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ABSTRACT

There has been a long established relationship problem between Child Protection Services social workers and law enforcement officers. The purpose of this research was not only to explore the existence of the relationship problem, but to develop possible resolutions. A cross-sectional design was used to define what the problem is between these two groups, as well as to what degree each group sees the problem in reference to it interfering with their job. The format used in data collection was that of surveys involving dual agencies. The sample size included 36 law enforcement officers and 20 child protective services social workers. Among those surveyed were officers from Redlands Police Department and social workers from San Bernardino County, Department of Children’s Services. This study acknowledged the relational problem and offered numerous solutions which could produce a positive impact on both professions and the communities they serve.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

There has been a long established relationship problem between Child Protection Services (CPS) social workers and Law Enforcement (LE) officers. It is an issue of which both sides are aware, but neither side has specifically addressed this discord in an effort to improve collaboration between the two agencies. Based on the investigation for this research, it would seem that if asked, most LE officers would offer a negative opinion about the social workers they encounter in their line of duty. Their opinion was noted as social workers are lazy and do not have a very good reputation. This opinion was recounted by different LE officers within multiple agencies, including police, sheriffs, and probation. This same type of prevailing response came from CPS social workers. They were heard complaining about officers not seeing their calls as having priority and leaving social workers to sit in front of a house for hours on end, worrying about what may be happening to the children inside while they wait.
Problem Statement

One cause contributing to the tension that lies between LE officers and CPS social workers is confidentiality laws. According to Sally Richter SSSP from San Bernardino Department of Children's Services, during the referral stage of the investigation, information can be freely shared between agencies. However, once the referral has moved into court jurisdiction, CPS cannot legally cross share information without a court order. This may be frustrating to LE when trying to conduct their criminal investigation in the same case (S. Richter, personal communication, September 19, 2007).

Neither of these two sides seems to have any respect for the other, or for the importance of the other's job and their value to the community (S. Richter, personal communication September 17, 2007). While there are many professionals involved in child abuse cases, the role of the social worker is to protect the child from abuse by providing the family with interventions to strengthen and educate the family unit. A social worker performs a full investigation before deciding to remove the child/children. The role of LE officers in child abuse
cases is to investigate in order to determine if a
criminal act has occurred, identify and apprehend the
offender, and file appropriate criminal charges. The
response of LE officers to child abuse cases is often
vital for protection of the child, but there is a need
for both agencies within a case.

From a micro perspective, LE officers and CPS social
workers both play necessary roles in assisting the
victim/child and their families to mend/stabilize their
lives in time of crisis. However, disagreements between
LE officers and CPS social workers can arise concerning
the immediate steps which need to be taken when
responding to a reported child abuse case. These types of
disagreements can seriously interrupt or slow the child
abuse investigation (Brooks, Perry, Starr, & Tepley,
1994).

From the literature gathered, it would seem that
both social services and LE agencies are concerned about
and see the need for collaboration between the two
agencies, yet neither side is looking at reasons behind
the relationship problems. The research conducted
confirms that both agencies are well aware of the
dissention going on, and would welcome a way to mend the
relationship between the agencies, in order to form a more productive partnership.

Agency collaboration is a focus that is in the forefront of most LE and CPS agencies, and most states have legislation which mandates that these two agencies work together on multidisciplinary teams (MDT). Building Partnerships to Protect our Children, outlines recommendations formed from the Child Protection Summit: "Some of the recommendations proposed were to strengthen partnerships to prevent maltreatment, enhance the professionalism of child abuse and neglect responders, and build interdisciplinary working relationships" (International Association of Chiefs of Police, Child Welfare League of America, & National Children's Alliance, 2001, p. i).

Currently, MDT's are being implemented across the country; however, LE and CPS are at odds in their practice approach. One main obstacle in forming collaborating relationships between these professionals is found in their differing foci. "For instance, police officers might be more interested in building probable cause for an arrest, while CPS workers remain more concerned with preserving families" (Heck, 1999, p. 21).
However, there are signs that this differing focus has started to shift following the catastrophic events on September 11, 2001. LE officers have become more involved in the community, giving them a better perspective on the need for social work interventions (Slaght, 2002). Even with the known disagreements among LE and CPS, many states are requiring these two agencies to work together when investigating criminal cases of child abuse.

In order to meet these state requirements, the development and implementation of MDT’s for combating child abuse have become the new intervention. MDT’s are the collaboration of multiple agencies for a common cause, in this case child abuse. Other professionals included in child abuse MDT’s are victims’ witness advocates, mental health workers, specially trained medical personnel, and prosecutors. The MDT model is based on professionals working together to guide the investigation, eliminating the need for multiple interviews of the child victim, and collaborating on decision making (Cross, Finkelhor, & Ormrod, 2005).

Though both LE and CPS roles have a single similarity, which is to protect those in need, the need for these professionals to understand and respect the
others' organizational culture, is critical (Garrett, 2004). With the development of MDT’s becoming the norm in dealing with child abuse, also comes the issue of integrating these two different organizational cultures. From a macro perspective, domain theory could be applied to the roles of both LE and CPS, and their organizational behaviors.

According to domain theory, the front line workers in both agencies are in a service domain, with the agencies’ supervisors in management domain, and the State elected officials, who make mandates, in a policy domain. People from different domains have different vantage points, as well as perceptions of the reality of the organization (Kouzes & Mico, 1979). According to Schon (1971), this is referred to as The Rashomon Effect, "which explains this phenomenon as when the same story told from the point of view of several participants, fragments into several different and incompatible stories" (p. 210).

The problem lies in the behaviors which are normal within each domain, but may be incompatible in other domains. This causes a separation and weakens the relationship between domains (Kouzes & Mico, 1979). For
instance both LE and CPS have differing pursuits, which cause the lack of cohesiveness when acting from their differing norms.

