in this study tend to be younger

Table 3

Gender, Age, and Ethnic Categories of Subjects (N = 40)

Age Categories	Gender Groups		Total Group		Ethnic Group	Total Group	
	Female	Male	<u>n</u>	%		<u>n</u>	%
Under 30	0	0	0	.0%	African American	0	.0%
Between 30-35	1	1	2	5.0%	Asian	0	.0%
Between 36-40	3	2	5	12.5%	Latino	0	.0%
Between 41-45	9	2	11	27.5%	Native American	1	2.5%
Between 46-50	6	6	12	30.0%	White	37	92.5%
Between 51-55	3	5	8	20.0%	Other	1	2.5%
Older than 56	1	1	2	5.0%	No Response	1	2.5%
<u>n</u>	23	17	40			40	
Total %	57.5%	42.5%		100.0%			100.0%

than their male counterparts by one age category of five years. See Table 3 for a detailed listing of the various age groups.

Ethnicity. The ethnic category of the subject group was predominantly white with 37 of the respondents, or 92.5%, categorizing themselves as *White*. Only three of the subjects in the study categorized themselves as representative of other than a member of the *White* ethnic group. One subject indicated a *Native American* nationality, one subject marked *Other*, and one subject marked no ethnic category. Because of the lack of variation in ethnicity and the predominantly white nationality of the subjects in the study, no statistical correlations were assessed using this data. See Table 3 for an itemized listing of the various race categories in this sample population.

Years in Administration. Table 4 documents the number of years the subjects reported for their years of experience in administration. The number of years in administration ranges from 0 years to 26 years. Two respondents failed to make any response about the number of years in administration, and two respondents reported that they had zero years in administration.

For female subjects, the mean number of years in administration was 6 Years. For male subjects, the mean number of years in administration was 15. For the group as a whole, the mean number of years in administration was 6.5 years. See Table 4 for the number of respondents in each category.

Table 4

Number of Years in Administration and Number of Years in Current Position (N = 40)

Number of Years	Years in Administration				Years in Current Position			
	Female	Male	<u>n</u>	%	Female	Male	All	%
Less than 1 year	3	0	3	7.5%	5	1	6	15.0%
Between 1-5 years	8	4	12	30.0%	14	8	22	55.0%
Between 6-10 years	8	2	10	25.0%	2	5	7	17.5%
Between 11-15 years	2	3	5	12.5%	0	1	1	2.5%
Between 16-20 years	1	3	4	10.0%	1	1	2	5.0%
More than 20 years	0	4	4	10.0%	0	1	1	2.5%
No response	1	1	2	5.0%	1	0	1	2.5%
All	23	17	40	100.0%	23	17	40	100.0%
<u>M</u>	6	15	6.5		3	7	5	

Years in Current Position. Subjects were asked to report the number of years in their current administrative positions. For females, 50% had been in their current positions between 1 and 5 years. The mean was 3 years and only 3 females had been in their current positions more than 5 years.

For males, 50% had been in their current positions between 1 and 5 years, and the mean was 5 years. Ten of the males (60%) had been in their current positions longer than 5 years.

Females in this study sample appear to have been in their current positions for shorter periods of time overall than their male counterparts. See Table 4 for data relating to the present study sample.

Current Position. The majority of the subjects (55%) identified *Building Principals* as their current positions on the Administrator Questionnaire. The second largest group was *District Office* administrators, with 20% of the subjects in this category. The third largest group was *Assistant Principal* with 15% of the total group in this category. Two subjects failed to report the type of position they hold in their current position.

For female subjects, 50% reported their current position as *Building Principal*. For male subjects, 65% reported *Building Principal* as their current position. See Table 5 for the percentage of respondents who reported in each of the position categories.



Table 5

Current Type of Administrative Position for Subjects in the Study (N = 40)

Current Position	Female	Male	All	%
Building Principal	11	11	22	55.0%
Assistant Principal	5	1	6	15.0%
Athletics or Activities	1	0	1	2.5%
District Office	4	4	8	20.0%
Other	1	0	1	2.5%
No Response	1	1	2	5.0%
All	23	17	40	100.0%

Size of District by Number of Students. Subjects reported the size of their district by identifying the number of students in the district. The data show that more than one-fourth (27.5%) of the respondents failed to report the number of students in their district. Fifty percent of the subjects reported the number of students in their district to be more than 4,000. Five subjects (12.5%) reported fewer than 1,000 students in their districts, and four subjects reported their district to be between 1000 and 1500 students.

Size of District by Number of Teachers. Eighteen of the subjects (45%) failed to report the number of teachers in the district, making it difficult to draw any conclusions about the size of the district from this sample. Four subjects (10%) reported their district to have 50 to 100 teachers, two (5%) reported between 100 and 199 teachers, twelve

subjects (30%) reported their district to have between 200 and 299 teachers, and four (10%) reported between 400-500 teachers.

See Table 6 for the district size categories and the number and percentage of respondents in each category for both number of students and number of teachers in their districts.

Size of School by Number of Students. The subjects in this study reported the student size of their current schools in the demographic section of the questionnaire. Nine subjects (22.5%) reported zero students. This failure to respond to this question appears to show that these respondents may likely work at the District Office level rather than in schools.

The majority of subjects (65%) reported the number of students in their school to be less than 1000. The remaining 12.5% subjects reported their school to have between 3000 and 3999 students.

Size of School by Number of Teachers. Eleven subjects (27.5%) reported zero teachers in their school. Again, this response leads the researcher to the conclusion that these respondents most likely work at the District Office level rather than in a school building.

Thirteen subjects (32.5%) reported the number of teachers in their school to be under 24. Nine subjects (22.5%) reported between 25 and 49 teachers in their school, and seven (17.5%) reported between 50 and 74. All of the subjects were in schools with less than 75 teachers. See Table 6 for a detailed listing of the responses for each category based on number of students and number of teachers in the school.

Table 4

Number of Years in Administration and Number of Years in Current Position (N = 40)

Number of Years	Years in Administration				Years in Current Position			
	Female	Male	<u>n</u>	%	Female	Male	All	%
Less than 1 year	3	0	3	7.5%	5	1	6	15.0%
Between 1-5 years	8	4	12	30.0%	14	8	22	55.0%
Between 6-10 years	8	2	10	25.0%	2	5	7	17.5%
Between 11-15 years	2	3	5	12.5%	0	1	1	2.5%
Between 16-20 years	1	3	4	10.0%	1	1	2	5.0%
More than 20 years	0	4	4	10.0%	0	1	1	2.5%
No response	1	1	2	5.0%	1	0	1	2.5%
All	23	17	40	100.0%	23	17	40	100.0%
<u>M</u>	6	15	6.5		3	7	5	

## **Content Validity Results**

The Administrator Questionnaire was developed with input from 22 experts in the field of child sexual abuse who served on a Delphi Panel. These experts assisted with the validation of the content of the training modules by identifying the topics for the training sessions. Six modules were written to focus on the topics that were identified by the panel as important information for administrators to know about child sexual abuse in the school setting.

These six identified topics became the basis for the six training modules and were used to develop the six questions on the pre- and post-evaluation case studies. The subjects' responses on these research instruments were then used to assess their knowledge gain on the post-tests.

The subjects' responses on the Administrator Questionnaire have been compiled in numerical tables and corresponding items are organized in groups to match each of these six questions used on the pretest. See Appendix D for a detailed listing of the results of these six categories on the Administrator Questionnaire.

Analysis of these data indicate that the administrators who participated in this study self-reported a greater degree of knowledge about the six child sexual abuse topics when responding to the questions on the

Administrator Questionnaire than was actually demonstrated by their performance on the Pre-Evaluation Case Study A.

See Table 7 for the results of the females, males, and entire group on each of the six questions on the Pre-Evaluation Case Study A. The following narratives are comparisons of the pretest results with the results from the corresponding questions on the Administrator Questionnaire.

Q1: What does the law require you to do in this case? The mean score for the group on Q1 was 5.0 points out of a possible 10 points. This score indicates that subjects were able to provide 50% of the information that was requested on Q1 on the pretest. Females were able to provide slightly more information on the pretest question (52%) than were the males (47%).

These results indicate that the subjects had a higher level of knowledge about the information presented in the first training module before participating in the training sessions than they had on any of the other five modules; however, they still knew only about 50% of the information needed by administrators in this area.

Comparison of the pretest results with the survey results indicate that administrators have a better knowledge and are more confident of their knowledge level about their legal responsibilities in reporting child sexual abuse than they may be in the other five training module areas.

Table 7

Summary of Pretest Results for Females, Males and Total Group

Pretest Items		Females		Males		Total Group	
Question	Points	Pretest <u>M</u>	%	Pretest <u>M</u>	%	Pretest <u>M</u>	%
Q1	10	5.2	52%	4.7	47%	5.0	50%
Q2	10	3.0	30%	2.3	23%	2.7	27%
Q3	10	1.8	18%	2.0	20%	1.9	19%
Q4	10	4.0	40%	3.9	39%	4.0	40%
Q5	10	1.4	14%	2.2	22%	1.8	18%
Q6	10	1.5	15%	2.3	23%	1.8	18%
Total Test	60	16.9	28%	17.4	29%	17.2	29%

Although subjects displayed a relatively high level of knowledge on Q1 on the pretest, the responses given on the Administrator Questionnaire indicate that many administrators have had little experience actually applying the law. (See Appendix D for these survey results.)

When asked if they had ever reported allegations of child sexual abuse, only 22.5% of the respondents indicated that they had ever made a child abuse report, while 77.5% indicated they had never made a report. These results would indicate that, although administrators understand the law, they do not have a strong knowledge base about child sexual abuse and do not recognize the indicators of child sexual abuse or pedophile behaviors.

When asked how many sexual abuse reports they had made, administrators indicated that, in the past school year, the number of reports they had made ranged from 0 to 12. More than half (52.5%) reported that they had made no reports in the past year, and 37.5% indicated they had made only 1 to 3 reports. More than one quarter (27.5%) of the administrators had not made a report in the past five years.

When asked how many reports they had made regarding alleged abuse by a school employee, an overwhelming majority (82.5%) of the administrators reported that they had not made a report regarding a school employee in the past year, and 65% had not made such a report in the past five years. Only 17.5% of the administrators had made a report regarding a

school employee in the past year, and 35% had made 1 or 2 reports over the past five years. This is strong evidence that school administrators are not trained to recognize the characteristics of pedophile behavior and therefore fail to report suspicious behaviors that may be occurring in the school setting.

More than half (55%) of the administrators were able to identify 5 or more of the 7 agencies to which they could make a child abuse report. These data indicate that many administrators are knowledgeable about making reports to various agencies and persons, but the questionnaire data indicate that they may not put this knowledge into practice frequently enough.

A majority of the administrators (67.5%) reported that they were somewhat familiar with the Oregon Statute defining child sexual abuse. A small number (15%) indicated they were very familiar with the statute, but no administrators reported that they were totally unfamiliar with it. Although administrators may be familiar with the Oregon Statute, other data indicate that they frequently fail to implement the law and that they may not recognize the indicators of child sexual abuse well enough to be able to comply with the statute.

When asked if they were familiar with the Oregon Mandatory Reporting Law, almost all (97.5%) of the administrators reported that they were familiar with the law, 57.5% were somewhat familiar, and 40% were



very familiar with the law. None of the administrators reported that they were totally unfamiliar with the law. From the data, it appears that administrators are knowledgeable about the reporting law, but that they fail to implement the law by reporting suspicions as often as they should.

These data appear to show that administrators lack adequate knowledge to recognize possible victims or perpetrators and emphasize the need for training in this area.

Q2: What signs would you look for in the students who may be victims in this case? Females scored slightly higher than males on this pretest item. The mean score for the females was 3.0. The mean score for males was 2.3. The mean score for the total group on item Q2 was 2.7 points out of a possible 10 points. This score indicates that subjects were able to provide only about one-fourth (27%) of the information that was requested on Q2 on the pretest.

Even though administrators saw themselves as somewhat effective in recognizing victims of sexual abuse, the pretest results indicate that this is an area in which administrators lacked a great deal of knowledge prior to participating in the training session. (See Table 7.)

There were five questions on the Administrator Questionnaire that corresponded to Q2 on the pretest. Overall, the results on these five questions indicate that this group of administrators perceived themselves as somewhat effective in identifying students who are victims of child sexual

abuse. (Appendix D provides detailed results from the Administrator Questionnaire on each of these questions.)

When surveyed about the amount of prior training they had received in this area, almost half (45%) of the administrators reported that they had had no courses in college that prepared them to identify victims of sexual abuse. Approximately one-third (37.5%) reported they had had 1 to 4 college courses in which part of the curriculum focused on identification of child sexual abuse victims. Half (50%) of the administrators reported that they had taken workshops or inservice training of 1 to 4 hours in which identification of child sexual abuse victims was taught, and 40% had had 5 or more hours of training. These data indicate that most administrators have had limited training in the areas of child sexual abuse.

An overwhelming majority of the administrators (90%) reported that their training in this area had been somewhat effective or highly effective. Only 7.5% perceived their training to be totally ineffective or somewhat ineffective. These responses create a serious discrepancy when compared to the pretest results for Q2. Administrators in the study were unable to provide information on the pretest to confirm that their prior training had been effective.

When asked the percentage of children who are sexually abused, approximately one-fourth (22.5%) of the administrators reported that they didn't know the percentage of girls who are sexually abused. Almost half

(45%) responded with the correct answer of 1 out of 4. When focusing on boys who are sexually abused, only about one-fourth (27.5%) of the administrators gave the correct response of 1 out of 6. A fourth of the administrators (27.5%) indicated that they didn't know the answer. These data indicate that administrators are unaware of how pervasive the problem of child sexual abuse is, and the data fail to support the administrators' perceptions that their training in this area had been effective.

When asked to identify the group of students who are at greatest risk of child sexual abuse, only 20% of the administrators reported correctly that students with mild disabilities are at the greatest risk of sexual abuse.

Almost half (42.5%) of the administrators responded that they didn't know the correct answer. These data indicate that administrators lack adequate knowledge about who are the victims of child sexual abuse and that their training has been inadequate in this area.

Surprisingly, a large percentage (62.5%) of the administrators reported that they were somewhat confident in their ability to recognize the characteristics of victims of sexual abuse in their school. Only 5% of the group indicated that they were totally lacking in confidence in this area, and 32.5% reported they were somewhat lacking in confidence. The results on the pretest for Q2 fail to support the administrators' level of confidence in their ability to identify child sexual abuse victims. Few of the administrators were able to list the indicators of a victim of sexual abuse. Pretest data

indicates that administrators fail to apply their knowledge in this area and that their perceptions of confidence in their abilities are inaccurate.

Q3: What are some of the signs you would look for in pedophile behavior? The mean for females on this pretest item was 1.8. Males scored slightly higher than the females with a mean score of 2.1. The mean score for the total group on item Q3 was 1.9 points out of a possible 10 points. This score indicates that subjects were able to provide less than 20% of the information that was requested on Q3 on the pretest and that this may be an area in which administrators have little knowledge.

There were four questions on the questionnaire that corresponded to Q3 on the pretest. Overall, the results on these four questions indicate that this group of administrators perceive themselves as somewhat effective and somewhat confident in identifying pedophiles who are perpetrators of child sexual abuse.