The sampling of LE officers and CPS social workers displays a clearer understanding of the frustrations felt by both sides. The goal behind the research study was to compile information gathered through surveying both sides, as to what they see as the main reasons behind the discord of these two agencies. In addition, those surveyed also provided ideas for resolving this issue. With their differences set aside, the collaboration of these agencies could result in a partnership which is beneficial to each other, as well as provide more effective services to the victims/families.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to help both LE officers and CPS social workers build a strong interdisciplinary relationship. LE officers and CPS social workers have a similarity in their jobs in that they both have to deal with child abuse cases. Their primary goal is to protect the child and/or children who are victims. However, the contradiction each holds about
the others’ profession causes an obstacle in the way they perform their job. The discord in the relationship between LE and CPS is an important issue to address; though the research proved challenging, the primary goal was to ease tension between the two occupations and set the stage for future studies and possible focus groups.

The relationship tension between these occupations is a concern in many ways. One concern deals with the obvious, in that LE officers and CPS social workers are usually the first responders in reported child abuse cases, creating a need for them to be able to collaborate and work together for a common purpose. According to Cross et al. (2005):

Both types of investigators seek to learn the truth about allegations, and broadly are concerned with protecting children. But police are looking for evidence of a specific crime that could lead to an arrest, whereas CPS investigators are assessing the child safety in the caretaking environment and making certain that adequate plans are made for children to live in a safe environment. (p. 226)

Both parties play an important role in observing and assessing situations concerning alleged child abuse; to
do this they need to pay very close attention, or else important evidence could be missed. When LE officers and CPS social workers are uncomfortable with one another, it may also affect their collaborative ability within MDT's.

The method of this research was a survey involving dual agencies. It used an exploratory design presenting the variables of interest. The reason behind this survey design is that LE officers and CPS social workers were the best sources of data, in that the research question involves finding out the opinions of both of these groups. It was a comparative study containing elements which are very similar, but differ in one important aspect: the reasoning behind the discord towards the opposite agency workers. A cross-sectional design was used to define what the problem is between these two groups, as well as to what degree each group sees the problem interfering with their jobs.

To do this, group-administered questionnaires were the best plan for ensuring participation. When addressing LE officers within Redlands Police Department, the best chance of obtaining a large response group was to have them complete the survey together during briefing sessions, when the research was explained and questions
were immediately addressed. In addition to the actual survey, a cover letter was attached and handed out containing a detailed explanation of the project, and obtaining the research participants' consent; it also address confidentiality regarding the responses. The same was done during a general staff meeting at San Bernardino County Department of Children Services.

Within this survey, the data collected included independent variables. There were demographic variables such as age, gender, and ethnicity, along with other independent variables such as years of service, service area, and degree and frequency of involvement with social workers or law enforcement officers. The dependent variable was the identification of the problem that exists between LE and CPS. In this case there was a second dependent variable, which required a more time consuming analysis of the data obtained. The second dependent variable in this case was a proposed resolution to the problem.

Significance of the Project for Social Work

In order to meet state mandates in implementing MDT's, LE and CPS agencies can no longer continue to
skirt around their relationship issues. Since both occupations need to effectively respond to families in crisis, ensuring accurate assessment of safety issues, this research can help prevent future struggles and frustration when collaborating on child abuse cases. By surveying participants from both sides, the root of the problem was brought to light, opening up a pathway that could lead to the development of relationships built on mutual respect. It would be a benefit to the children served through the child welfare system if they could have a team of people truly working together, in every sense of the word, thus ensuring their safety and providing the most comprehensive services. Each agency would benefit by tapping into the vast knowledge held by, what right now is considered, the opposing agency.

The research design involved the first three stages of the generalist intervention process. The study engaged both sides in the process of assessing the direct issues involved in their relationship problem. The design of the survey was directed at assessing the problem, but also allowed each side to present suggestions for implementing a corrective action plan. Though this study was not to start the implementation process it lays the foundation
for future research and possible focus groups. These focus groups could actually be the change agent implementing the improvements needed from the findings of the survey. This study's purpose was to answer the research question: What can be done to improve the relationship between Law Enforcement Officers and Child Protective Services Social Workers?
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

From exhaustive research, there do not seem to be any studies directed at the root causes of the relational problems between law enforcement (LE) officers and Child Protective Services (CPS) social workers. While very aware of the problem's existence, neither agency surveyed, Redlands Police Department and San Bernardino County Department of Children's Services, have deliberately looked into the underlying cause behind their relationship issues in order to find resolution. Though none of the following literature is specific to the research question proposed, there were numerous studies found which mentioned or referred to the discord present between LE and CPS agencies. The common thread in all the literature is the need for joint collaboration between the two agencies in order to provide safety and protection, and to ensure the best possible outcomes.

Joint Collaboration

The 2001 Child Protection Summit addressed the need for collaborative efforts among social workers and law
enforcement. The recommendations centered on building partnerships to protect children, and there was a strong argument made for the need for and strengths of this type of partnership (International Association of Chiefs of Police, Child Welfare League of America, & National Children’s Alliance, 2001). However, in addressing obstacles, the Summit alluded to the tension between agencies but did not offer reasons behind the tension, nor did it suggest a need to address the relationship issues in order to form more positive collaboration between agencies.

Still, other studies continue to stress the need for this type of joint collaboration. Ross, Conger, and Armstrong (2002) studied the relationship between child welfare and the juvenile justice system and proposed what they referred to as a challenging objective, which was to create a partnership between local agencies. The research addressed the problems which occur when foster youth are arrested and police/probation officers do not ask if the child/youth is in foster care, and therefore do not include CPS. The conclusion was to implement programs which required multi-agency collaboration. The study designed a solution for bridging the gap, but concluded
there would be challenges; included as one of the hurdles to be faced was deciding departmental hierarchies. It is suggested that cross-agency hierarchy will meet opposition, especially in light of the relational problems between CPS social workers and LE officers. Once again the relationship issue is alluded to but not addressed in the need for joint collaboration.