When surveyed about the amount of training in this area, almost half (45%) of the administrators reported that they had had no courses in college that prepared them to identify perpetrators of child sexual abuse. Approximately one-third (37.5%) reported they had had 1 to 4 college courses in which part of the curriculum focused on identification of child sexual abuse perpetrators. The other 17.5% of those surveyed failed to respond to this question. Half (50%) of the administrators reported that they had taken workshops or inservice training of 1 to 4 hours in which

identification of child sexual abuse perpetrators was taught. About 40% of the administrators reported that they had had 5 or more hours of training.

An overwhelming majority of the administrators (90%) reported that their training in this area had been somewhat effective or highly effective. Only 7.5% perceived their training to be totally ineffective or somewhat ineffective. These responses create a serious discrepancy when compared to the pretest results for Q3. Administrators in the study were unable to provide information on the pretest to confirm that their prior training had been even minimally effective.

When asked what percentage of adults are believed to engage in child sexual abuse, only 7.5% of the administrators were aware that 1% of the general population are believed to be pedophiles. Half (50%) of those surveyed responded with an incorrect answer, and 42.5% indicated that they didn't know the correct answer. When questioned about the percentage of school employees who are believed to be pedophiles, a surprising 40% of the administrators responded with the correct answer, and 40% of those surveyed indicated they didn't know the answer. These data indicate that administrators in the study appear to have insufficient knowledge about pedophilic behaviors.

Of those surveyed, 45% of the administrators reported that they were somewhat confident that they could recognize pedophilic behaviors in adults. The responses by this same group of administrators on Q3 on the

pretest failed to confirm the administrators' perceptions of their abilities.

Few administrators were able to list pedophilic behaviors in the pretest.

Pretest data on this question appear to indicate that administrators need enhanced training in recognizing characteristics of adults who are perpetrators of sexual abuse in order to protect the children in their schools.

Q4: What information do you need to justify reporting child abuse to the appropriate agency? The mean score for females on this question was 4.0 out of a possible 10 points. Males scored almost the same with a mean score of 3.9. The mean score for the total group on Q4 was 4.0 points out of a possible 10 points. This score indicates that subjects were able to provide 40% of the information that was requested on Q4 on the pretest.

This pretest question had the second highest mean for this group of subjects. (Q1 had the highest mean.) These results indicate that the administrators had a higher level of knowledge in this area than in four other areas prior to the training session. Practicing administrators in this study appear to know more about reporting child abuse to appropriate agencies than they do about other areas in the training modules. However, a result of only 40% indicates that administrators in this study were able to provide less than half of the information that was requested on this question. (See Table 7 for these pretest results.)

There were four questions on the Administrator Questionnaire that corresponded to Q4 on the pretest. Overall, the results on these four

questions indicate that this group of administrators perceive themselves as somewhat knowledgeable about the requirements for reporting child abuse to appropriate agencies.

When surveyed about the amount of training they had in this area, about one-third (32.5%) of the administrators reported that they had had some courses in college that prepared them to report sexual abuse. Almost half (47.5%) reported that they had had no college courses in which part of the curriculum focused on reporting allegations of child sexual abuse. The remaining 20% of those surveyed failed to respond to this question. Almost all (95%) of the administrators reported that they had taken workshops or inservice training of 1 to 5 hours in which the reporting requirements for child sexual abuse was taught. Only 5% of those surveyed indicated they had had no workshop or inservice training on this issue. These data indicate that the majority of administrators have had limited training in reporting child sexual abuse, and this training occurred most typically in a workshop or inservice type of setting.

Despite reporting a high level of confidence in their ability to recognize pedophiles and in their knowledge of the reporting requirements, an overwhelming majority (82.5%) of the administrators in this study had made no reports on school employees within the past year, and 65% had made no such reports within the past five years. Only 17.5% of the administrators had made a report on an employee in the past year, and 35%

had made a report within the past five years. These results imply that the administrators' perceptions of themselves as knowledgeable in this particular area are inaccurate. Their inability to recognize pedophilic behaviors in employees is confirmed by their failure to make substantial numbers of reports and by their failure to provide adequate information on the pretest question in this area.

Administrators were asked to identify what they feel most unsure about when reporting allegations of child sexual abuse. Although 42.5% of the administrators responded with multiple answers to this question, the largest single concern identified was the need to preserve the reputation of the child or adult (22.5%). This result indicates that administrators may not be as confident about their abilities to recognize and report child sexual abuse as they believe they are.

The administrators were asked to identify the situations under which a school employee is required to report suspicions of child abuse. The majority of administrators (62.5%) in this survey were successful in identifying all five matching responses. These results indicate that the subjects in this study have a high level of knowledge about when they must report suspicions of child abuse. Their failure to recognize the suspicious behaviors in the Pretest Case Study, however, indicates that they may be unable to apply their knowledge effectively to prevent child sexual abuse in the school setting.



Q5: How would school policy and ethical standards apply in this case? The mean score for females on this pretest item was 1.4 points. The mean score for males was slightly higher at 2.2 points. The mean score for the total group on Q5 was 1.8 points out of a possible 10 points. This score was the lowest mean of all six questions and indicates that subjects were unable to provide a significant amount of the information that was requested on this pretest item. (See Table 7 for these results.)

There were three questions on the questionnaire that corresponded to Q5 on the pretest. Overall, the results on these three questions indicate that this group of administrators are lacking in knowledge about the legal, policy and ethical issues relating to child sexual abuse. (See Appendix D for the results on these questions.)

When surveyed about the ways in which an administrator can be held liable in a sexual abuse case, none of the administrators were able to match all of the correct responses in this question. Slightly more than half (55%) of the administrators correctly matched 5 of the 10 responses. An additional 30% of the group matched 6 of the 10 responses, and 12.5% matched 7 out of 10. Administrators in the present study perceive themselves to have a higher level of knowledge in the area of legal liability than in other areas on the questionnaire. However, pretest data indicates that administrators may not be able to put this knowledge into practice to prevent child sexual abuse in the school setting.

When asked what the Oregon Administrative Rules say about educators who engage in sexual contact with a student, slightly more than one-third (37.5%) were able to match 6 out of 9 responses. Another 30% matched more than 6 responses. No one matched all 9 responses. Overall, the majority of administrators participating in this study appear to lack knowledge about the requirements in the Oregon Administrative Rules relating to child sexual abuse.

When surveyed about their level of familiarity with their district's policy relating to child sexual abuse, none of the administrators in this survey indicated that they were very familiar with the policy in their district. Only 20% were somewhat familiar with the policy, and 75% were unsure that there was a policy or knew there was a policy but had never used it. These data indicate that this is an area in which this particular group of administrators were lacking in information.

These results indicate that the administrators in the present study had an extremely low level of knowledge on this particular question when compared to the other five questions. The pretest results for Q3, Q5, and Q6 were all less than 20%. This information was used to design training sessions that concentrated more time on these three focus areas.

Q6: What steps do you take to investigate these allegations? The mean score for females on this pretest item was 1.5 points. The mean score for males was slightly higher at 2.3 Points. The mean score for the total

group on item Q6 was 1.8 points out of a possible 10 points. (See Table 7 for these data.)

This score was the second lowest mean of all six questions and confirms that subjects were unable to provide a significant amount of the information on this pretest item. These results indicate that the administrators had a low level of knowledge in this particular area when compared to the results on the other questions. As noted above, the pretest results for Q3, Q5, and Q6 were all less than 20%. This information was used to identify the training areas on which the researcher needed to concentrate.

There were three questions on the questionnaire that corresponded to Q6 on the pretest. Overall, the results on these three questions indicate that this group of administrators is lacking in knowledge about the appropriate steps to take in investigating allegations of child sexual abuse.

Administrators were asked what actions they would take after receiving a report of alleged child abuse. Their responses ranged from matching 5 out of 11 to matching all 11 responses. There was no category that had a majority of responses. Four (10%) of the administrators were able to match all of the correct responses in this question. These data indicate that the majority of administrators in the present study perceive themselves to be inadequately prepared to conduct investigations into child sexual abuse and are unaware of the appropriate steps to take.

When surveyed about the resources they had used when receiving reports of child sexual abuse, administrators indicated that they had used the following documents: 57.5% had used the CSD Booklet; 85% had used the district policy and regulations; 67.5% had used district forms and procedures; and 62.5% had used training or workshop materials. In a previous question, a large group (75%) of these same administrators indicated that they were unsure their district had a policy or indicated that they knew about their district's policy but had never used it. The responses on this question appear to contradict the results on the previous question. Based on the pretest results, the administrators in this group were unable to provide information to confirm that they were knowledgeable about investigating allegations of child sexual abuse.

On the second part of this survey question, administrators reported that they had used the following parties or agencies: 80% had used the State Office for Services to Children and Families (formerly CSD); 67.5% had used law enforcement agencies; 35% had used the district's legal counsel; 42.5% had used the Superintendent; 57.5% had used the Personnel Director; and 12.5% had used other resource persons. These data indicate that administrators in the present study understand their obligation to seek assistance from appropriate agencies and to inform district personnel of allegations of child sexual abuse in their schools.

When asked their level of confidence about the procedure to follow when reporting child sexual abuse cases, the majority of administrators in this survey (57.5%) indicated that they were somewhat confident and 22.5% indicated they were very confident about the procedures to follow. Only 17.5% indicated that they were totally lacking in confidence or somewhat lacking in confidence about the procedures to follow. Yet, few administrators were able to list or explain the procedures they would follow when given the scenario on the pretest case study. These results demonstrate that administrators in the present study were unable to adequately apply the knowledge they may have about child sexual abuse reporting procedures or that most administrators in the study group are lacking in knowledge in these important areas.

### **Pre- and Post-Test Results**

Examination of the Primary Question. The primary question being examined in this study asserts that a training session based on specially designed modules will make a significant improvement in a school administrator's performance on child sexual abuse case simulations.

This study sought to determine if administrators would demonstrate increased knowledge after participating in the training session and if there would be significant differences among the subjects on the basis of gender, age, experience level, and longevity in their current positions.

Pre- and post-test results were used to assess the knowledge gain for the subjects based on the overall test scores and the scores for each of the six questions within the tests. These results were also analyzed for the four sub-groups based on gender, age, experience level, and longevity. The  $t$  test of alpha was used to examine the significance in the changes in performance between the pretests and post-tests. A standard level of significance ( $p < .05$ ) was employed.

Pre- and Post-Test Results for Overall Gains. The knowledge gains between the pretests and post-tests demonstrated by the participants were statistically significant at the .05 level and show that administrators performed at a much higher level on the post-test after participating in the training sessions.

Table 8 provides the overall gain scores and the results for the  $t$  test of correlated means between the pre- and post-tests (i.e., total test). In examining the data for significant gains, the following comparisons were made. The pretest mean for the group was 17.2 points and the post-test mean was 35.7 points out of a total of 60 possible points. Overall, the group demonstrated a mean gain of 18.5 points between the pretests and post-tests. The 18.5 point gain is a gain of 108% and more than doubles the mean score achieved on the pretest. Subjecting the gain to a statistical test, the results were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level. A one-tailed  $t$  test for correlated means was employed ( $t.05,37$ ).

Table 8

Summary of Gains on Six Individual Questions and on the Overall Test (n = 37)

Level of Significance for Directional (One-Tailed) Tests = .05

Test Item	Pretest <u>M</u>	Post-test <u>M</u>	<u>M</u> Gain	<u>t</u> Value	p < .05
Q1	5.0	7.2	2.2	2.5917	s*
Q2	2.7	5.7	3.0	7.1884	s*
Q3	1.9	4.6	2.7	6.6544	s*
Q4	4.0	5.9	1.9	3.8076	s*
Q5	1.8	7.0	5.2	7.8702	s*
Q6	1.8	5.2	3.4	3.5939	s*
Total Test	17.2	35.7	18.5	11.11719	s*

Note. Critical value ( $t_{\alpha, n-1}$ ) = 1.689. Significance of results is designated by s\* indicating that results are significant ( $p < .05$ ), one-tailed test.

Pre- and Post-Test Results for Six Questions. The results of each of the six questions from the pre- and post-tests were statistically analyzed to determine if the knowledge gain was significant. Table 8 provides a detailed review of the results of the six questions and examines the significance of the change in the subjects' performance on each. Subjecting the gain on each question to a statistical test, the pre-post difference was found to be statistically significant at the .05 level. In the present instance, a one-tailed *t* test for correlated means was employed (*t*.05,37).

As evidenced by the entries in Table 8, the results confirm that the subjects demonstrated a significant gain between the pretest and the post-test on all six questions. The conclusion can be drawn that the training sessions were effective in improving the performance of the administrators in the present study on each of the areas covered by the six questions on the pre- and post-tests.

Results by Gender. The effects of gender upon learning within the workshop were explored within this study. In particular, the data were examined to determine the extent to which males and females differed in their performance on the pre-post test.

In examining the data for possible gender differences, three separate sets of comparisons were made. In the first set of comparisons, the pre- and post-test performances of female participants were examined. Similarly, the pre- and post-test performances of male participants were examined.



As evidenced by the entries in Table 9, female participants ( $n = 21$ ) made overall gains in test performance. Specifically, the female participants averaged approximately 17 points on the pretest and about 37 points on the post-test. Female participants demonstrated a gain of 118% over their baseline performance.

Subjecting the gain to a statistical test, the pre-post difference was found to be statistically significant at the .05 level. In the present instance, a one-tailed  $t$  test for correlated means was employed ( $t_{.05,20}$ ).

Still within the first set of comparisons, a parallel procedure was employed with the male participants ( $n = 16$ ). The male participants averaged about 17 points on the pretest and nearly 34 points on the post-test (See Table 9). The pre-post difference amounted to approximately a 100% improvement over the average baseline performance. The one-tailed  $t$  test for correlated means was again employed ( $t_{.05,15}$ ) and the results were found to be statistically significant.

As a result of the first set of analyses, it is clear that both male and female participants gained from the training sessions and that the gain each group made was statistically significant.

In the second set of comparisons, the pre- and post-test performances of female participants for each of the six individual subtests were examined and the gains were subjected to statistical tests. The pre-post differences have been summarized in Table 9.

Table 9

Summary of Overall Gains for Females and Males

Level of Significance for Directional (One-Tailed) Tests = .05

Test	Females ( $n = 21$ )					Males ( $n = 16$ )				
	Pretest	Post-test	<u>M</u>	<u>t</u>	$p <$	Pretest	Post-test	<u>M</u>	<u>t</u>	$p <$
Item	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	Gain	Value	.05	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	Gain	Value	.05
Q1	5.2	7.1	1.9	1.5629	ns**	4.7	7.2	2.5	2.2361	s*
Q2	3.1	5.7	2.6	5.6168	s*	2.3	5.7	3.4	4.6362	s*
Q3	1.8	5.0	3.2	6.6232	s*	2.1	4.2	2.1	3.0598	s*
Q4	4.1	5.9	1.8	2.6874	s*	3.9	6.0	2.1	2.6359	s*
Q5	1.4	7.9	6.5	8.2158	s*	2.2	5.9	3.7	3.5032	s*
Q6	1.5	5.6	4.1	6.9023	s*	2.3	4.8	2.5	4.4426	s*
Total Test	17.1	37.2	20.1	9.6859	s*	17.4	33.8	16.4	6.0646	s*

Note. Critical value for females ( $t_{\alpha, n-1}$ ) = 1.725. Critical value for males ( $t_{\alpha, n-1}$ ) = 1.753. Significance of results is designated by s\* indicating that results are significant ( $p < .05$ ), one-tailed test. ns\*\* indicates that results are non-significant.

The differences were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level on test items 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, but the gain on the first subtest was found to be non-significant at the .05 level for females.

For males, the pre- and post-test performances on each of the six individual subtests are summarized in Table 9. The differences for males were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level on all six test items.

The third set of comparisons contrast the performance by gender. Table 10 summarizes the performance of females versus males on the amount of gain for the pre-post test. In this case, both genders had a gain score, but the differences between females and males were non-significant at the .05 level. These gains were statistically analyzed using a two-tailed  $t$  test for correlated means ( $t_{.05,35}$ ) and no significant differences in performance on the basis of gender were found in the present study.

Results by Age. The effects of age upon learning within the training sessions were explored within the present study. In particular, the data were examined to determine the extent to which younger administrators under the age of 40 differed from older administrators over the age of 40 in their performance on the pre-post test.

In examining the data for possible age differences, three separate comparisons were made. In the first set of comparisons, the pre- and post-test performances of younger participants were examined.

Table 10

Comparison of Differences in Gains for Females and Males  
 Level of Significance for Nondirectional (Two-Tailed) Tests = .05

Gender Group	<u>n</u>	Pretest <u>M</u>	Post-test <u>M</u>	<u>M</u> Gain	<u>t</u> Value	p < .05
Females	$n_1 = 21$	17.1	37.2	20.1	1.1119	ns*
Males	$n_2 = 16$	17.4	33.8	16.4	1.1119	ns*

Note. Critical value ( $\alpha/2, [n_1-1] + [n_2-1]$ ) = 2.0315. Significance of results is designated by ns\* and indicates that differences between females and males are non-significant ( $p > .05$ ), two-tailed test.

Similarly, the pre-and post-test performances of older participants were examined. The results for the first set of comparisons have been summarized in Table 11

As evidenced by the entries in Table 11, younger participants ( $n = 18$ ) made overall gains in test performance. Specifically, the younger participants averaged approximately 18 points on the pretest and about 37 points on the post-test. The younger participants demonstrated a gain of 106% over their baseline performance. Subjecting the gain to a statistical test, the pre-post difference was found to be statistically significant at the .05 level. In the present instance, a one-tailed  $t$  test for correlated means was employed ( $t_{.05,18}$ ).

Still within the first set of comparisons, a parallel procedure was employed with the older participants ( $n = 19$ ). The older participants averaged about 16 points on the pretest and about 34 points on the post-test (See Table 11). The pre-post difference amounted to approximately a 109% improvement over the average baseline performance. The one-tailed  $t$  test for correlated means was again employed ( $t_{.05,19}$ ) and the results were found to be statistically significant.

As a result of the first set of analyses, it is clear that both younger and older participants gained from the training sessions and that the gain each group made was statistically significant.

Table 11

Summary of Overall Gains for Administrators by Age  
 Level of Significance for Directional (One-Tailed) Tests = .05

Test Item	Younger Administrators ( $\underline{n} = 18$ )					Older Administrators ( $\underline{n} = 19$ )				
	(Under the Age of 40)					(Over the Age of 40)				
	Pretest	Post-test	<u>M</u>	<u>t</u>	p <	Pretest	Post-test	<u>M</u>	<u>t</u>	p <
	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	Gain	Value	.05	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	Gain	Value	.05
Q1	5.3	7.8	2.5	1.8439	s*	4.7	6.6	1.9	1.7942	s*
Q2	3.1	5.8	2.7	4.8199	s*	2.4	5.6	3.2	5.2588	s*
Q3	2.4	5.1	2.7	4.0912	s*	1.5	4.2	2.7	5.3444	s*
Q4	3.7	6.1	2.4	3.1680	s*	4.3	5.8	1.5	2.1971	s*
Q5	1.9	6.9	5.0	5.5317	s*	1.6	7.1	5.5	5.5043	s*
Q6	1.7	5.6	3.9	6.5527	s*	2.0	5.0	3.0	4.7632	s*
Total Test	18.1	37.2	19.1	8.7082	s*	16.4	34.3	17.9	7.0623	s*

Note. Critical value for younger administrators ( $t_{\alpha, n-1}$ ) = 1.740. Critical value for older administrators ( $t_{\alpha, n-1}$ ) = 1.734. Significance of results is designated by s\* indicating that results are significant ( $p < .05$ ), one-tailed test. ns\*\* indicates that results are non-significant.

In the second set of comparisons, the pre- and post-test performances of younger participants for each of the six individual subtest items were examined and the gains were subjected to statistical tests. The pre-post differences have been summarized in Table 11. The differences were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level on all six test items.

For older participants, the pre- and post-test performances on each of the six individual subtests are summarized in Table 11. The differences for older participants were found to also be statistically significant at the .05 level on all six test items.

The third set of comparisons contrast the performances by age. Table 12 summarizes the performance of younger participants under the age of 40 versus older participants over the age of 40 on the amount of gain for the pre-post test. In this case, both age groups had a gain score, but the differences between the two groups were non-significant at the .05 level. Overall, there were no significant differences in performance on the basis of age in the present study.

Results by Experience. The effects of experience as an administrator upon learning within the training sessions were explored within the present study. In particular, the data were examined to determine the extent to which less experienced administrators with less than eight years of experience differed from more experienced administrators with more than eight years of experience in their performance on the pre-post test.

Table 12

Comparison of Gains for Younger and Older Administrators  
 Level of Significance for Nondirectional (Two-Tailed) Tests = .05

Age Group	<u>n</u>	Pretest <u>M</u>	Post-test <u>M</u>	<u>M</u> Gain	<u>t</u> Value	p < .05
Younger (Under 40)	$n_1 = 18$	18.1	37.2	19.1	2.0301	<i>ns</i> *
Older (Over 40)	$n_2 = 19$	16.4	34.3	17.9	2.0301	<i>ns</i> *

Note. Critical value ( $t_{\alpha/2, [n_1-1] + [n_2-1]}$ ) = 2.0315. Significance of results is designated by *ns*\* and indicates that differences between the two groups are non-significant ( $p > .05$ ), two-tailed test.



In examining the data for possible age differences, three separate comparisons were made. In the first set of comparisons, the pre- and post-test performances of less experienced participants were examined. Similarly, the pre- and post-test performances of more experienced participants were examined. The results for the first set of comparisons have been summarized in Table 13.

As evidenced by the entries in Table 13, less experienced participants ( $n = 18$ ) made overall gains in test performance. Specifically, the less experienced administrators averaged approximately 19 points on the pretest and about 39 points on the post-test. The less experienced participants demonstrated a gain of 105% over their baseline performance. Subjecting the gain to a statistical test, the pre-post difference was found to be statistically significant at the .05 level. In the present instance, a one-tailed  $t$  test for correlated means was employed ( $t.05, 18$ ).

Still within the first set of comparisons, a parallel procedure was employed with the more experienced participants ( $n = 17$ ). The more experienced participants averaged about 16 points on the pretest and about 33 points on the post-test (See Table 13). The pre-post difference amounted to approximately a 106% improvement over the average baseline performance. The one-tailed  $t$  test for correlated means was again employed ( $t.05, 17$ ) and the results were found to be statistically significant.

Table 13

Summary of Overall Gains Based on Experience

Level of Significance for Directional (One-Tailed) Tests = .05

Test Item	Less Experienced Administrators ( $\underline{n} = 18$ )					More Experienced Administrators ( $\underline{n} = 17$ )				
	(Less than 8 Years of Experience)					(More than 8 Years of Experience)				
	Pretest	Post-test	<u>M</u>	<u>t</u>	p <	Pretest	Post-test	<u>M</u>	<u>t</u>	p <
	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	Gain	Value	.05	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	Gain	Value	.05
Q1	5.0	7.5	2.5	2.0335	s*	5.0	7.1	2.1	1.6915	s*
Q2	3.2	4.5	1.3	4.4523	s*	2.5	5.5	3.0	4.9721	s*
Q3	2.4	5.6	3.2	4.9995	s*	1.5	3.8	2.3	4.0947	s*
Q4	4.0	6.6	2.6	3.1203	s*	4.1	5.2	1.1	1.7594	s*
Q5	2.2	7.8	5.6	6.9693	s*	1.5	5.9	4.4	3.9223	s*
Q6	2.2	5.2	3.0	4.6027	s*	1.5	5.1	3.6	6.0609	s*
Total Test	19.1	38.7	19.6	9.8333	s*	16.1	32.5	16.4	5.7419	s*

Note. Critical value for less experienced administrators ( $t_{\alpha, n-1}$ ) = 1.740. Critical value for more experienced administrators ( $t_{\alpha, n-1}$ ) = 1.746. Significance of results is designated by s\* indicating that results are significant ( $p < .05$ ), one-tailed test. ns\*\* indicates that results are non-significant.

As a result of the first set of analyses, it is clear that both less experienced and more experienced administrators gained from the training sessions and that the gain each group made was statistically significant.

In the second set of comparisons, the pre- and post-test performances of less experienced participants for each of the six individual subtest items were examined and the gains were subjected to statistical tests. The pre-post differences have been summarized in Table 13. The differences were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level on all six test items.

For more experienced participants, the pre- and post-test performances on each of the six individual subtests are summarized in Table 13. The differences for more experienced administrators were found to also be statistically significant at the .05 level on test items 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, but the gain on the first subtest was found to be non-significant at the .05 level.

The third set of comparisons contrast the performances by level of experience. Table 14 summarizes the performance of less experienced participants with less than eight years of experience versus more experienced participants with more than eight years of experience on the amount of gain for the pre-post test.

In this case, both experience level groups had a gain score, but the differences between the two groups were non-significant at the .05 level.

Table 14

Comparison of Gains for Less Experienced Versus More Experienced Administrators

Level of Significance for Nondirectional (Two-Tailed) Tests = .05

Experience Group	<u>n</u>	Pretest <u>M</u>	Post-test <u>M</u>	<u>M</u> Gain	<u>t</u> Value	p < .05
Less Experienced (Less than 8 Years)	$n_1 = 18$	19.1	38.7	19.6	2.0452	<i>ns*</i>
More Experienced (More than 8 Years)	$n_2 = 17$	16.1	32.5	16.4	2.0452	<i>ns*</i>

Note. Critical value ( $t_{\alpha/2, [n_1-1] + [n_2-1]}$ ) = 2.0357. Significance of results is designated by *ns\** and indicates that differences between the two groups are non-significant ( $p > .05$ ), two-tailed test.

Overall, there were no significant differences in performance on the basis of experience level in the present study.

Results by Longevity in Current Position. The effects of longevity in the current position upon learning within the training sessions were explored within the present study. In particular, the data were examined to determine the extent to which administrators with shorter longevity (less than three years) in their current position differed from administrators with greater longevity (more than three years) in their current position in their performance on the pre-post test.

In examining the data for possible differences based on longevity, three separate comparisons were made. In the first set of comparisons, the pre- and post-test performances of participants with shorter longevity were examined. Similarly, the pre- and post-test performances of participants with greater longevity were examined. The results for the first set of comparisons have been summarized in Table 15.

As evidenced by the entries in Table 15, participants with shorter longevity ( $n = 19$ ) made overall gains in test performance. Specifically, the administrators in this group averaged approximately 15 points on the pretest and about 37 points on the post-test. This group with shorter longevity demonstrated a gain of 147% over their baseline performance. Subjecting the gain to a statistical test, the pre-post difference was found to be

Table 15

Summary of Overall Gains for Administrators Based on Longevity in a Position

Level of Significance for Directional (One-Tailed) Tests = .05

Test Item	Shorter Longevity ( $\underline{n} = 19$ )					Greater Longevity ( $\underline{n} = 18$ )				
	(Less than 3 Years in Current Position)					(More than 3 Years in Current Position)				
	Pretest	Post-test	<u>M</u>	<u>t</u>	p <	Pretest	Post-test	<u>M</u>	<u>t</u>	p <
	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	Gain	Value	.05	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	Gain	Value	.05
Q1	4.5	6.8	2.3	1.9237	s*	1.2	5.6	4.4	1.6861	s*
Q2	2.5	5.6	3.1	6.1290	s*	2.9	5.8	2.9	4.2145	s*
Q3	2.2	5.3	3.1	4.6383	s*	1.7	3.9	2.2	5.3340	s*
Q4	3.3	6.1	2.8	3.7118	s*	4.7	5.8	1.1	1.6388	s*
Q5	1.1	7.1	6.0	6.7019	s*	2.5	6.9	4.4	4.5308	s*
Q6	1.7	5.8	4.1	6.2450	s*	2.0	4.7	2.7	5.2154	s*
Total Test	15.2	36.8	21.6	10.5654	s*	19.3	34.6	15.3	6.1362	s*

Note. Critical value for administrators with shorter longevity ( $t\alpha, n-1$ ) = 1.734. Critical value for administrators with greater longevity ( $t\alpha, n-1$ ) = 1.740. Significance of results is designated by s\* indicating that results are significant ( $p < .05$ ), one-tailed test. ns\*\* indicates that results are non-significant.

statistically significant at the .05 level. In the present instance, a one-tailed  $t$  test for correlated means was employed ( $t_{.05,19}$ ).

Still within the first set of comparisons, a parallel procedure was employed with the participants with greater longevity ( $n = 18$ ). This group of administrators averaged about 19 points on the pretest and about 35 points on the post-test (See Table 15). The pre-post difference amounted to approximately an 84% improvement over the average baseline performance. The one-tailed  $t$  test for correlated means was again employed ( $t_{.05, 18}$ ) and the results were found to be statistically significant.

As a result of the first set of analyses, it is clear that both shorter and greater longevity groups gained from the training sessions and that the gain each group made was statistically significant.

In the second set of comparisons, the pre- and post-test performances of participants with shorter longevity for each of the six individual subtest items were examined and the gains were subjected to statistical tests. The pre-post differences have been summarized in Table 15. The differences were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level on all six test items.

For participants with greater longevity, the pre- and post-test performances on each of the six individual subtests are summarized in Table 15. The differences for these participants were also found to be statistically

significant at the .05 level on test items 2, 3, 5, and 6, but the gain on tests items 1 and 4 were found to be non-significant at the .05 level.

The third set of comparisons contrast the performances by longevity level. Table 16 summarizes the performance of participants with shorter longevity of less than three years versus participants with greater longevity of more than three years on the amount of gain for the pre-post test. In this case, both groups had a gain score, but the differences between the two groups were non-significant at the .05 level. Overall, there were no significant differences in performance on the basis of longevity in their current positions for the administrators who participated in the present study.

### **Summary**

This study was designed to examine specially designed training modules used to train school administrators in strategies for addressing child sexual abuse cases in the school setting.

The primary question being investigated is whether a training session based on these six specially designed modules will make a significant improvement in school administrators' performances on child sexual abuse case simulations.