It is generally believed that collaboration between LE officers and CPS social workers can be achieved and produce better outcomes. Reported in Faller and Henry (2000), "...cooperation among professionals is viewed as a strategy for reducing intervention-induced trauma to children, improving case management decisions related to child safety, and increasing the number of criminal convictions" (p. 1216). The results of this study were encouraging in that they reported a high success rate in cases where LE officers and CPS social workers collaborated, despite the frustration and barriers that these two professionals encountered.

Mandated Multidisciplinary Teams (MDT)

Because, "all states have legislation requiring the reporting of child abuse and neglect" (Brooks, Perry,
Starr, & Teply, 1994, p. 49) the use of collaboration is not just a recommendation; most states have implemented legislation mandating the use of MDT’s. According to Smith, Witte, and Fricker-Elhai (2006), “the use of an MDT is intended to increase interagency cooperation, promote accountability, improve tracking of cases, and increase the efficient use of community services and resources” (p. 355). This belief that collaboration can bring more positive results is what has fueled the development of MDT’s nationwide. According to Ells (2000), child abuse MDT’s are made up of:

a group of professionals who work together in a coordinated and collaborative manner to ensure an effective response to reports of child abuse and neglect. Members of the team represent the government agencies and private practitioners responsible for investigating crimes against children and protecting and treating children in a particular community. An MDT may focus on investigations; policy issues; treatment of victims, their families, and perpetrators; or a combination of these functions. (p. 2)
CPS involvement in MDT’s dates back more than 50 years, when they originated as child protection teams located in hospital settings, and included CPS social workers and medical professionals. The field of child abuse has advanced remarkably with the adoption of child maltreatment as a medical diagnosis (Laraque, DeMattia, & Low, 2006).

Over the past 20 years there has been a marked increase in the use of MDT’s in combating child abuse, as well as an increased involvement of multiple agencies. LE officers now play a pivotal role in MDT’s, especially in the investigation process and establishment of Child Assessment Centers (CAC). CAC’s typically include both LE officers and CPS social workers, among other professionals. CAC’s are centers where forensic interviews are conducted with child abuse victims. In the interview process it is important that there are no conflicting issues among the professionals as to which agency is taking the lead (Newman, Dannenfelser, & Pendleton, 2005).

While the functions of MDT’s contain undeniable advantages, the effectiveness of the team depends on numerous factors. These include the ability to have
common professional perspectives, shared objectives and goals, and clearly defined roles and leadership. “The consequences of poor cooperation can be profound and prove disastrous when dealing with children who have been abused” (Lalayants, & Epstein, 2005, p. 454). Therefore the success of MDT’s in social welfare requires a shift in roles for both LE officers and CPS social workers.

Changing Roles

As far back as 1977, studies noted the need for changes in the roles of LE officers and CPS social workers. “Historically, the police department has been the only community institution to make house calls 24 hours a day, 365 days a year” (Woolf & Rudman, 1977, p. 62). However CPS social work agencies usually run on a normal daily, Monday through Friday schedule. With the stereotypes which are often assumed regarding LE officers and CPS social workers, it can make collaboration difficult. These stereotypes include the view that LE officers are power hungry, macho men who are insensitive to families, and only concerned with the pursuit of criminals, while CPS social workers are overworked, bleeding hearts (Cross et al., 2005).
The United States is not alone in realizing the need for changing roles of LE officers and CPS social workers. Many other industrialized countries, while seeing the need for collaboration, are also seeing the relational problems between these two human service agencies. The need for role changes has brought more police involvement within child protection, especially within the framework of decision-making, accountability and control. These changes prompted the development of Child Protection Units (CPU), located in local police departments (Masson, 2002). According to Garrett (2004) about 80% of social workers in England are women, and the relational problems began when CPU’s were first located in police departments, which were male dominant. Officers would make derogatory comments stating the units were only there to provide jobs “for the girls” (p. 83). The tendency of police to assume they are the lead agency was also a point of contention.

The need for changing roles among LE officer and CPS social workers was heightened following the catastrophic events of September 11th. LE officers had to become more involved in the community, which put them in positions with a vantage point for recognizing cases which need
human services intervention. The problem here lies with LE’s lack of training in human services and mental health problems. Many cases involving juveniles require the need for knowledge in these areas. In fact 7%-10% of all LE calls have related mental health issues (Hails, & Borum, 2003), and the ratio in juvenile involved calls is considerably higher. The lack of training in this area has caused frustration among LE officers, but the answer is obvious; LE’s should be trained to recognize and refer persons to mental health and other human services (Slaght, 2002).

Training Needs

Slaght (2002) published a study entitled: Revisiting the relationship between social work and law enforcement. The author addressed the need for changing roles in law enforcement, suggesting officers need to become more involved in community roles which require them to have a knowledge and sensitivity of social problems which goes beyond their normal training. The study also suggested that CPS social workers should play a part in the training of LE officers in order to present a united team effort in the community. This need for training came to
the forefront, in the wake of recent terrorist attacks as a way to have a more collaborative response to community crisis.

Heck (1999), states that LE officers often learn child abuse investigation approaches through on the job training, and later go straight from a patrol unit to a specialized unit dealing with child abuse investigations. These officers may receive training in investigations and interrogation, but not in forensic interviewing which is greatly needed when dealing with child abuse (Daly, 2005).

According to Farrar (2003) LE officers do not feel they are adequately prepared for cases involving child maltreatment. “A training program has the potential to better equip law enforcement officers to make child maltreatment assessment” (Farrar, 2003, p. 4). In addition, Farrar (2003) states that the training program should train LE officers in the process of starting where the client is, just as CPS social workers do in their job. In addressing training needs, it is useful to keep in mind that both LE officers and CPS social workers tend to carry the same personality traits, such as dominance and independence, which are necessary for them to be effective on their jobs (Kelly, 2003).
The United States is not alone in recognizing the need for further training of LE officers in child welfare issues such as physical and sexual child abuse. The United Kingdom has also expressed concern about the need for more extensive training for LE officers in dealing with child abuse and maltreatment (Daly, 2004). This comes from reports from LE officers who believe they have not had a sufficient amount of training in order to prepare them for cases involving child sexual abuse or other types of child maltreatment. Daly, (2004) offers information from officers about the training they received and whether they felt it was sufficient. Though most of the officers reported the initial training they received was adequate, most reported that the subsequent training was insufficient in keeping them updated about new legislation and operational developments.