Table 16

Comparison of Gains for Administrators Based on Longevity in a Position

Level of Significance for Nondirectional (Two-Tailed) Tests = .05

Longevity Group	<u>n</u>	Pretest <u>M</u>	Post-test <u>M</u>	<u>M</u> Gain	<u>t</u> Value	p < .05
Shorter Longevity (Less than 3 Years)	$n_1 = 19$	15.2	36.8	21.6	1.9782	<i>ns*</i>
Greater Longevity (More than 3 Years)	$n_2 = 18$	19.3	34.6	15.3	1.9782	<i>ns*</i>

Note. Critical value ( $\alpha/2, [n_1-1] + [n_2-1]$ ) = 2.0315. Significance of results is designated by *ns\** and indicates that differences between the two groups are non-significant ( $p > .05$ ), two-tailed test.

The data obtained from the use of these three instruments were analyzed and organized into three sections in this chapter:

- 1) Descriptive data were derived from the demographic results from the Administrator Questionnaires,
- 2) Content validity data were derived from the questions on the Administrator Questionnaires and the Pre-Evaluation Case Studies, and
- 3) Statistical data were derived from comparisons of the pre- and post-test results.

A brief summary of these results are provided below.

Demographic Results. A total of 40 subjects ( $N=40$ ) completed the demographic information requested on the Administrator Questionnaire. The results indicate that this study sample represented a group that was 57.5% female and 42.5% male, with a median age between 46 - 50. Females in the study tended to be about five years younger than their male counterparts. The study sample was predominantly white, with 92.5% of the participants representing this ethnic group. Males in the group had an average of 15 years of experience and tended to be more experienced than females, who averaged 6 years of experience.

Males averaged 5 years in their current positions and tended to be in their positions longer than females, who averaged 3 years. The majority of

the subjects (55%) were building principals, 20% were district office administrators, and the remainder were in other administrative positions.

Half of the administrators came from large districts with more than 4,000 students and 200 teachers. The majority of subjects worked in schools with fewer than 1,000 students and 75 teachers.

The demographic data were used to provide a descriptive analysis of the group of administrators who participated in this study on the basis of gender, age, race, years in administration, years in current position, current position, size of district by number of students and teachers, and size of school by number of students and teachers.

Content Validity Results. The content of the training modules was validated through the results from two instruments: (1) the Administrator Questionnaire and (2) the Pretest.

The Administrator Questionnaire was developed with input from 22 experts in the field of child sexual abuse who served on a Delphi Panel. These experts assisted with the validation of the content for the training modules by identifying the topics for the training sessions. The subjects' responses on the Administrator Questionnaire and on the Pre-Evaluation Case Study A were analyzed and used as a needs assessment for this study sample.

These data were organized in groups to match each of the six questions used on the pretest. These six questions also corresponded to the

six training modules and focused on the topics identified by the Delphi Panel as important information for administrators to know about child sexual abuse.

The pretest results confirm that the subjects in this study were able to provide only 29% of the overall information that was requested. See Table 7 for these results.

Analysis of these data indicate that the administrators who participated in this study reported a greater degree of knowledge about the six child sexual abuse topics when responding to the questions on the Administrator Questionnaire than they were able to demonstrate by their performance on the Pre-Evaluation Case Study A. Although the subjects demonstrated a greater degree of knowledge on Q1 and Q4 than on the other four questions, their performance was deficient in all six areas on the pretest.

This study confirms that the administrators in this sample were lacking in knowledge in these important areas; or, if they were knowledgeable about these six areas of child sexual abuse, they were unable to adequately apply this knowledge on the pretest.

Pre- and Post-Test Results. Pre- and post-test results were used to assess the knowledge gain for the subjects based on the overall test scores and the scores for each of the six questions within the tests. The  $t$  test of alpha was used to examine the correlated means and determine the

significance in the changes in performance. A standard level of significance ( $p < .05$ ) was employed throughout the study.

It is clear from these data that participants made significant gains in knowledge from their participation in the training sessions and that the gains were significant for each of the six questions and for the overall test ( $t = 11.11719$ ).

The pre- and post-test results were analyzed on the basis of gender, age, experience level, and longevity in the current position. It was found that there were no significant differences among these groups.

These results confirm that administrators in this study demonstrated a lack of knowledge about the six child sexual abuse topics on the pretest. The results further confirm that the contents of the training modules were valid and appropriate for this group of administrators. Finally, the results confirm that a training session based on these specially designed training modules was effective in improving the administrators' performances on post-test simulations.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether specially designed training would significantly improve a school administrator's performance on child sexual abuse case simulations. A review of the pertinent literature in the field of child sexual abuse and a Delphi Process using a panel of experts in the field of child sexual abuse were used to identify the areas in which school administrators should be knowledgeable about child sexual abuse in the school setting.

The six training modules for this study and the pre- and post-test research instruments were framed around these six topics. Specifically, the six questions that emerged as the focus topics for this study included the following:

- 1) Does the administrator know how to comply with the Oregon Child Abuse Reporting Law?
- 2) To what degree can the administrator recognize indicators of sexual abuse by observing a possible victim?
- 3) To what degree can the administrator recognize the characteristics of pedophile behavior?

- 4) Does the administrator know the information that is needed to justify reporting suspicion of child abuse to the appropriate agency?
- 5) Does the administrator understand how professional ethics and district policies apply to employees who are alleged to be sexual abuse perpetrators?
- 6) Does the administrator know what steps are to be followed in an investigation when allegations of child sexual abuse are made against a school employee?

Consequently, the primary question presented in this study sought to examine the knowledge gain of a specific group of administrators on a post-test instrument after they had participated in the specially designed training session.

Subjects for this study were from a convenience sample of 40 practicing administrators, 23 females and 17 males, from five school districts in Yamhill County. In order to investigate these questions, data were collected using three instruments:

- 1) An Administrator Questionnaire developed through the Delphi Process.
- 2) A Pre-Evaluation Case Study A.
- 3) A Post-Evaluation Case Study B.

The data obtained from the use of these three instruments were analyzed and organized to report the results of the research based on the following three categories:

- 1) Descriptive data from the demographic results of the Administrator Questionnaire.
- 2) Content validity data from the Administrator Questionnaire and Pre-Evaluation Case Study A.
- 3) Statistical data from comparisons of the results of the Pre-Evaluation Case Study A and Post-Evaluation Case Study B.

The following conclusions, implications and recommendations are based on the results of these data.

## **Conclusions**

**Demographic Data:** The study sample represented a group of administrators that was composed of 57.5% females and 42.5% males, with a median age between 46 - 50. The study sample was predominantly white (92.5%), with males averaging 15 years of administrative experience and females averaging 6 years of experience. Males had greater longevity in their current positions (5 years) as opposed to females who had an average of 3 years in their current positions. The majority of the administrators in the study sample came from large districts with more than 4,000 students and more than 200 teachers.



The results from the demographic data collected from the Administrator Questionnaire and the correlations to the post-test results lead the researcher to the following conclusions in this study:

- Convenience Sample. Although convenience samples such as the one used in this study cannot be considered to be representative of any general population, the training sessions were replicated in five different districts to decrease the likelihood that the results obtained in any one district were a one-time occurrence. However, It can be concluded that the results of this study apply only to this specific study sample.
- Gender. There was a greater percentage of females than males in this study sample. Since the study sample represented most of the administrators in Yamhill County, females appear to outnumber males in administrative positions among this study sample at the current time. However, there were no differences in performance on the basis of gender among this study sample; therefore, it can be concluded that the training sessions were equally effective for both gender groups.
- Age. The average age of administrators in this study group was between 46 - 50. The females tended to be about five years younger than their male counterparts. In this specific study sample, it appears that females hold administrative positions in

greater numbers and at younger ages than males. There were no differences in performance on the basis of age among this study sample, and the conclusion may be drawn that age is not a factor in the effectiveness of this study.

- Ethnicity. This study sample was predominantly white (92.5%) and indicates there is relatively little diversity in ethnic composition among the administrators in this study. Therefore, the results of the study cannot be generalized to other ethnic groups without additional research. Because of the lack of variation in ethnicity and the predominantly white nationality of the subjects in this study, no statistical correlations were assessed on the basis of ethnicity and no conclusion can be made about ethnicity as it relates to this study.
- Years in Administration. The males in this study sample tended to have more years of experience and to be in their positions longer than the females; however, there were no differences in performance on the basis of experience level. Administrators with more years of experience might be expected to perform at a higher level, but such was not the case in this study. The researcher concludes that number of years in administration does not appear to influence the results of this study.

- Years in Current Position. The females in this study sample had been in their current positions an average of 3 years. Males had been in their positions an average of 5 years. There were no significant differences in performance among these two groups of administrators on the basis of years in current position, and it is concluded that this variable does not appear to be a factor in the outcome of this study.
- Current Position. The majority of administrators (55%) in this study sample were building principals. The next largest group consisted of District Office administrators (20%). There were no differences in the performance of the different administrative groups on the post-test on the basis of their current positions, and it is concluded that the position an administrator holds does not impact the results of this study.
- Size of District. Fifty percent of the study sample were from districts with more than 4,000 students and more than 200 teachers. There were no differences in performance among administrators from the five districts, and it is concluded that size of district does not impact the results of this study.
- Size of School. The majority of subjects (65%) reported their schools to have fewer than 1000 students, and all (100%) reported their schools to have fewer than 75 teachers. There were

no significant differences in performance among administrators on the basis of size of school. Therefore, the conclusion is drawn that the size of the school does not appear to influence administrators' performance in this study.

Based on this demographic data and the statistical correlations with the post-test results, this study concludes that gender, age, ethnicity, years in administration, years in current position, current position, size of district, and size of school made no difference in the performance of administrators in this study sample on the knowledge gain between the pre- and post-tests.

Content Validity Data: A review of the pertinent literature and input from the experts on the Delphi Panel were used to initially identify the child sexual abuse topics about which administrators should have knowledge. The Administrator Questionnaire was used to assess the administrators' current level of knowledge about these topics, and six training modules were then designed to include information from these six content areas. Six questions were also developed to correspond to these content areas and were included on the pre- and post-tests to assess the knowledge gain of the administrators who participated in the study.

Analysis of the content validity data indicate that the administrators who participated in this study self-reported a greater degree of knowledge about the six child sexual abuse topics when responding to the questions on the Administrator Questionnaire than was actually demonstrated by their

performance on the Pre-Evaluation Case Study A. Although many of the administrators represented on the questionnaire than they knew a great deal about child sexual abuse, they were able to provide only 29% of the information that was requested on the six questions on the pretest.

The conclusions that have been drawn from an analysis of the data from the six questions on the pretest are identified below:

- Q1: What does the law require you to do in this case? The participants were able to provide 50% of the information that was requested on this question on the pretest. Comparison of these pretest results with the survey results indicate that administrators had a better knowledge and were more confident of their knowledge level in this area than they were in the other five training module areas. This was the highest score on any of the six questions on the pretest achieved by this group of administrators; but, the results indicate that this group was still deficient in the information they needed to know in this area. These data conclude that the study participants were somewhat knowledgeable about this area, but they still lack complete and adequate knowledge to fully comply with the law.
- Q2: What signs would you look for in the students who may be victims in this case? The study subjects were able to provide only about one-fourth (27%) of the information that was requested on

- this question on the pretest. Even though administrators represented themselves as somewhat effective in recognizing victims of sexual abuse on the questionnaire, the pretest results indicated that this was an area in which the administrators lacked a great deal of knowledge prior to participating in the training session. Few of the administrators were able to list more than one or two indicators of a victim of sexual abuse. This study concludes that administrators' perceptions of their knowledge level in this area were inaccurate. They either did not have adequate knowledge in this area, or they failed to apply their knowledge.
- Q3: What are some of the signs you would look for in pedophile behavior? The administrators in this study were able to provide only 19% of the information that was requested on this question on the pretest. This was one of the three lowest areas of performance on the pretest. On the questionnaire, this group of administrators perceived themselves as somewhat effective and somewhat confident in identifying pedophiles and perpetrators of child abuse; yet their responses on this question on the pretest was extremely lacking. These data support the conclusion that administrators need training in recognizing the characteristics of adults who are perpetrators of sexual abuse in order to protect the children in their schools.

- Q4: What information do you need to justify reporting child abuse to the appropriate agency? The subjects were able to provide 40% of the information that was requested in this area on the pretest. This was the second highest area of knowledge among the group as demonstrated on the pretest. Q1 was the only area having a higher score. Practicing administrators in this study appear to know more about what the law requires them to do and what information is needed in reporting child abuse to appropriate agencies than they do about the other four content areas. Despite reporting a high level of confidence in their abilities to recognize pedophiles and in their knowledge of the reporting requirements, it is remarkable that 82.5% of the administrators in this study reported that they had made no reports on school employees within the past year. These results would indicate that the subjects in this study may have a higher level of knowledge in the reporting requirements, but they may be unable to apply their knowledge effectively to prevent child sexual abuse in the school setting because they are unable to identify pedophiles or recognize indicators of sexual abuse. These data support the conclusion that administrators need greater knowledge and practice in applying what they know about child sexual abuse in their schools. It is concluded that more reports would be made by administrators

once they had participated in the training session and were more knowledgeable about all areas of child sexual abuse.

- Q5: How would school policy and ethical standards apply in this case? Administrators in this study were about to provide only 18% of the information requested on this question on the pretest.

Overall, the results from the questionnaire and the pretest results indicate that this group of administrators have an extremely low level of knowledge about the legal, policy, and ethical issues relating to child sexual abuse when compared to some of the other content areas. These data lead to the conclusion that this is an area in which administrators are extremely lacking in knowledge and one in which they need a great deal of training.

- Q6: What steps do you take to investigate these allegations? The administrators in this group were able to provide only 18% of the information requested on this question on the pretest. These results indicate that the administrators also had a low level of knowledge in this content area. Few of the administrators were able to list or explain the procedures to follow when investigating allegations of child sexual abuse. This study concludes that this is another area in which administrators may have a negligible amount of knowledge and one in which they would benefit from concentrated training.



These questionnaire and pretest results suggest several conclusions about this study:

- 1) That the six content areas identified from the literature and from the Delphi Panel were all appropriate areas for inclusion in the training modules and were all areas in which the participants in this study needed formal training.
- 2) That the questionnaire results revealed that this study sample perceived their knowledge in these six areas to be greater than they were able to demonstrate on the pretest.
- 3) That the administrators' performance on the pretest demonstrated that they were lacking in knowledge or in the ability to apply the knowledge they did have in all six content areas to an adequate degree.
- 4) That these administrators had a greater degree of knowledge in the areas of Q1 (legal requirements) and Q4 (information needed to justify reporting child abuse to the appropriate authorities) than in the other four content areas.
- 5) That, in the other four content areas (Q2: indicators of victims, Q3: pedophile behaviors, Q5: policy and ethical standards, and Q6: investigating allegations), administrators were extremely lacking in knowledge and unable to demonstrate that they could

adequately apply the knowledge they did have in these areas on the pretest.

- 6) That an increased amount of time needed to be spent in the training sessions on the four areas represented by Q2, Q3, Q5, and Q6 to adequately train administrators to deal effectively with these issues.

Overall, the questionnaire and pretest results in this study conclude that administrators in this study sample were lacking in knowledge about child sexual abuse issues in the school setting and that they were unable to adequately apply the knowledge they did have on the pre-evaluation instrument. It is concluded that training sessions based on the six content areas tested in the pretest will enhance administrators' performance in these areas on post-evaluation case simulations.

Pre- and Post-Test Data: The primary question being examined in this study asserted that a training session based on specially designed training modules would make a significant improvement in a school administrator's performance on child sexual abuse case simulations. Pre- and post-test results were used to assess the knowledge gain for the subjects in the study. These assessments were based on the overall test scores and on the correlated mean scores for each of the six questions within the tests. On the basis of these results, this study concludes the following:

- Results for Overall Gains. The knowledge gains demonstrated by the participants between the pre- and post-tests were statistically significant at the .05 level and show that administrators performed at a much higher level on the post-test case simulation after participating in the training sessions. The study group made a 108% gain, which more than doubled the mean score achieved on the pretest, after participating in a three-hour training session. It is concluded that the training sessions were effective in improving the administrators' performance on the overall post-test.
- Results for the Six Questions. The knowledge gains on each of the six questions were also statistically analyzed to determine the significance of the gains. The pre-post differences were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level for all six questions. These results confirm that the administrators in the study group demonstrated significant gains in all six content areas, and it is concluded that the training modules were effective in increasing the administrators' knowledge in all six areas.

In summary, based on the findings of this investigation, it is concluded that the training sessions were effective in improving the performance of the administrators in the study sample on each of the six questions and on the overall test. It can further be concluded that the training sessions were equally effective for males and females, for younger

and older administrators, for administrators with different levels of experience in administration, for administrators with a range of years in their current positions, for administrators in all different types of administrative positions, for administrators in large or small districts, and for administrators in large or small schools.

### **Implications**

The pertinent literature and the results of this study reveal that, overall, school administrators may lack sufficient knowledge about child sexual abuse to adequately protect children who are in their schools. This study provides relevant data to conclude that specially designed training sessions for administrators will improve their performance in these areas and, as a result, will reduce the number of child sexual abuse cases that are occurring in public schools.

The literature notes that the number of lawsuits being brought against school districts for failing to protect children from abuse is dramatically increasing. The costs to districts to defend themselves in these cases are also on the rise. Case law in this area is being developed at a phenomenal rate, and districts are finding it necessary to take proactive measures to contain legal costs and reduce their exposure to liability.

The results of this study do suggest some implications for school districts and possibly for state licensing agencies and teacher preparation institutions:

- 1) Districts may better fulfill their moral and legal obligations to protect children from sexual abuse by providing specialized training in this area for all their administrators. According to Slowik (1993), 3% to 5% of school employees may be pedophiles and each pedophile may have hundreds of victims before he/she is identified. If administrators can reduce the number of employees who engage in child sexual abuse by even a small percentage, this training will be worthwhile.
- 2) Districts may reduce their legal costs and their exposure to liability by providing training for administrators in these important areas. Newspaper accounts of lawsuits being brought against school districts are increasing, and the size of judgments that are being handed down by the courts are causing district insurance premiums to increase at a substantial rate. Any effort to reduce the number of lawsuits will result in savings in both time and money for public school districts.
- 3) State licensing agencies may find it necessary to require child abuse prevention training as part of the licensure programs for administrators. Because Teacher Standards and Practices

Commission is required to investigate allegations of sexual abuse by a school employee and revoke the employee's license if the charges are founded, training in this area will reduce the number of cases that reach the state level. Requiring all administrators to obtain training in these areas will provide greater protection for children, greater protection for districts, and assurance that ethical standards are being upheld as required by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

- 4) Teacher preparation institutions may find it important to include training in the prevention of child sexual abuse in their programs for both teachers and administrators. The questionnaire results from this study confirm that few administrators have received training or education in these critical areas either through college courses or workshops. Training in the areas of identifying and reporting child abuse provides school professionals with increased knowledge and is a viable method for reducing or intervening in cases of abuse and neglect.
- 5) The reporting figures for child abuse and neglect are extremely low (Shakeshaft & Cohan, 1995). Considering that they have more contact with children than other agencies, educators should play a major role in the detection of abuse, appropriate training in this

area should increase the number of reports that are made to agencies.

- 6) Although the gain scores on each of the questions on the post-test were statistically significant in this study, there is still room for improvement. The participants in this study demonstrated an overall gain of 108% between the pre- and post-tests, but this level of performance represents a knowledge level of only 60% of the information that participants were expected to provide on the post-test. Because the training sessions were limited to three hours, it may be found that a longer training session will result in greater knowledge gains and in increased performance on the part of administrators.
- 7) Because the questions on the pre- and post-tests were based on case studies taken from actual incidents, it is anticipated that the administrators who participated in the study will be better able to apply their knowledge to similar situations in their schools after participating in the training. The ability to apply this information to the actual school site would result in better protection for children in the schools and in a higher level of reporting.

## **Recommendations**

Although the value of this study has been articulated in the conclusions of this investigation, it is important to acknowledge the inherent limitations and the related recommendations which arise from the study:

- 1) It is difficult to assess the generalizability of this study to populations. Because a one-group pretest, intervention, post-test (A-B-A) design was used in this study and the study group was a convenience sample, it is not possible to generalize the results to populations. Therefore, it is recommended that this study be replicated in other school districts, possibly with control groups, to ascertain if the findings are generalizable.
- 2) The original training modules were designed to be presented in a six-hour training session. None of the superintendents in the five districts used in this study would afford that amount of time to the researcher for training sessions on child sexual abuse. Thus, the training sessions were condensed and the presentations reduced to three hours. It is recommended that this training process be repeated allowing the full six-hours for the training sessions to determine if the gains could be significantly increased beyond those reported in this study. Since administrators in this study were able to provide only 60% of the information requested on the post-test, there is sufficient room for improvement and additional



training time may be a significant variable in providing for additional improvement.

- 3) A third limitation was the reluctance on the part of the participants to spend sufficient time completing the questionnaires, the pretests, and the post-tests. It was the researcher's observation that many of the administrators who participated in the training sessions felt an urgency to leave the workshop site as soon as possible and return to their buildings. As a result, they completed these instruments without a great deal of thought and rigor applied to the tasks. A more controlled environment for the training session, away from the district, may result in more accurate results.
- 4) The training modules used in this study were designed specifically for administrators. The researcher has been approached by administrators to present the training sessions for other school personnel. Since school employees who work directly with children are responsible for complying with the child abuse reporting laws, it may be equally important for them to have training in this area. It is recommended that the training modules be adapted for other school employees and that studies be conducted to determine the effectiveness of this training for other groups.

- 5) Because all educators are charged with protecting the welfare of children and preventing child abuse within their schools, and because all school employees are categorized as mandated reporters under Oregon law, it is recommended that this study be replicated in private schools as well as public schools.
- 6) Because the study sample was predominantly white, it is recommended that the study be replicated in districts with greater ethnic diversity to determine if the results are generalizable to other ethnic groups.
- 7) No follow-up information has been collected from the participants in this study to see if the information they learned has helped them in their schools. Specifically, it is recommended that a longitudinal study be conducted to verify whether this type of training does result in increased reporting from the administrators who participated.

The conclusions of this study lead the researcher to recommend that research in this important area continue. If schools reduce the numbers of children who become victims of sexual abuse by even a small percentage, this study will have been validated as important and worthwhile.

## REFERENCES

Abrahams, N., Casey, K., & Daro, D. (1992). Teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs about child abuse and its prevention. Child Abuse and Neglect: The International Journal, 16(2), 229-238.

Abrams, S., & Abrams, J. (1993). Polygraph testing of the pedophile. Portland, OR: Ryan Gwinner Press.

American Association of University Women Educational Foundation. (1993). Hostile hallways: The AAUW survey on sexual harassment in America's schools. Researched by Harris/Scholastic Research. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Arnold, D.W. (1990, August). Legal issues in integrity testing. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA, August 10-14, 1990.

Barton, W. (1990, December). Child abuse: Investigations by and liability of school personnel. Taken from Recovering for Psychological Injuries, (2nd edition, pp. 253-285). ATLA Press. Paper presented at the Tenth Annual Oregon School Law Conference, Eugene, Oregon.

Bridgeland, W., & Duane, E. (1990). Principals as secondary enforcers in child abuse. Education and Urban Society, 22(3), 314-324.

Butterfield, G. (1994). The tort of negligent hiring. School Safety. Westlake Village, CA: National School Safety Center, 9-11.

Children's Services Division. (1995). Recognizing and reporting child abuse & neglect. Salem, OR: Department of Human Resources.

Committee for Children. (1994). Identifying, reporting and handling disclosure of the sexually abused child. [Brochure]. Seattle, WA: Committee for Children.

- Courtney, E. W. (1988). A guide to empirical research in education. Corvallis, OR: Sanderling.
- Finkelhor, D. (1979). Sexually victimized children. New York: The Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1984). Child sexual abuse. New York: The Free Press.
- Fossey, R. (1995, March/April). Courts hold co-workers liable for knowledge of sex abuse. The Harvard Education Letter, 11(2), 5-6.
- Fossey, W. (1990). Confidential settlement agreements between school districts and teachers accused of child abuse: Issues of law and ethics. Education Law Reporter, 63(1), 1-10.
- Fraenkel, J., & Wallen, N. (1996). How to design and evaluation research in education. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Gray, L., & Stiehl, R. (1994). Understanding sexual development across the life span: Pre-adolescence. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University.
- Land, H. (1986). Child abuse: Differential diagnosis, differential treatment. Child Welfare, 65(1), 33-44.
- Lanning, K. (1994). Child molesters: A behavioral analysis. School Safety. Westlake Village, CA: National School Safety Center, 12-17.
- McGrath, M. (1994, Fall). Administrators held personally liable for employee's sexual abuse of students. Educator's Newsletter, 5(1), Santa Barbara, CA: McGrath Systems, Inc.
- McIntyre, T. (1987). Teacher awareness of child abuse and neglect. Child Abuse and Neglect: The International Journal, 11(1), 133-135.

- Milgram, J. (1984). Physical and sexual child abuse: Implications for middle level professionals. NASSP Bulletin, 68(473), 58-62.
- Regotti, T. (1992). Negligent hiring and retaining of sexually abusive teachers. West's Education Law Quarterly, 1(3), 254-261.
- Roscoe, B. (1984). Sexual abuse: The educator's role in identification and interaction with abuse victims. Education, 105(1), 82-86.
- Samahito, S. (1984). Competency needs for physical education master's degree program in thailand. (Doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University.) Dissertation Abstracts International, A4/12A, p. 3631.
- Sendor, B. (1995). When teachers have to turn in their colleagues. The American School Board Journal, 182(5), 16-17.
- Shakeshaft, C., & Cohan, A. (1995). Sexual abuse of students by school personnel. Phi Delta Kappan, 76(7), 512-520.
- Shoop, R., & Firestone, L. (1988). Mandatory reporting of suspected child abuse: Do teachers obey the law? West's Education Law Reporter, 46(3), 1115-1122.
- Silbert, M. & Pines, A. (1983). Early sexual exploitation as an influence in prostitution. Social Work, 28(4), 285-289.
- Slowik, S. (1993). Objective pre-employment interviewing. Evergreen, CO: Stanley M. Slowik, Inc.
- Sorenson, G. (1991). Sexual abuse in schools: Reported court cases from 1987-1990. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27(4), 460-480.
- Tite, R. (1993). How teachers define and respond to child abuse: The distinction between theoretical and reportable cases. Child Abuse and Neglect: The International Journal, 17(5), 591-603.

Tower, C. (1987). How schools can help combat child abuse and neglect. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Valente, W. (1990). School district and official liability for teacher sexual abuse of students under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983. West's Education Law Reporter, 57(3), 645-659.

Valente, W. (1992). Liability for teachers' sexual misconduct with students: Closing and opening vistas. West's Education Law Quarterly, 1(4), 347-357.

Wurtele, S., & Miller-Perrin, C. (1984). Harmful effects of school-based sexual abuse prevention programs? Reassure the parents. In C. Tower (Ed.), How Schools Can Help Combat Child Abuse and Neglect (pp. 146-153). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Zellman, G. (1990). Linking schools and social services: The case of child abuse reporting. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12(1), 41-55.

## **APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX A:**  
**LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS**



**LETTER SEEKING APPROVAL  
FROM SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS**

December 1, 1995

«FirstName» «LastName», «JobTitle»

«Company»

«Address1»

«City» «State» «PostalCode»

Re: Research Study

Dear «Title» «LastName»:

As part of my doctoral program, I am conducting a research study to examine a specially designed training module relating to child sexual abuse in the school setting. This six-part training module teaches school administrators strategies for addressing the reporting requirements and for implementing appropriate investigation procedures.

With an estimated 94 to 98 percent of child sexual abuse cases going unreported and with increasing litigation against school districts for alleged failure to protect children, it is apparent that a significant problem exists and that there is a growing need for school administrators to be trained in identifying the victims of sexual abuse and in following appropriate procedures to investigate charges against school personnel.

I am asking all administrators in Yamhill County to voluntarily participate in the study to assist me in refining the training materials and determining the effectiveness of the training program. By participating in the research project, administrators will receive a handbook that includes information that can later be used at their work sites.

Participating administrators will be asked to complete a questionnaire to determine their current level of knowledge on child sexual abuse issues. During the training session, they will be asked to complete questions on pre and post case simulations. All of the evaluation instruments used in this study will be coded to allow the researcher to match the instruments for each participant. Strict standards of confidentiality will be maintained and special precautions will be taken to protect the confidentiality of their responses.

I am requesting your approval to provide this training session in your school district in January or February. The training will be offered free of charge for those districts that are willing to participate in the study. I am hoping to provide this service to all districts in Yamhill County before expanding the study to any districts outside of the county.

I will contact you during the next week or two to discuss my study and, hopefully, obtain your permission to present the training session in your district. I am looking forward to working with your administrators. If you have any questions in the meantime, please call me at (503) 434-6551.