Freeman and Morris (1999) conducted a study regarding the impact of a training workshop, which was conducted with twelve CPS social workers to determine their abilities in conducting investigative interviews with abused children. Of the twelve participants, nine were caseworkers and three were supervisors; eight were women and four were men. The research conveyed that this
type of workshop training program was not sufficient in preparing CPS social workers for investigative interviewing on the job. The results suggested CPS social workers are in need of more extensive training in the area of investigative interviewing than what can be provided in workshops.

Theories Guiding Conceptualization

This research project was guided by integrating systems and ecological theories. In ecological systems theory (or eco-systems theory), individuals engage with other people and other systems within their environment; therefore, individuals are influenced by systems, and the systems are influenced by individuals. In order to deliver adequate resources to communities, LE officers and CPS social workers need to be able to create positive transactions between the two agencies, or the people and their environment.

The surveys brought to light what is behind the discord, which opened the way for the establishment of plans to lessen the strife between systems insuring that they can more effectively work within their environment. The systems include the environment as the community
system, LE as a sub-system protecting the community, and CPS as a sub-system ensuring the safety of children, and working with families in the community. LE officers and CPS social workers have a niche or role within society; in finding a way for the two systems to work together they may both be able to achieve a more stable sense of identity. After researching thoroughly possible theories for this study, ecological and systems (eco-systems) theory, is the best suited given the participants of this study (Payne, 2005).

Summary

The aforementioned literature supports the need for further research to be done concerning the relational problems which lie between LE offices and CPS social workers. It not only addresses the problem, but also presents the need for joint collaboration among these two agencies in order to meet state mandates requiring them to work together on MDT’s. The literature expresses the need for changing roles, and more specialized training among both LE officers and CPS social workers in order to incorporate more characteristics of the others job. Since each of these agencies are sub-systems within the larger
community system, applying eco-systems theory to this research provides insight into why these two systems need to collaborate within their environment to better meet the needs of the children and families they serve.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Introduction

This research examined the existing relational problems between Law Enforcement (LE) officers and Child Protective Services (CPS) social workers. This chapter discusses the study design, sampling, and data collection including the instruments used. It also discusses the procedures, the protection of human subjects and analysis of data.

Study Design

The purpose of this study’s design was to explore the different variables which lie behind the relational problems in an attempt to design a resolution which would allow LE officers and CPS social workers to form a more cohesive, interdisciplinary partnership. A cross-sectional survey of both groups was used to gather data defining what each group sees as the relational problems between these two agencies, and to what degree it is interfering with their jobs.

The rationale behind the use of a survey design is that it collected first hand data from LE officers and
CPS social workers who are the best source of information regarding their relationship with one another. The limitations to this type of data collection included the human factors such as not having enough participants, or the mood of the person on the day he/she participated in the survey. The survey contained both quantitative and qualitative questions designed to address the research question: What can be done to improve the relationship between LE officers and CPS social workers?

Sampling

Convenience sampling was the most effective sampling method in collecting data from these two closed agencies. In part the convenience was that both agencies are located within San Bernardino County and both had given prior approval for access to their employees during their working hours. The sampling was done through group administered questionnaires where the research was first explained and questions immediately addressed. A realistic sample size of fifty-six participants was collected.

The LE officers who were surveyed work for the city of Redlands Police Department. The officers who
volunteered to participate in the survey met the criteria of being line patrol officers, who are first responders to calls for service in suspected child abuse cases. Also included were detectives from the Crimes against Children's Unit, who deal with CPS social workers on a regular basis. The CPS social workers who volunteered to participate in the survey are employees of San Bernardino County Department of Children's Services and met the criteria of being intake workers, those who are first responders in child abuse referrals. Also included were the intake workers' supervisors.

Data Collection and Instruments

The instrument used for data collection was a questionnaire developed by researchers for this particular study. Since this is a newly developed instrument, researchers conducted a pre-test including five employees from each agency. The participants in the pre-test were recruited on a voluntary basis and provided feed back as to the validity of the questionnaire as it applied to the research question. The questionnaires completed by participants in the pre-test group were not included in the survey analysis.
The questionnaire consisted of two sections (See appendix A). Section one was designed to extract demographic data which were used as independent variables, and included nominal, ratio, and ordinal levels of measurement. The independent variables contained in the questionnaire included years of service in the profession as a ratio measurement, age as a ratio measurement, occupation, gender, and ethnicity as nominal measurements, level of education as an ordinal measurement, parental status as a nominal measurement, training in child maltreatment as an ordinal measurement, and frequency involved with the opposite agency as an ordinal measurement. The demographic data were constructed to measure what impact each independent variable may have on the dependent variables. A slight limitation to this section existed in that the questions were all closed-ended, which required the participants to choose from a limited number of responses.

Section two's design was that of open-ended questions addressing the two dependent variables including the cause of the relational problems and predicted resolution. The participants who answered yes to whether they see a problem in the relationship with
the opposite agency then went on to the next question which asked: What do you see as the primary problem in the relationship between LE officers and CPS social workers? The second dependent variable which was defined answered the question: What do think needs to happen in order to repair the relational problems which lie between LE officers and CPS social workers?

Four additional open-ended questions were added giving the participants opportunity to clarify statements and add any additional information which they deemed important to the study. The first question asked for participants' understanding of child abuse asking: What is your understanding of the meaning of child abuse? The next question was a continuation of the first question and addressed cultural sensitivity, in that it allowed the participants to express their views on child abuse with the inclusion of cultural beliefs. The question was: Are there cultural considerations which factor into your definition? The third clarifying open-ended question asked: Does it make a difference if you frequently go out with the same worker from the opposite agency and if so how? The final question allowed participants to add additional comments or information they saw as advantages
to the research. Though the study included quantitative research it was the open-ended questions in section two which provided more reliability and validity to the instrument and made up for any limitations in section one.