Sincerely,

Val Just  
Director of Personnel  
McMinnville School District

**APPENDIX B:**  
**DELPHI PROCESS**

**PANEL OF EXPERTS  
FOR  
THE DELPHI PROCESS**

NO	NAME AND TITLE	ADDRESS	PHONES	OK DATE	ROUND 1		ROUND 2	
					DATES SENT	RECV'D	DATES SENT	RECV'D
1.	Anderson, Larry Director of Personnel	N. Clackamas School District 4444 SE Lake Road Milwaukie, OR 97222	(W) 503-653-3607 FAX 503-653-3625	10/4	10/9	10/12	11/03	No return
2.	Brewster, Becky Protective Services Worker	State Office for Services to Children and Families (Children's Services Division) 2270 McDaniel Lane McMinnville, OR 97128	(W) 503-472-4634 ext. 243	10/4	10/9	10/13	11/03	11/17
3.	Brody, Clark H.S. Principal	Centennial High School 3505 SE 182nd Ave. Gresham, OR 97030-5097	(W) 503-661-7612 FAX 503-661-5296	10/4	10/9	10/18	11/03	11/09
4.	Buck, James Director of Human Resources	Gresham-Barlow S.D. 1331 NW Eastman Pkwy Gresham, OR 97030-3825	(W) 503-669-2461 FAX 503-661-1589	10/4	10/9	10/19	11/03	11/17
5.	Chambers, Vicki Asst. Dir. Personnel Serv.	N. Clackamas School District 4444 SE Lake Road Milwaukie, OR 97222-4799	(W) 503-653-3607 FAX 503-653-3625	10/5	10/9	10/23	11/03	No return
6.	Goodman, Bev Intake Screener	State Office for Services to Children and Families (Children's Services Division) 2270 McDaniel Lane McMinnville, OR 97128	(W) 503-472-4634 ext. 240	10/4	10/9	10/26	11/03	11/14

7.	Gourley, Susan Director Human Resources	Salem-Keizer Sch. Dist. P.O. Box 12024 Salem, OR 97309-0024	(W) 503-399-3061 FAX 503-375-7802	10/5	10/9	10/12	11/03	11/17
8.	Hamm, Bob Director of Personnel	West Linn-Wilsonville P.O. Box 35 West Linn, OR 97068	(W) 503-638-9879 FAX 503-638-9878	10/4	10/9	10/13	11/03	11/16
9.	Harms, Ruth Trainer Committee for Children	1827 22nd SE Olympia WA 98501	(W) 360-352-0414	10/31	10/9	Recvd too late	11/03	11/17
10.	Hendricks, Marianne School Counselor	McMinnville High School 615 E. 15th Street McMinnville, OR 97128	(H) 503-472-4847 FAX 503-472-6108	10/5	10/9	10/16	11/03	11/09
11.	Hubard, Ann Coordinator	Citizen Review Board 324 Capitol Street NE Salem, OR 97310	(W) 503-378-5430 FAX 503-373-1152	10/4	10/9	10/11	11/03	11/13
12.	Hungerford, Nancy School Attorney	653 S. Center Street Oregon City, OR 97045	(W) 503-650-5054 FAX 503-655-9659	10/5	10/9	10/17	11/03	11/13
13.	Hylton, Judith Special Education	Oregon Health Sciences University - CDRC P.O. Box 574 Portland, OR 97207	(W) 503-494-2755	10/6	10/9	10/13	11/03	11/13
14.	Johnstone, Robert School Attorney	1215 N. Adams Street McMinnville, OR 97128	(W) 503-472-9555 FAX 503-472-9550	10/5	10/9	10/25	11/03	11/15
15.	Joki, Dr. Russ Superintendent	Tigard-Tualatin Sch. District 13137 SW Pacific Hwy Tigard, OR 97223	(W) 503-620-1620 FAX 503-684-2296	10/4	10/9	10/16	11/03	11/13

16.	Kaiser, Bruce Director of Personnel Services	Lake Oswego Sch. Dist. P.O. Box 70 Lake Oswego, OR 97034	(W) 503-635-0304 FAX 503-635-0328	10/4	10/9	10/13	11/03	11/14
17.	Sawyer, Det. Buzz Police Detective	McMinnville Police Dept. 130 N. Baker Street McMinnville, OR 97128	(W) 503-434-7307 dial 3, ext. 2340	10/4	10/9	10/20	11/03	11/09
18.	Schenk, Jan Consultant and Trainer	State Office for Services to Children and Families (Children's Services Division) 2270 McDaniel Lane McMinnville, OR 97128	(W) 503-472-4634 ext. 244	10/4	10/9	10/12	11/03	11/09
19.	Shaw, Stephanie Director of Special Services	McMinnville School Dist. 1500 N. Baker Street McMinnville, OR 97128	(H) 503-393-5164 (W) 503-434-6551	10/5	10/9	10/16	11/03	11/06
20.	Slowik, Dr. Stanley Interview Design and Training	28164 Tresine Drive Evergreen, CO 80439	(W) 303-674-5125	10/4	10/9	10/30	11/03	11/13
21.	Taylor, Carey School Counselor	Duniway Middle School 565 Michelbook Lane McMinnville, OR 97128	(H) 503-472-0796 (W) 503-434-9399	10/4	10/9	10/27	11/03	11/09
22.	Torino, Julian Supervisor	State Office for Services to Children and Families (Children's Services Division) 2270 McDaniel Lane McMinnville, OR 97128	(W) 503-472-4634 ext. 239	10/4	10/9	10/18	11/03	11/14

**VAL JUST  
14200 NW ORCHARD VIEW ROAD  
MCMINNVILLE, OR 97128  
PHONE (503) 472-3694**

October 6, 1995

«Title» «FirstName» «LastName»  
«Company»  
«Address1»  
«City» «State» «PostalCode»

Re: Delphi Panel

Dear «Title» «LastName»:

I am conducting a research study which is designed to determine the effectiveness of a specially designed training session for school administrators which focuses on the reporting requirements for school personnel and the investigation procedures to be followed when allegations of child sexual abuse are made against a school employee.

As part of the study, I have developed a questionnaire to determine the current level of knowledge of administrators on child sexual abuse issues. I am validating this questionnaire through a Delphi Technique which uses experts in the field of child sexual abuse. The methodology of the Delphi Technique is designed to get reliable answers from experts in the field and to validate the questions on the experimental process. This panel of experts will critically analyze whether the questionnaire reflects the important knowledge areas of sexual abuse reporting and investigation procedures needed by school administrators.

The Delphi Panel will consist of persons selected to represent various areas of expertise and specialized knowledge in child sexual abuse--areas such as child psychology, school personnel services, child protective services, human resources, school counseling, school legal services, and law enforcement. You have been selected because of your expertise in «Area\_\_of\_Expertise».

If you are willing to assist me with this task, please complete the first round of questioning on the enclosed questionnaire and return the packet to me by October 18, 1995, in the enclosed envelope. To complete the Delphi Technique, panel members are asked to:

Delphi Panel

Page 2

- 1) Review each question on the questionnaire;
- 2) Determine whether the question contains critical information a school administrator should know about child sexual abuse;
- 3) Make any recommendations for revisions;
- 4) Identify additional questions you believe should be included in the questionnaire; and
- 5) Return the packet with your recommendations.

Upon receipt of the packet from each panel member, I will use pre-determined criteria for evaluating and retaining a trial question. When at least eighty percent of the experts agree that the question contains critical information needed by the administrator, it will be determined that consensus has been reached and the question will be retained in the final questionnaire.

The responses from the panel members will be used to revise the questionnaire, and the revised questionnaire will be disseminated to the panel members for a second round of revisions. The panelists will be asked to review the revised questions and reconsider their own responses in an effort to reach consensus.

Once the Delphi Technique is completed, the final questionnaire will be based on expert consensus, and the instrument will be recognized as valid because the respondents were chosen for their expertise in the field of child sexual abuse and because an opinion reached through group analysis is considered to be more valid than the opinion of one person alone.

I hope you will agree to assist me with this important task. It is becoming more and more evident that school administrators are not receiving the training they need in this area. The number of sex abuse cases that are going unreported and the increasing litigation against school districts for failing to protect children underscore the seriousness of this problem.

I am planning to complete the second round of questioning by November 1, 1995, and will send you a copy of the final questionnaire if you participate in the process. Thank you for the time you will be devoting to this task.

Sincerely,

Val Just

Director of Personnel

McMinnville School District



**VAL JUST  
14200 NW ORCHARD VIEW ROAD  
MCMINNVILLE, OR 97128  
PHONE (503) 472-3694**

November 3, 1995

«Title» «FirstName» «LastName»  
«Company»  
«Address1»  
«City» «St» «PostalCode»

Re: Delphi Panel Round #2

Dear «Title» «LastName»:

Thank you for your input from Round #1 of the Delphi Technique. Based on the feedback from the panel members, I have revised the questionnaire as follows:

- The panel reached consensus on 7 out of 20 questions in Round #1.
- 12 out of the 20 questions were revised.
- One question was deleted.
- One question was separated into two questions.
- 30 additional questions were recommended by panel members.

For Round #2, I am asking the twenty panel members who responded in the first round

to provide feedback on the revised questions and to determine if any of the recommended questions are critical to this questionnaire. Please keep in mind that the questionnaire is designed to determine the current level of knowledge of administrators on child sexual abuse issues. If you have any additional comments or recommendations, please include them on the back of the last page.

Please complete the document and return to me in the enclosed envelope by November 15th. After I compile the results, I will send you a copy of the final questionnaire and a list of the panel participants. Thank you, again, for your assistance with this task.

Sincerely,

Val Just  
Director of Personnel  
McMinnville School District

**APPENDIX C:**  
**ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE**

## ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

### DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

<p>Gender: <input type="checkbox"/> Male</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Female</p>	<p>Age: <input type="checkbox"/> Under 30</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Between 30 - 35</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Between 36 - 40</p>
<p>Race: <input type="checkbox"/> African American</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Asian</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Latino</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Native American</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> White</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Between 41 - 45</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Between 46 - 50</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Between 51 - 55</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Older than 56</p>

Total years in administration: \_\_\_\_\_

Years in current position: \_\_\_\_\_

Current position:

- ☐ Building Principal
- ☐ Assistant Principal
- ☐ Athletics or Activities
- ☐ District Office
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Size of district:

Students \_\_\_\_\_

Teachers \_\_\_\_\_

Size of school:

Students \_\_\_\_\_

Teachers \_\_\_\_\_

1. How much **formal** training have you had relating to the **identification** of sexual abuse victims and perpetrators? (Please check one choice in each column that most closely matches your training level.)

**PARTS OF  
COLLEGE COURSES**

- ☐ 0 courses  
☐ 1-2 courses  
☐ 3-4 courses  
☐ 5 courses or more

**WORKSHOPS  
OR INSERVICES**

- ☐ 0 hours  
☐ 1-2 hours  
☐ 3-4 hours  
☐ 5 hours or more

2. How much **formal** training have you had relating to the **reporting** of sexual abuse? (Please check one choice in each column that most closely matches your training level.)

**PARTS OF  
COLLEGE COURSES**

- ☐ 0 courses  
☐ 1-2 courses  
☐ 3-4 courses  
☐ 5 courses or more

**WORKSHOPS  
OR INSERVICES**

- ☐ 0 hours  
☐ 1-2 hours  
☐ 3-4 hours  
☐ 5 hours or more

3. What is the approximate date of your most recent formal training session, if any?

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
 MONTH DAY YEAR

4. How effective do you believe your training has been in the area of sexual abuse identification and reporting? (Circle the number that most closely matches your belief.)

0                                      1                                      2                                      3  
 TOTALLY                      SOMEWHAT                      SOMEWHAT                      HIGHLY  
 INEFFECTIVE                      INEFFECTIVE                      EFFECTIVE                      EFFECTIVE

5. According to statistical studies, what percentage of children are believed to be sexually abused between the ages of birth and 18?

**GIRLS**

- ☐ 50% (1 out of 2)
- ☐ 25% (1 out of 4)
- ☐ 16% (1 out of 6)
- ☐ 12% (1 out of 8)
- ☐ 10% (1 out of 10)
- ☐ 5% (1 out of 20)
- ☐ Don't know

**BOYS**

- ☐ 50% (1 out of 2)
- ☐ 25% (1 out of 4)
- ☐ 16% (1 out of 6)
- ☐ 12% (1 out of 8)
- ☐ 10% (1 out of 10)
- ☐ 5% (1 out of 20)
- ☐ Don't know

6. According to recent studies, which group of students are at the greatest risk of child sexual abuse? (Check one box.)

- ☐ Students without disabilities
- ☐ Students with mild disabilities
- ☐ Students with moderate disabilities
- ☐ Students with severe disabilities
- ☐ Don't know

7. How confident are you that you can recognize the characteristics of a sexually abused child in your school? (Please circle the number that most closely matches your level of confidence.)

<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
TOTALLY LACKING IN CONFIDENCE	SOMEWHAT LACKING IN CONFIDENCE	SOMEWHAT CONFIDENT	VERY CONFIDENT

8. According to statistical studies, what percentage of adults are believed to engage in child sexual abuse?

**GENERAL POPULATION**

- ☐ 0 - 1%
- ☐ 2 - 5%
- ☐ 6 - 10%
- ☐ 11 - 25%
- ☐ more than 26%
- ☐ don't know

**SCHOOL EMPLOYEES**

- ☐ 0 - 1%
- ☐ 2 - 5%
- ☐ 6 - 10%
- ☐ 11 - 25%
- ☐ more than 26%
- ☐ don't know

9. How confident are you that you can recognize adult behaviors that indicate children may be at risk of sexual abuse?

0	1	2	3
TOTALLY LACKING IN CONFIDENCE	SOMEWHAT LACKING IN CONFIDENCE	SOMEWHAT CONFIDENT	VERY CONFIDENT

10. Check the ways in which an administrator can be held liable in a sex abuse case involving an employee and a student in his/her school?  
(Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Displaying indifference to obvious signs of child abuse
- ☐ Failing to complete a thorough investigation
- ☐ Failing to report allegations to the proper agencies
- ☐ Failing to conduct a criminal history check before hiring
- ☐ Failing to protect children from known abuse
- ☐ Failing to remove the perpetrator from his/her position
- ☐ Failing to report a colleague who has abused a child
- ☐ Failing to notify parents before interviewing the child
- ☐ Failing to notify Teacher Standards & Practices Commission

11. After receiving a report of alleged child abuse, what actions would you take? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Contact the parents of the child immediately
- ☐ Review the district policy and procedures
- ☐ Collect the necessary information about the alleged abuse
- ☐ Interview the child
- ☐ Interview the alleged abuser
- ☐ Complete a thorough investigation of the report
- ☐ Fill out a written report of the allegations
- ☐ Contact the State Office for Services to Children and Families (formerly Children's Services Division) or Law Enforcement
- ☐ Turn the investigation over to the proper agencies
- ☐ Report to the Superintendent of the District
- ☐ Notify Teacher Standards and Practices Commission

12. Have you ever reported allegations of child sexual abuse?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**IF THE ANSWER TO NUMBER 12 IS  
YES**

13. How many sex abuse reports would you estimate that you have made?

\_\_\_\_\_ number of reports in the past school year

\_\_\_\_\_ number of reports in the past five years

14. How many of the reports have you made regarding alleged abuse by a school employee?

\_\_\_\_\_ number of reports in the past school year

\_\_\_\_\_ number of reports in the past five years

15. What are the appropriate agencies or persons to which you should report alleged abuse? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ State Office for Services to Children and Families  
(formerly Children's Services Division)
- ☐ Law Enforcement Agency
- ☐ Juvenile Department
- ☐ School District Superintendent or Personnel Office
- ☐ School District's Legal Counsel
- ☐ Parents of the child who has allegedly been abused
- ☐ Teacher Standards and Practices Commission

16. What resources have you used to determine appropriate actions to take when receiving reports of child sexual abuse?

**DOCUMENTS**

**TITLES OR AGENCIES**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> CSD Booklet                     | <input type="checkbox"/> State Office for Services to |
| <input type="checkbox"/> District Policy and Regulations | Children & Families (CSD)                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> District Forms and Procedures   | <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement Agency       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training or Workshop Materials  | <input type="checkbox"/> Legal Counsel                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify)          | <input type="checkbox"/> Superintendent               |
| _____  | <input type="checkbox"/> District Personnel Dept.     |
| _____  | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify)       |
| _____  | _____   |



17. When reporting child sexual abuse cases, how confident are you about the procedure to follow? (Circle the number that most closely matches your level of confidence.)