Procedures

Prior to conducting the survey for the collection of research data, the heads of both Redlands Police Department and the Department of Children’s Services, had to be contacted and a letter of approval provided (Appendices E & F). Permission was gained for group administered questionnaires which took fifteen minutes to complete.

LE questionnaires were distributed during briefing sessions, which occurred directly before the beginning of each shift and include supervisors. Therefore, the survey was administered during three different briefing sessions in order to include officers from each of the three daily shifts. All collection occurred during the same week.

CPS questionnaires were distributed at the end of intake unit meetings, and included unit supervisors. Due to the timing of some unit meetings surveys were
distributed through inter office mail and returned. Again the questionnaires were administered during the same week at the Department of Children’s Services. The complete collection of surveys lasted no more than two weeks leaving more time for in-depth analysis of the data received.

The group administered questionnaires were conducted at the end of the meetings so that anyone not wanting to participate could leave. At the time of the questionnaire administration an explanation of the study’s purpose was given and participants had an opportunity to have questions answered. Accompanying each questionnaire was an informed consent and a cover letter ensuring anonymity and reminding the participant that participation was completely voluntary, including a statement that refusal to participate would not have resulted in any type of penalty. As participants deposited completed questionnaires into the collection envelope provided, they were given a debriefing statement.

Protection of Human Subjects

Anonymity and confidentiality was of high priority in the collection of data, insuring protection of human
subjects. Attached to each questionnaire was an informed consent (See Appendix B) outlining the study’s purpose, insuring anonymity in that the questionnaire contained no identifiable information and all questionnaires were destroyed once all data was collected. Also included was a statement that participation was strictly voluntary and that refusal to participate would not result in any penalty. The informed consent required that the participant sign, with an X, acknowledging he/she had read and understood the informed consent before beginning the questionnaire.

Upon completion of the questionnaire the participant deposited the survey into a collection envelope and was then handed a debriefing statement (See Appendix C). The debriefing statement contained information on how participants could access the study’s results as well as whom they could contact if they had any questions or concerns regarding the study.

Data Analysis

The analysis of the data is both quantitative and qualitative. A descriptive analysis was employed in order to include the univariate statistics, those describing
characteristics of both LE officers and CPS social workers. The questionnaire had a combination of questions with most being of nominal measurement, and put into categories. However, the questions in section two are of a qualitative nature and required more than one person to analyze, therefore to ensure the content analysis had an acceptable inter-rater reliability.

The variables in section one and two were analyzed using bivariate statistics, such as cross tabulations, correlations, and frequencies to determine the strength of the potential relationships between independent and dependent variables. The demographic data were used as independent variables allowing for their correlation with the dependent variables including the cause of the problem between LE officers and CPS social workers and the predicted solution. This process also allowed for a comparison of the participants' definition of child abuse and their attitudes towards LE officers or CPS social workers.

Summary

Chapter three outlined the study's design and procedures for collection and analysis of the data
included in the questionnaire. It also provided for the
protection of human subjects and the steps taken with
both agencies involved in the research. Included was the
express assurance of confidentiality and anonymity.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

Presented in this chapter are the results derived from surveys completed by law enforcement (LE) officers and Child Protective Services (CPS) social workers in San Bernardino County. Independent variables are included to supply demographic information on respondents from both occupational fields. However, open-ended questions provided results in answering the two main research questions of defining the relational problem, and offering possible resolution. There are 56 respondents included in the research incorporated herein.

Presentation of the Findings

There were a total of 36 respondents from LE, and 20 respondents from CPS. The demographic data from each group were run separately so descriptive statistics could be analyzed and compared. There were 7 independent variables and 1 dependent variable included among the quantitative questions in the survey. The independent variables included gender, age, parenting, ethnicity, education, service years, and training in child
maltreatment, with the dependent variable being if the respondents thought there was a relationship problem between LE officers and CPS social workers.

Table 1. Law Enforcement Officers Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender * Occupation Crosstabulation</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrol Officer</td>
<td>Crimes Against Children Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Child Protective Services Social Worker Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender * Occupation Crosstabulation</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intake SSP</td>
<td>Intake SSSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above (Tables 1 and 2), representation of gender is displayed for both occupational fields. Within LE, male representation is significantly larger than
female, with 29 out 36 officers being male. The opposite representation is shown within CPS, with 16 out 20 respondents being female.

For LE the age range is between age 25 and age 56, with a mean age of 37. In CPS the range is from age 28 to age 65, with a mean age of 42. The combined mean age for both occupations is 39, with a mode age of 43.

Table 3. Law Enforcement Officers Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrol Officer</td>
<td>Crimes Against Children Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Isl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Child Protective Services Social Workers

**Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Intake SSP</th>
<th>Intake SSSP</th>
<th>Social Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Isl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above (Tables 3 & 4) are displayed the diverse ethnic backgrounds represented within respondents from LE and CPS. LE had no Native American's represented in the research sample, and had ethnic representation of 53% Caucasian. Within CPS, all ethnicities were represented. The highest CPS ethnic representation was Caucasian, with 45% of respondents (n = 9). The next highest ethnic representation was that of 26% African American (n = 5).
Table 5. Law Enforcement Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrol Officer</td>
<td>Crimes Against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Child Protective Services Social Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intake SSP</td>
<td>Intake SSSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above (Tables 5 and 6) the education levels for both occupations are shown and range from some college to a doctoral degree. LE reported 20 out of 36
respondents have a bachelor’s degree and 8 respondents possessing a master’s degree. CPS respondents reported 18 out of 20 have a master’s degree, and 1 possessing a doctorate degree.

For LE the numbers of years of service ranged from 1 to 30, with the mean years of service being 12. For CPS the numbers of years of service ranged from 1 to 24, with the mean years of service being 6.