0	1	2	3
TOTALLY LACKING IN CONFIDENCE	SOMEWHAT LACKING IN CONFIDENCE	SOMEWHAT CONFIDENT	VERY CONFIDENT

18. When reporting allegations of child sexual abuse, what do you feel most unsure about? (Check one.)

- ☐ Persons or agencies to contact
- ☐ Procedures to follow
- ☐ Determining the truthfulness of the child
- ☐ Determining the truthfulness of the alleged perpetrator
- ☐ Preserving the reputation of the child or adult
- ☐ Informing other district personnel of the report
- ☐ Completing the appropriate reports and/or records
- ☐ The requirements in the school district policy
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

19. How familiar are you with the Oregon Statute defining child sexual abuse?

0	1	2	3
TOTALLY UNFAMILIAR	SOMEWHAT UNFAMILIAR	SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR	VERY FAMILIAR

20. How familiar are you with the Oregon Mandatory Reporting Laws?

0	1	2	3
TOTALLY UNFAMILIAR	SOMEWHAT UNFAMILIAR	SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR	VERY FAMILIAR

21. When is a school employee required to report suspicions of child abuse to the State Office for Services to Children and Families (formerly CSD) or to a law enforcement agency? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ In his/her official capacity during school related activities
- ☐ Outside of school activities and/or work hours
- ☐ If the abuse or evidence of abuse is observed firsthand
- ☐ If the school employee has reasonable suspicion that abuse is occurring
- ☐ Whenever another school employee shares his/her suspicions of abuse with the employee

22. What do the Oregon Administrative Rules say about an educator who engages in any sexual contact with a student? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Sexual contact includes verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature directed towards the student
- ☐ The teacher has violated the Standards for Competent and Ethical Performance
- ☐ The teacher must receive a verbal or written reprimand
- ☐ The teacher may be charged with gross neglect of duty
- ☐ The teacher's license may be suspended or revoked
- ☐ The teacher must be supervised more thoroughly
- ☐ The superintendent must report the teacher to TSPC within 30 days
- ☐ The teacher fails to meet the standard of "good moral character"
- ☐ The teacher may be charged with a crime

23. How familiar are you with your district's policy relating to child sexual abuse? (Circle the number that most closely matches your level of familiarity.)

0	1	2	3
UNSURE THAT THERE IS A POLICY	KNOW THERE IS A POLICY BUT HAVE NEVER USED IT	SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR WITH THE POLICY	VERY FAMILIAR WITH THE POLICY

**APPENDIX D:**  
**QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS**

## ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

### Demographic Data

#### GENDER:

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Female	23	57.5%
Male	17	42.5%
All	40	100.0%

#### AGE:

Age	Female	Male	All	Percentage
Under 30	0	0	0	.0%
Between 30-35	1	1	2	5.0%
Between 36-40	3	2	5	12.5%
Between 41-45	9	2	11	27.5%
Between 46-50	6	6	12	30.0%
Between 51-55	3	5	8	20.0%
Older than 56	1	1	2	5.0%
All	23	17	40	100.0%

**RACE:**

Race	Frequency	Percentage
African American	0	.0%
Asian	0	.0%
Latino	0	.0%
Native American	1	2.5%
White	37	92.5%
Other	1	2.5%
No Response	1	2.5%

**YEARS IN ADMINISTRATION:**

Years in Admin.	Female	Male	All	Percentage
0 years	2	0	2	5.0%
.5 year	1	0	1	2.5%
1 year	1	1	2	5.0%
2 years	1	0	1	2.5%
3 years	1	0	1	2.5%
4 years	2	0	2	5.0%
5 years	3	3	6	15.0%
6 years	2	1	3	7.5%
7 years	2	0	2	5.0%
8 years	3	0	3	7.5%
9 years	1	0	1	2.5%
10 years	0	1	1	2.5%
12 years	1	1	2	5.0%
14 years	1	0	1	2.5%
15 years	0	2	2	5.0%
18 years	1	1	2	5.0%
19 years	0	1	1	2.5%
20 years	0	1	1	2.5%
22 years	0	2	2	5.0%
25 years	0	1	1	2.5%
26 years	0	1	1	2.5%
No response	1	1	2	5.0%
All	23	17	40	100.0%

---

**YEARS IN CURRENT POSITION:**


---

Years in Current Position	Female	Male	All	Percentage
0.0 years	2	0	2	5.0%
0.5 year	3	1	4	10.0%
1.0 years	5	1	6	15.0%
1.5 years	2	1	3	7.5%
2.0 years	2	1	3	7.5%
2.5 years	0	2	2	5.0%
3.0 years	2	0	2	5.0%
4.0 years	1	3	4	10.0%
5.0 years	2	0	2	5.0%
8.0 years	2	2	4	10.0%
9.0 years	0	1	1	2.5%
10.0 years	0	2	2	5.0%
15.0 years	0	1	1	2.5%
16.0 years	1	0	1	2.5%
18.0 years	0	1	1	2.5%
23.0 years	0	1	1	2.5%
All	23	17	40	100.0%
Sum years	69	123	192	

---



---

**CURRENT POSITION:**


---

Current Position	Female	Male	All	Percentage
Building Principal	11	11	22	55.0%
Assistant Principal	5	1	6	15.0%
Athletics or Activities	1	0	1	2.5%
District Office	4	4	8	20.0%
Other	1	0	1	2.5%
No Response	1	1	2	5.0%
All	23	17	40	100.0%

---

---

**SIZE OF DISTRICT:**


---

Students	Freq.	Percent	Teachers	Freq.	Percent
0	11	27.5%	0	18	45.0%
920	2	5.0%	55	2	5.0%
980	3	7.5%	64	1	2.5%
1100	1	2.5%	84	1	2.5%
1399	1	2.5%	100	1	2.5%
1400	2	5.0%	150	1	2.5%
4300	1	2.5%	210	1	2.5%
4500	5	12.5%	230	1	2.5%
4600	2	5.0%	250	6	15.0%
4633	1	2.5%	260	1	2.5%
4650	2	5.0%	265	1	2.5%
4800	6	15.0%	270	1	2.5%
4850	1	2.5%	274	1	2.5%
4864	1	2.5%	400	3	7.5%
4900	1	2.5%	450	1	2.5%
All	40	100.0%	All	40	100.0%

---

---

**SIZE OF SCHOOL:**


---

Students	Freq.	Percent	Teachers	Freq.	Percent
0	9	22.5%	0	11	27.5%
175	1	2.5%	12	1	2.5%
245	1	2.5%	13	1	2.5%
275	1	2.5%	16	1	2.5%
285	2	5.0%	18	1	2.5%
290	1	2.5%	19	4	10.0%
304	1	2.5%	20	2	5.0%
360	2	5.0%	21	1	2.5%
400	1	2.5%	24	2	5.0%
420	1	2.5%	30	5	12.5%
440	1	2.5%	32	1	2.5%
450	1	2.5%	35	2	5.0%
480	1	2.5%	37	1	2.5%
490	1	2.5%	51	1	2.5%
530	1	2.5%	54	1	2.5%
540	1	2.5%	59	1	2.5%
555	1	2.5%	63	1	2.5%
590	2	5.0%	67	1	2.5%
600	1	2.5%	70	1	2.5%
618	1	2.5%	74	1	2.5%
620	1	2.5%			
630	1	2.5%			
665	2	5.0%			
1400	4	10.0%			
1450	1	2.5%			
All	40	100.0%	All	40	100.0%

---



## Questionnaire Responses

### QUESTION 1:

**HOW MUCH *FORMAL* TRAINING HAVE YOU HAD RELATING TO THE  
*IDENTIFICATION* OF SEXUAL ABUSE VICTIMS AND PERPETRATORS?**

Parts of College Courses	Freq.	Percent	Workshops or Inservices	Freq.	Percent
0 courses	18	45.0%	0 hours	3	7.5%
1-2 courses	11	27.5%	1-2 hours	9	22.5%
3-4 courses	4	10.0%	3-4 hours	11	27.5%
5 courses or more	0	.0%	5 hours or more	16	40%
No response	7	17.5%	No response	1	2.5%
All	40	100.0%	All	40	100.0%

### QUESTION 2:

**HOW MUCH *FORMAL* TRAINING HAVE YOU HAD  
RELATING TO THE *REPORTING* OF SEXUAL ABUSE?**

Parts of College Courses	Freq.	Percent	Workshops or Inservices	Freq.	Percent
0 courses	19	47.5%	0 hours	1	2.5%
1-2 courses	12	30.0%	1-2 hours	14	35.0%
3-4 courses	0	.0%	3-4 hours	15	37.5%
5 courses or more	1	2.5%	5 hours or more	9	22.5%
No response	8	20.0%	No response	1	2.5%
All	40	100.0%	All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 3:**
**WHAT IS THE APPROXIMATE DATE OF YOUR  
MOST RECENT FORMAL TRAINING SESSION?**

Dates	Freq	Percentage	Dates	Freq	Percentage
04/09/89	1	2.5%	04/09/95	1	2.5%
05/09/90	1	2.5%	08/09/95	2	5.0%
09/09/90	1	2.5%	08/28/95	2	5.0%
11/09/90	1	2.5%	08/30/95	1	2.5%
07/09/92	1	2.5%	09/06/95	1	2.5%
08/09/92	1	2.5%	09/09/95	3	7.5%
09/09/92	1	2.5%	10/01/95	1	2.5%
04/10/93	1	2.5%	10/09/95	3	7.5%
08/20/94	1	2.5%	01/12/96	2	5.0%
08/25/94	1	2.5%	08/30/96	1	2.5%
09/09/94	4	10.0%	No Response	7	17.5%
10/01/94	1	2.5%	All	40	100.0%
03/01/95	1	2.5%			

---

**QUESTION 4:**
**HOW EFFECTIVE DO YOU BELIEVE YOUR TRAINING  
HAS BEEN IN THE AREA OF  
SEXUAL ABUSE IDENTIFICATION AND REPORTING?**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Totally ineffective	1	2.5%
Somewhat ineffective	2	5.0%
Somewhat effective	29	72.5%
Highly effective	7	17.5%
No response	1	2.5%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 5:**

**ACCORDING TO STATISTICAL STUDIES, WHAT PERCENTAGE  
OF CHILDREN ARE BELIEVED TO BE SEXUALLY ABUSED  
BETWEEN THE AGES OF BIRTH AND 18?**

Girls	Freq	Percent	Boys	Freq	Percent
50% (1 out of 2)	3	7.5%	50% (1 out of 2)	0	.0%
25% (1 out of 4)	18	45.0%	25% (1 out of 4)	8	20.0%
16% (1 out of 6)	6	15.0%	16% (1 out of 6)	11	27.5%
12% (1 out of 8)	1	2.5%	12% (1 out of 8)	5	12.5%
10% (1 out of 10)	3	7.5%	10% (1 out of 10)	5	12.5%
5% (1 out of 20)	0	.0%	5% (1 out of 20)	0	.0%
Don't know	9	22.5%	Don't know	11	27.5%
All	40	100.0%	All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 6:**

**ACCORDING TO RECENT STUDIES, WHICH GROUP OF STUDENTS ARE  
AT THE GREATEST RISK OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE?**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Students without disabilities	6	15.0%
Students with mild disabilities	8	20.0%
Students with moderate disabilities	6	15.0%
Students with severe disabilities	3	7.5%
Don't know	17	42.5%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 7:**
**HOW CONFIDENT ARE YOU THAT YOU CAN RECOGNIZE THE  
CHARACTERISTICS OF A SEXUALLY ABUSED CHILD IN YOUR SCHOOL?**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Totally lacking in confidence	2	5.0%
Somewhat lacking in confidence	13	32.5%
Somewhat confident	25	62.5%
Very confident	0	.0%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 8:**
**ACCORDING TO STATISTICAL STUDIES, WHAT PERCENTAGE OF  
ADULTS ARE BELIEVED TO ENGAGE IN CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE?**

General Population	Freq.	Percent	School Employees	Freq	Percent
0 - 1%	3	7.5%	0 - 1%	6	15.0%
2 - 5%	10	25.0%	2 - 5%	16	40.0%
6 - 10%	7	17.5%	6 - 10%	1	2.5%
11 - 25%	3	7.5%	11 - 25%	0	.0%
More than 26%	0	.0%	More than 26%	0	.0%
Don't know	17	42.5%	Don't know	16	40.0%
No response	0	.0%	No response	1	2.5%
All	40	100.0%	All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 9:**

**HOW CONFIDENT ARE YOU THAT YOU CAN RECOGNIZE  
ADULT BEHAVIORS THAT INDICATE CHILDREN MAY BE AT  
RISK OF SEXUAL ABUSE?**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Totally lacking in confidence	6	15.0%
Somewhat lacking in confidence	16	40.0%
Somewhat confident	18	45.0%
Very confident	0	.0%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 10:**

**CHECK THE WAYS IN WHICH AN ADMINISTRATOR CAN BE  
HELD LIABLE IN A SEX ABUSE CASE INVOLVING AN  
EMPLOYEE AND A STUDENT IN HIS/HER SCHOOL?**

Percentage of Matching Responses	Frequency	Percentage
40% (4 out of 10)	1	2.5%
50% (5 out of 10)	22	55.0%
60% (6 out of 10)	12	30.0%
70% (7 out of 10)	5	12.5%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 11:**

**AFTER RECEIVING A REPORT OF ALLEGED CHILD ABUSE,  
WHAT ACTIONS WOULD YOU TAKE?**

Percentage of Matching Responses	Frequency	Percentage
45% (5 out of 11)	5	12.5%
55% (6 out of 11)	5	12.5%
64% (7 out of 11)	7	17.5%
73% (8 out of 11)	7	17.5%
82% (9 out of 11)	5	12.5%
91% (10 out of 11)	7	17.5%
100% (11 out of 11)	4	10.0%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 12:**

**HAVE YOU EVER REPORTED ALLEGATIONS OF  
CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE?**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	9	22.5%
No	31	77.5%
All	40	100.0%

**QUESTION 13:****HOW MANY SEX ABUSE REPORTS WOULD YOU  
ESTIMATE THAT YOU HAVE MADE?**

In the Past School Year	Freq.	Percent	In the Past Five Years	Freq.	Percent
0 reports	21	52.5%	0 reports	11	27.5%
1 reports	7	17.5%	1 reports	4	5.0%
2 reports	4	10.0%	2 reports	3	7.5%
3 reports	4	10.0%	3 reports	3	7.5%
5 reports	2	5.0%	4 reports	3	7.5%
10 reports	1	2.5%	5 reports	3	7.5%
12 reports	1	2.5%	6 reports	2	5.0%
All	40	100.0%	10 reports	2	5.0%
			12 reports	3	7.5%
			15 reports	1	2.5%
			20 reports	3	7.5%
			22 reports	1	2.5%
			30 reports	1	2.5%
			All	40	100.0%

**QUESTION 14:****HOW MANY OF THE REPORTS HAVE YOU MADE  
REGARDING ALLEGED ABUSE BY A SCHOOL EMPLOYEE?**

In the Past School Year	Freq.	Percent	In the Past Five Years	Freq.	Percent
0 reports	33	82.5%	0 reports	26	65.0%
1 reports	7	17.5%	1 reports	10	25.0%
All	40	100.0%	2 reports	4	10.0%
			All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 15:**
**WHAT ARE THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES OR PERSONS  
TO WHICH YOU SHOULD REPORT ALLEGED ABUSE?**