Table 7. Law Enforcement Officers Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you had specialized training in the area of child maltreatment *</th>
<th>Occupation Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrol Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you had specialized training in the area of child maltreatment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Child Protective Services Social Workers

Training

Have you had specialized training in the area of child maltreatment *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you had specialized training in the area of child maltreatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above (Tables 7 and 8) respondents were asked if they had any specialized training in the area of child maltreatment. LE reported yes in 20 out 36 respondents, leaving 16 respondents reporting they had not had any specialized training in child maltreatment. CPS reported yes in 19 out of 19 respondents.
Table 9. Law Enforcement Officers Problem

Do you think there is a relationship problem between LE officers and CPS social workers? Occupation Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrol Officer</td>
<td>Crimes Against Children Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think there is a relationship problem between LE officers and CPS social workers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Child Protective Services Problem

Do you think there is a relationship problem between LE officers and CPS social workers? Occupation Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intake SSP</td>
<td>Intake SSSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think there is a relationship problem between LE officers and CPS social workers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above (Tables 9 and 10) both occupations were asked whether they think there is a relationship problem between LE officers and CPS social workers. The answer to
this question lays the groundwork for the basis of this research. LE reported 23 out 36 respondents who answered yes, indicating they think there is a relationship problem between the two occupations. Of the 20 CPS respondents, 17 answered yes, also indicating they think there is a relationship problem among the two occupations. The respondents' answers to this question had a direct bearing on their answers to the qualitative questions addressing the reasons behind the relationship problem and possible resolutions.

For the qualitative analysis of the open-ended questions, two evaluators independently read and determined recurring themes. Each respondent’s answer was then recorded under the theme or topic to which it was most closely related. The evaluators then compared results and combined responses under emergent themes.

There were 3 dominant themes presented in answering question 4 of section 2, which asked: What do you see as the primary problem in the relationship between LE officers and CPS social workers? The theme with the largest representation was lack of understanding of each other’s roles and agency’s focus. There were a total of 17 responses corresponding with this theme. One LE
officer reported, "Perhaps, a lack of knowledge and understanding the operations of each other's agency." A CPS social worker responded, "difference in scope – difference in expectations – lack of understanding of the others perspective."

The negative response category was the second highest represented theme, with 11 total responses. One LE officer responded, "CPS workers are overwhelmed and often fail to heed to officer advice. CPS workers also 'kiss-off' their work on LE." One CPS social worker responded;

LE often calls at night when they have responded and they tell SW's what they need to do with the child. As a professional I have been trained to assess situations and think that my assessment should be enough. I should not have to justify my decision in handling a case to LE.

The third recurring theme was communication, with a total of 7 responses. One response from a LE officer was, "LE needs to have a better communication with CPS. It would be nice to have a CPS worker assigned to the police department. That way we would all be on the same page."
Question 5 in section 2, asked the frequency of which each respondent went out in the field with a recurring worker from the opposite agency. This question went relatively unanswered, but was a lead-in to question 6, which asked: Does it make a difference and how? Among respondents, 47% of LE officers (n = 17), and 80% of CPS social workers (n = 16) responded favorably, indicating that rapport building could produce a positive outcome. The following two answers are representative of this theme. A LE officer responding saying:

I think more time with a specific CPS worker would be great. Even better would be a worker assigned to each agency. This is done at other agencies and said to work very well. I think working together on a regular basis would help in the communication issues, on both sides.

Question 7 in section 2, asked: What do you think needs to happen in order to repair the relational problems which lie between LE officers and CPS social workers? The respondents' answers to this question were key to the desired outcome of this research. There were 3 major themes represented among respondents from both LE and CPS. Two of those themes included were negative
responses and communication. An example of the negative responses include: from LE “Just realize we need faster responsive time because we also have a job to do”; and from CPS, “LE needs to prioritize child abuse and their response time to DCS.” An example of a communication response came from a CPS social worker, “Better communication and shared discussion of problematic interactions.”

The theme which had the most recurring answers in resolving the relational problems between LE officers and CPS social workers was training and education in each other’s role. There were 19 responses under this theme, with the following two responses being representative of the group: one LE officer noted, “Training together along with more positive experiences in working together. Both groups need to understand each others needs and goals”; one CPS social worker responded, “Both need to gain an understanding/education of each other’s agency through trainings and possibly ‘ride-a-longs’.”

The final question gave respondents the ability to clarify answers if they felt it necessary, or to give additional input which they deemed significant to the
research. However, none of the respondents took advantage of this question as all surveys were left blank.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the results of the surveys completed by LE officers from the City of Redlands Police Department and CPS social workers from San Bernardino County Department of Children's Services. Demographic data was included to provide a profile of the respondents. The open-ended questions offered a glimpse into the perceptions of LE officers and CPS social workers, contributing their opinions regarding the relational problems which exist between them and possible resolution.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

Introduction

Presented in this chapter are the conclusions drawn from the surveys collected, which included law enforcement (LE) officers and Child Protective Services (CPS) social workers within San Bernardino County. There were some significant differences among demographic data in the two occupations represented. Included is the discussion of the qualitative answers given for the research question: What can be done to improve the relationship between law enforcement officers and Child Protective Services social workers? Further discussion presents the limitations of this research as well as recommendations for social work practice, implications for policies, continuance of research, and conclusions gained from research findings.

Discussion

Important to the validity of this research were respondents' answers to the question: Do you think there is a relationship problem between LE officers and CPS social workers? The results were as anticipated, with the
majority of respondents answering yes, which included 64% of LE officers (n = 23) and 85% of CPS social workers (n = 17). By acknowledging their belief in the presence of a relationship problem; the hypothesis was supported giving relevance to the research.

Some significant demographic differences between the two occupations represented were noted in this research, which included gender, level of education, and specialized training in the area of child maltreatment. The different representation of gender among occupations sampled was as anticipated. Among LE respondents, 80% were male (n = 29) and among CPS respondents, 90% were female (n = 18). This difference in gender is considered to be representative of these occupations in general, and could account for some of the differences in opinions held by each occupation.