Percentage of Matching Responses	Frequency	Percentage
29% (2 out of 7)	4	10.0%
43% (3 out of 7)	7	17.5%
57% (4 out of 7)	7	17.5%
71% (5 out of 7)	16	40.0%
86% (6 out of 7)	4	10.0%
100% (7 out of 7)	1	2.5%
No response	1	2.5%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 16:**
**WHAT RESOURCES HAVE YOU USED TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATE  
ACTIONS TO TAKE WHEN RECEIVING REPORTS OF  
CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE?**

Documents	Freq	Percent	Titles or Agencies	Freq	Percent
CSD Booklet	23	57.5%	SOSCF (CSD)	32	80.0%
District Policy & Regs	34	85.0%	Law Enforce. Agency	27	67.5%
District Forms & Proc.	27	67.5%	Legal Counsel	14	35.0%
Trng or Wkshp Mater.	25	62.5%	Superintendent	17	42.5%
Other	0	.0%	Personnel Director	23	57.5%
			Other	5	12.5%



---

**QUESTION 17:**
**WHEN REPORTING CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE CASES, HOW  
CONFIDENT ARE YOU ABOUT THE PROCEDURE TO FOLLOW?**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Totally lacking in confidence	1	2.5%
Somewhat lacking in confidence	6	15.0%
Somewhat confident	23	57.5%
Very confident	9	22.5%
No response	1	2.5%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 18:**
**WHEN REPORTING ALLEGATIONS OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE,  
WHAT DO YOU FEEL MOST UNSURE ABOUT?**

Responses	Freq.	Percentage
Persons or agencies to contact	1	2.5%
Procedures to follow	2	5.0%
Determining the truthfulness of the child	2	5.0%
Determining the truthfulness of the alleged perpetrator	0	.0%
Preserving the reputation of the child or adult	9	22.5%
Informing other district personnel of the report	3	7.5%
Completing the appropriate reports and/or records	0	.0%
The requirements in the school district policy	0	.0%
Other	3	7.5%
No response	3	7.5%
Multiple responses	17	42.5%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 19:**
**HOW FAMILIAR ARE YOU WITH THE OREGON STATUTE  
DEFINING CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE?**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Totally unfamiliar	0	.0%
Somewhat unfamiliar	6	15.0%
Somewhat familiar	27	67.5%
Very familiar	6	15.0%
No response	1	2.5%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 20:**
**HOW FAMILIAR ARE YOU WITH THE OREGON  
MANDATORY REPORTING LAWS?**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Totally unfamiliar	0	.0%
Somewhat unfamiliar	0	.0%
Somewhat familiar	23	57.5%
Very familiar	16	40.0%
No response	1	2.5%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 21:**

**WHEN IS A SCHOOL EMPLOYEE REQUIRED TO REPORT  
SUSPICIONS OF CHILD ABUSE TO THE STATE OFFICE  
FOR SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES (FORMERLY  
CSD) OR TO A LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY?**

Percentage of Matching Responses	Frequency	Percentage
20% (1 out of 5)	2	5.0%
40% (2 out of 5)	1	2.5%
60% (3 out of 5)	4	10.0%
80% (4 out of 5)	8	20.0%
100% (5 out of 5)	25	62.5%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 22:**

**WHAT DO THE OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES SAY  
ABOUT AN EDUCATOR WHO ENGAGES IN ANY SEXUAL  
CONTACT WITH A STUDENT?**

Percentage of Matching Responses	Frequency	Percentage
33% (3 out of 9)	3	7.5%
44% (4 out of 9)	1	2.5%
56% (5 out of 9)	9	22.5%
67% (6 out of 9)	15	37.5%
78% (7 out of 9)	7	17.5%
89% (8 out of 9)	5	12.5%
All	40	100.0%

---

**QUESTION 23:**
**HOW FAMILIAR ARE YOU WITH YOUR DISTRICT'S POLICY  
RELATING TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE?**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Unsure that there is a policy	5	12.5%
Know there is a policy but have never used it	25	62.5%
Somewhat familiar with the policy	8	20.0%
Very familiar with the policy	0	.0%
No response	2	5.0%
All	40	100.0%

**APPENDIX E:**  
**PRE- AND POST-EVALUATION**  
**CASE STUDIES**

## CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE CASE A

A patron comes into the school office to see the principal. He asks if a custodian who works in the school has ever been accused of sexual abuse of children. The patron said he had read something in the newspaper about a school custodian being charged with sexual abuse and assumed it must be the same person.

The man informs the principal that he has direct knowledge that the employee had sexually abused his own daughters when they were young and that his children have all been in therapy for years dealing with abuse issues. Now, the employee is baby-sitting female children from your school in his home, and the patron is worried about their safety.

This custodian has recently been transferred to your building. He just started a recycling program in which he works with children in the third grade classes. These children go to the custodian's room to sort paper and other products to be recycled.

1. What does the law require you to do in this case?
2. What signs of sexual abuse would you look for in the students who may be victims in this case?



## CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE CASE B

A parent attends an athletic event in another school's gymnasium. While sitting in the bleachers behind a group of high school students from your school, the parent hears the students talking about one of the coaches who is "having an affair with one of the girls." The parent reports this conversation to the principal but asks that her name not be used since she has a student who is on the team of the accused coach.

The principal and other teachers have heard similar rumors in the past about this coach being involved with other girls on his team. When the principal checked into the rumors earlier, he found no evidence to substantiate the rumors; however, the coach does have the girls come to his room after school often, and he does take a special interest in their personal lives.

Now that a second allegation has arisen, the administrator is not sure of the action he should take. Since the parent refused to be identified, should he ignore it as an anonymous complaint in accordance with the negotiated agreement, or should he conduct a further investigation? It would be a shame to ruin the reputation of a fine, young coach, and teenagers are known to gossip and fantasize about such things at this age.

1. What does the law require you to do in this case?
2. What signs of sexual abuse would you look for in the students who may be victims in this case?





**APPENDIX F:**  
**PRE- AND POST-TEST**  
**CODING SHEETS**

Total Points Possible	Points for Each Part	<b>PRE AND POST-TEST CODES</b>
10 points total	10 points 5 points 0 points	<p><b>1. What does the law require you to do in this case?</b></p> <p>1A= Report to Children's Services Division and/or Law Enforcement Agency  1B= Report to Children's Services Division only  1C= Any other response</p>
10 points total	1 point for each indicator up to 10	<p><b>2. What signs would you look for in the students who may be victims in this case?</b></p> <p>X= Total number of indicators from the lists below.  Physical Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficulty in walking or sitting</li> <li>Torn, stained or bloody underclothing</li> <li>Pain or itching in genital area</li> <li>Bruises, bleeding, or infection in external genitalia, vaginal, or anal areas</li> <li>Venereal disease, especially in pre-teens</li> <li>Pregnancy</li> <li>Sits with crotch exposed</li> <li>Tries to look at people undressing</li> <li>Touches own sex parts in public</li> <li>Shows sex parts to adults</li> <li>Uses sexual words</li> <li>Shows sex parts to other children</li> <li>Talks about sexual acts</li> <li>Imitates sexual behaviors with toys</li> <li>French kisses</li> <li>Puts mouth on sex parts</li> </ul>

		<p><b>Behavioral Indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Withdrawal, fantasy or infantile behavior</li> <li>Poor peer relationships</li> <li>Delinquent or run away behavior</li> <li>Indirect allusions to problems at home</li> <li>Reports sexual assault</li> <li>Fear of a person or an intense dislike at being left with someone</li> <li>Unusual interest in or knowledge of sexual matters</li> <li>Expressing affection in ways inappropriate for a child of that age</li> </ul> <p><b>Emotional Indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Behavior extremes such as aggression, violence, or withdrawal</li> <li>Habit disorders (sucking, biting, rocking)</li> <li>Attempted suicide</li> <li>Conduct disorders (antisocial, runaway, firesetting, destructive)</li> <li>Emotional neediness</li> </ul>
--	--	--

10 points total	1 point for each indicator up to 10	<p><b>3. What are some of the signs you would look for in pedophile behavior?</b></p> <p>X= Total number of indicators from the lists below.</p> <p>Persistent Patterns of Behavior:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sexual abuse in their background</li> <li>Limited social contact as teen-agers</li> <li>Premature separation from military</li> <li>Frequent and unexpected moves</li> <li>Prior arrests</li> <li>Multiple victims</li> <li>Planned, repeated, or high-risk attempts</li> </ul> <p>Children as Preferred Sexual Objects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over 25, single, never married</li> <li>Lives alone or with parents</li> <li>Limited dating relationships if not married</li> <li>If married, "special relationship" with spouse</li> <li>Excessive interest in children</li> <li>Associates and circle of friends are young</li> <li>Limited peer relationships</li> <li>Age and gender preference</li> <li>Refers to children as "clean, pure, innocent, impish," etc. or as objects</li> </ul> <p>Skilled in Obtaining Victims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Skilled at identifying vulnerable victims</li> <li>Identifies better with children than with adults</li> <li>Has access to children</li> <li>Participates in activities with children, often excluding other adults</li> <li>Seduces with attention, affection and gifts</li> <li>Skilled at manipulating children</li> <li>Has hobbies and interests appealing to children</li> <li>Shows sexually explicit material to children</li> </ul>
-----------------	-------------------------------------	--

		<p>Sexual Fantasies Focusing on Children:</p> <p>Youth-oriented decorations in house or room</p> <p>Photographing of children</p> <p>Collecting child pornography or child erotica</p>
10 points total	<p>5 points</p> <p>3 points</p> <p>2 points</p> <p>0 points</p>	<p><b>4. What information do you need to justify reporting child abuse to the appropriate agency?</b></p> <p>4A= Reasonable cause to believe abuse has occurred</p> <p>4B= Direct disclosure or direct knowledge of the abuse</p> <p>4C= Information about the victim and abuser</p> <p>4D= Not sure or no response</p>
10 points total	<p>5 points</p> <p>5 points</p> <p>0 points</p> <p>0 points</p>	<p><b>5. How would school policy and ethical standards apply in this case?</b></p> <p>5A= District policy determines procedure to follow</p> <p>5B= Teacher Standards and Practices Commission determines professional ethics</p> <p>5C= Other responses</p> <p>5D= Not sure or no response</p>
10 points total	<p>2 points</p> <p>2 points</p> <p>2 points</p> <p>2 points</p> <p>2 points</p> <p>0 points</p>	<p><b>6. What steps do you take to investigate these allegations?</b></p> <p>6A= Document the complaint</p> <p>6B= Update yourself on the district policies and procedrues</p> <p>6C= Turn the investigation over to Children's Services Division or Law Enforcement Agency</p> <p>6D= Complete an internal investigation after CSD/LEA complete their investigation</p> <p>6E= Consult legal counsel or Teacher Standards and Practices Commission if warranted</p> <p>6F= Unsure or no response</p>
<b>60 Points Possible</b>		

**APPENDIX G:**  
**PRE- AND POST-TEST RESULTS**

PRE AND POST-TEST SUMMARY																
SUBJECTS	CODE	PRE-TEST						Total Pre-Test Score	POST-TEST						Total Post-Test Score	DIFFERENCE IN PRE & POST-TESTS
		QUES. #1	QUES. #2	QUES. #3	QUES. #4	QUES. #5	QUES. #6		QUES. #1	QUES. #2	QUES. #3	QUES. #4	QUES. #5	QUES. #6		
1	A-1	0	4	3	5	5	4	21	5	8	8	8	5	4	38	17
2	A-2	10	1	2	5	0	4	22	10	2	1	5	10	6	34	12
3	A-3	0	2	2	0	0	2	6	0	3	8	10	0	4	25	19
4	A-4	0	2	1	8	5	2	18	5	4	4	5	10	8	36	18
5	A-5	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	7	3	5	5	6	31	27
6	M-2	5	5	4	8	0	4	26	10	8	5	5	10	6	44	18
7	M-3	0	5	2	3	0	2	12	10	4	2	5	0	2	23	11
8	M-4	10	2	2	2	5	2	23	10	4	4	5	10	6	39	16
9	M-5	10	2	2	5	0	2	21	10	7	7	5	10	8	47	26
10	M-6	5	1	1	5	5	2	19	5	5	3	7	5	6	31	12
11	M-7	5	3	1	7	5	4	25	10	5	4	5	10	2	36	11
12	M-9	10	6	3	0	0	2	21	5	7	5	10	10	8	45	24
13	M-10	10	5	3	5	0	2	25	10	5	5	7	10	6	43	18
14	M-11	5	2	1	7	5	4	24	10	10	5	5	10	6	46	22
15	M-12	10	2	2	5	0	0	19	10	6	5	5	10	4	40	21
16	M-13	5	3	2	5	0	2	17	5	7	8	5	10	10	45	28
17	M-14	10	5	3	8	0	2	28	10	5	4	7	10	8	44	16
18	M-15	5	3	1	5	0	2	16	0	2	0	7	0	2	11	-5
19	M-17	0	1	2	3	0	4	10	10	7	8	7	5	2	39	29
20	M-18	5	2	1	3	0	0	11	10	7	5	8	0	0	30	19
21	M-19	5	3	2	8	5	2	25	10	6	6	8	10	6	46	21
22	M-20	10	5	2	5	0	2	24	10	5	6	10	10	4	45	21
23	M-21	5	0	1	3	0	2	11	10	6	4	5	10	6	41	30
24	N-1	0	2	0	3	0	0	5	10	6	9	5	5	8	43	38
25	N-2	0	3	0	5	0	2	10	10	9	6	5	10	4	44	34
26	N-4	0	4	2	0	0	0	6	10	5	2	5	5	4	31	25
27	N-7	5	3	4	5	0	0	17	10	10	10	5	10	2	47	30
28	N-9	10	6	2	0	0	0	18	0	5	4	5	5	4	23	5
29	N-11	10	1	2	0	0	0	13	5	5	5	5	0	4	24	11
30	N-12	10	2	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-12
31	N-13	10	2	2	5	5	2	26	10	5	2	5	5	8	35	9
32	N-16	0	0	2	3	0	0	5	10	8	6	5	5	4	38	33
33	N-17	5	0	1	3	0	0	9	0	2	3	0	0	6	11	2
34	N-18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	3	5	5	6	28	27
35	S-1	5	0	1	3	0	0	9	0	3	2	7	10	8	30	21
36	S-2	10	5	2	5	10	2	34	10	5	3	7	10	6	41	7
37	Y-1	0	3	2	5	0	2	12	0	5	4	7	5	2	23	11
38	Y-2	5	2	2	5	5	2	21	0	3	2	5	5	6	21	0
39	Y-3	10	2	2	5	0	2	21	10	7	4	5	10	6	42	21
40	Y-4	10	4	1	8	10	4	37	10	6	2	5	10	6	39	2
40	TOTALS	215	104	68	160	65	72	684	280	218	177	230	270	204	1379	695
	MEANS	5.38	2.6	1.7	4	1.63	1.8	17.1	7	5.45	4.43	5.75	6.75	5.1	34.48	17.38
	STANDARD DEVIATIONS	4.09	1.7	0.98	2.52	2.83	1.4	8.3	4	2.16	2.34	2.01	3.8	2.32	10.93	10.8