The differing levels in education represented by each occupation showed CPS social workers have a higher overall level of education than LE officers. These differences in education could contribute to the relational problems in respect to professional perspectives, shared objectives and goals, and clearly defined roles and leadership. Since the system does not
clearly define the lead agency in child abuse case, case hierarchy is presumed by both LE and CPS, thus creating conflict between agencies.

Further, when looking at specialized training in the area of child maltreatment, there were noteworthy differences between LE officers and CPS social workers, which were carried over into respondents' definitions of the relationship problem between the two occupations. Of the LE respondents, only 20 out 36 reported having had this type of specialized training. However, of the 19 CPS respondents, all reported having had specialized training in child maltreatment. It was interesting to note that LE officers who had not had this training, offered a generalized reason for the relationship problems such as, CPS social workers do not heed to a LE officer’s advice on whether or not child abuse has occurred. On the other hand, CPS social workers offered a generalized reason behind the relationship problem, speculating because they have extensive training in child abuse, they should not have to listen to the opinion of untrained LE officers. These opposing opinions contribute to the relational problems which need resolution in order to better serve children and families in crisis.
As shown in chapter four, there were several themes which both LE and CPS respondents agreed upon concerning the existing relationship problem, as well as the evaluation of possible resolutions. When addressing the underlying issues behind the cause of the relational problems, the most recurring theme was that of a lack of understanding between the two agencies’ roles and focus. This was an insightful realization since both LE officers and CPS social workers work under differing organizational cultures, policies and procedures, yet they are often mandated to work together.

This leads into the issue also addressed as lack of communication. If there is no understanding of the other’s role or focus, communication is always going to be limited and/or strained. One could conclude that the negative responses given are a result of the lack of understanding and communication problems in that the tone of the negative responses was that of blaming the opposing agency. Each negative responder pointed his/her finger at and incited issues which blamed the other agency for the existence of the relationship problems.

There were four negative responses included in the evaluation of possible problem resolutions. Each of these
four was offered by those who responded negatively to the problem's cause. These responders had a tendency to not only blame the opposite agency's workers for the problem, but also alluded to the need for the other agency to make changes in order to resolve the problem. This underscores the depth of the relationship problem.

When analyzing the responses made for resolving the long standing relationship problems, included were suggestions which appear to be viable. The majority of respondents suggested that joint training, clearer policies and procedures, and closer working experiences are possible pathways to rebuilding the relationship. Though numerous respondents cited a need for more training and education in each other's profession, many also included some practical solutions which could be easily implemented. Some feasible examples include developing a LE/CPS liaison within each agency; having social workers go on ride-alongs; having CPS workers assigned to specific areas so that they work with the same LE agency on an ongoing basis; and having a CPS social worker assigned to each LE agency. The last of these suggestions is one that was noted in the literature review. According to the Garrett (2004), initially these
specialized units got off to a rocky start. However, once the notable gender issues were addressed, these units showed some promising results for future implementation.

Limitations

There were several limitations which were encountered during the research process. The first of which was a need to change LE agencies. After beginning the process and after several hours of meetings with one LE agency, a decision was made not to participate in the research. This limited the time allotted for the research process, as another LE agency needed to be found.

There were two qualitative questions in the survey which did not illicit responses which were as expected. The first one asked for each individual's definition of child abuse. Of the 91% of respondents (n = 51) who answered this question, none answered it in the way the research was intended. Instead of defining child abuse, most put down types of child abuse, such as mental, physical, or emotional. For the second part of that question involving the inclusion of culture in their definition of child abuse, most did not answer or else gave answers which indicated they did not clearly
understand the question. The question asked for personal cultural considerations affecting their definition of child abuse. They instead noted cultural factors which they had heard of, and/or had encountered on their jobs. Because these two questions were met with some confusion by respondents their analysis was inconclusive in relationship to the research question: What can be done to improve the relationship between LE officers and CPS social workers?

There was also a limitation in regards to the overall sample size. Since only one agency was used for each occupation, it was not enough to be representative of San Bernardino County, let alone of the State of California, or of a national sample of the United States.

Recommendations for Social Work Practice, Policy and Research

It was imperative that this research bring to light the relationship problems between LE officers and CPS social workers in order to address resolution. Though this is a well known issue among both occupations, it has been something that is complained about and then swept under the carpet. With the infusion of laws mandating LE officers and CPS social workers to work together in child
abuse cases, repair of their relationship must happen in order for them to establish a partnership for the good of the families in the community.

A recommendation gleaned from this research for social work practice, policy, and procedure, which could have a positive affect on the relationship between LE officers and CPS social workers, would be the inclusion of specialized units located within all LE agencies. By creating specialized Child Protection Units (CPU), staffed with full-time social workers and specially trained LE officer’s, it would create an atmosphere conducive to relationship building. To do this it would be important to also have joint policies and procedures put into place which would create a more collaborative organizational structure. However limited, research and literature supports the development of CPUs with the belief that they would be an improvement over current child abuse investigations.

A recommendation for future research on this topic would include the development of focus groups, which would include frontline workers from both occupations. Focus groups would be a beneficial addition to this research in that they would incorporate a more
representative sample of the entire San Bernardino County. These groups could not only address the relational problems, but on a macro level, they could aid in developing joint policies and procedures.

Conclusions

This research brought acknowledgement of the problem in the relationship between LE officers and CPS social workers. With the problem finally out in the open steps can be taken to not only repair the damage, but create a bond between these two occupations which can become a force to reckon with in combating child abuse. The inclusion of focus groups could increase the possibilities, thus opening doors to the development of joint trainings, changes in policies, procedures and practice.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
Survey Questionnaire

The purpose of section one is to determine if any of the following independent variables are factors in the views regarding the relational problems between LE officers and CPS social workers.

Section One: Please mark your answer with a check or an X

1. Occupation:
   _____ Intake SSP    _____ Intake SSSP
   _____ Patrol Officer    _____ Crimes Against Children Unit

2. Number of Years Service in Profession: ______

3. Age: ______

4. Gender:
   _____ Male
   _____ Female

5. Ethnicity:
   _____ Asian or Pacific Islander    _____ African American    _____ Hispanic
   _____ Caucasian    _____ Native American    _____ Multi-Ethnic
   _____ Other (Please Specify) __________________________

6. Level of Education:
   _____ GED    _____ HS Diploma    _____ Some College    ____Associate’s Degree
   ____Bachelor’s Degree    ____Master’s Degree    ____Doctorate Degree

7. Are you a Parent?
   _____ No    _____ Yes

8. Have you had specialized training in the area of child maltreatment?
   _____ No    _____ Yes

9. If yes, how much __________________________

10. Is the training ongoing: _____ No    _____ Yes

11. Frequency of involvement with opposite agency?
    _____ Never    _____ Rarely    _____ Occasionally    _____ Frequently    _____ Daily
Section Two:

1. What is your understanding of the meaning of "Child Abuse"?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. Are there cultural considerations which factor into your definition?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. Do you think there is a relationship problem between LE officers and CPS social workers?  _____ No  _____ Yes
4. If so, what do you see as the primary problem in the relationship between LE officers and CPS social workers?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

5. How often do you go out on calls with the same worker from the opposite agency?

   Daily   Weekly   Monthly   Occasionally

6. If you do, does it make a difference, and how?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
7. What do you think needs to happen in order to repair the relational problems which lie between LE officers and CPS social workers?

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

8. Are there any additional comments or information you would like to add?
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT
informed Consent

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to find out what can be done to improve the relationship between law enforcement officers and child protection social workers. The study is being conducted by Cheryl Gonzales and Aida Quiñonez, graduate students in the Master of Social Work program at California State University, San Bernardino under the supervision of Laurel Brown M.S.W, Faculty Supervisor at California State University, San Bernardino.

The survey will take approximately 15 minutes of your time and is completely voluntary; refusal to participate will not involve any penalty. You can withdraw at any time. Your supervisors will not know whether you participated. The study has been approved by the Department of Social Work Sub-Committee of the California State University, San Bernardino Institutional Review Board.

The information collected for the survey will be confidential. Please do not put your name or other identifying information on there. Surveys will be destroyed immediately after data has been collected. There are no immediate or foreseeable risks as questions pertain to individuals job title, description, and experience. The expected benefit of this project is to resolve the relational problems which exist between these two agencies. With these differences set aside, the collaboration of these agencies could result in a partnership which is beneficial to each other, as well as provide more effective services to the victims/families.

If you agree to participate in the study, please mark an X on the attached permission page and ensure that it stays attached to the survey when placed in the collection box. A debriefing statement will be given to you after completion of survey.

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, you can contact Ms. Laurel Brown, California State University San Bernardino, Department of Social Work, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, California 92407, call her at (909) 537-5184, or email her at labrown@projects.sdsu.edu

I have been informed of and understand the purpose of this survey. I completely understand that my participation is voluntary and the data collected will be used only for research purposes. By marking an X below, I give my consent to participate in the study.

“X” here ______________ Date __________________

Thank you for your participation in this survey.
APPENDIX C

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Debriefing Statement

Once again we would like to thank you for your participation in this study. The survey that you have just completed was designed to find out what can be done to improve the relationship between law enforcement officers and child protection services social workers. The survey was conducted by Cheryl Gonzales and Aida Quiñonez, graduate students in the Master of Social Work program at California State University, San Bernardino.

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, you can contact Ms. Laurel Brown, faculty supervisor at California State University San Bernardino, Department of Social Work, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, California 92407, call her at (951) 682-2580, or email her at labrown@projects.sdsu.edu

Results of the research project will be available at participating law enforcement agencies and the Department of Children’s Services after September 2008.
APPENDIX D

AGENCY APPROVAL LETTERS
Dr. Teresa Morris  
Department of Social Services  
California State University Parkway  
San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397  

Dear Dr. Morris:  
This letter serves as notification to the Department of Social Work at California State University San Bernardino that Cheryl D. Gonzales and Aida V. Quinonez have obtained consent from the Redlands Police Department to conduct the research project entitled "The Relationship between Law Enforcement Officers and Child Protective Social Workers". Asking the question: What can be done to improve the relationship between law enforcement officers and child protective services social workers?  

Sincerely,  

Jim Bueermann, Chief of Police,  
Redlands Police Department  

Date
January 10, 2008

Dr. Teresa Morris  
Department of Social Work  
California State University, San Bernardino  
5500 University Parkway  
San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397

Dear Dr. Morris:

This letter serves as notification to the Department of Social Work at California State University San Bernardino that Cheryl Gonzales and Aida Quinonez have obtained consent from the Department of Children's Services, San Bernardino County to conduct the research project entitled "The Relationship Between Law Enforcement Officers and Child Protective Services Workers."

Sincerely,

DeAnna Avey-Motikeit, Director  
Department of Children's Services
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ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES PAGE

This was a two-person project where authors collaborated throughout. However, for each phase of the project, certain authors took primary responsibility. These responsibilities were assigned in the manner listed below.

1. Data Collection: Law Enforcement Agency
   Assigned Leader: Cheryl Gonzales
   Assisted By: Aida Quiñonez

2. Data Collection: Child Protective Services
   Assigned Leader: Aida Quiñonez
   Assisted By: Cheryl Gonzales

3. Data Entry and Analysis:
   Team Effort: Cheryl Gonzales & Aida Quiñonez

4. Writing Report and Presentation of Findings:
   a. Introduction and Literature
      Team Effort: Cheryl Gonzales & Aida Quiñonez
   b. Methods
      Team Effort: Cheryl Gonzales & Aida Quiñonez
   c. Results
      Team Effort: Cheryl Gonzales & Aida Quiñonez
   d. Discussion
      Team Effort: Cheryl Gonzales & Aida Quiñonez