



6-1-2004

Controversial Maternal Roles of Intrafamilial Child Sexual Abuse Cases

Rhonda Elliott McGee
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Child Psychology Commons, Domestic and Intimate Partner Violence Commons, and the Family, Life Course, and Society Commons

Recommended Citation

McGee, Rhonda Elliott, "Controversial Maternal Roles of Intrafamilial Child Sexual Abuse Cases" (2004). *Dissertations*. 1123.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1123>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



CONTROVERSIAL MATERNAL ROLES OF INTRAFAMILIAL
CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE CASES

by

Rhonda Elliott McGee

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Sociology

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
June 2004

CONTROVERSIAL MATERNAL ROLES OF INTRAFAMILIAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE CASES

Rhonda Elliott McGee, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University, 2004

The purpose of this study was to examine Child Sexual Abuse case files, to determine which “maternal role”: a) protector, b) co-victim, c) co-perpetrator/conspirator, or d) perpetrator was the most common in court cases studied in this research. The researcher also sought to find: 1) The most dominant maternal role in reference to percentage; 2) The effect, if any, of certain “role types”; 3) And the consequences and/or effects of selected variables (e.g. age, race, and gender) had in family court decisions and adjudications.

The target population consisted of forty-one cases of Child Sexual Abuse cases, adjudicated by the Family & Children Courts of Kalamazoo County, Kalamazoo, Michigan. The case files examined were those for whom “Guilty & No Contest Plea” adjudications for 1999, 2000, and 2001 were researched.

“Content Analysis of Secondary Data” is the research method most compatible with the raw data contained in this essentially exploratory study. This research procedure required reviewing data from the forty-one case files. Information gathered from those files pertained to child victims of sexual abuse, the relationship and support of the mother, and the outcome of the case. These cases provide the data to determined the “maternal roles” consisting of: (a) Protector (b) Co-victim (c) Co-

Perpetrator/Co-Conspirator (d) Perpetrator. The major data-gathering instrument utilized was the “Data Code Sheet”. The “maternal roles” and additional information gathered from the files focused on twenty-seven descriptive variables pertaining to the preliminary and post events involved in Child Sexual Abuse court cases.

The major findings of this analysis were: (1) The most dominant “maternal role” in forty-one (41) child sexual abuse cases were Co-perpetrator/Co-conspirator (75.5%/29) (2) Black females (85.7%/6) exceeded White females (66.7%/4) in the Co-perpetrator/Co-conspirator “maternal role” in child sexual abuse, and also in No Contest Plea adjudications (85.7% Black females; 6/13). (3) The maternal role of “Protector” was the lowest percentage in this study (male 8.3%/2 vs. female 0%). (4) White Males (91.7%/22) dominated the perpetrator’s role in Child Sexual Abuse, and also Guilty Adjudications. (See tables 35, 38, 42, 43, 44, and 45).

UMI Number: 3130611

Copyright 2004 by
McGee, Rhonda Elliott

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3130611

Copyright 2004 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Copyright by
Rhonda Elliott McGee
2004

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all I am eternally grateful for the predestination of my Lord and Savior who inspired me to journey into the field of Psycho-Social Therapy, the doctoral program of Sociology, and the dissertation on topic of “Controversial Maternal Roles of Intrafamilial Child Sexual Abuse”. I would be remiss if I failed to honor my mother (Edith Elliott, deceased July 3, 2002), who always empowered me to be the *best* that I could be. Also, I appreciate my “beloved” son (Glenn Devon McGee, whose unconditional love gave daily inspiration to complete my goals.

This study could not have reached fruition, without the involvement of many significant people. My deepest appreciation goes to the following:

I must extend enormous thanks to my doctoral committee: Douglas V. Davidson Ph.D. (Chair), whose patience discerned my stamina and creatively assisted in designing the road map toward my goals and objectives; Herbert Smith Ph.D., who understood my passion for my thesis and proceeded to expand my theoretical approach; James Henry Ph.D., who sparked my advanced interest in his child sexual abuse classes, and Charles Crawford Ph.D., who was gracious enough to trust my reference and guide me through criminal justice perspectives.

I want extend a loving gratitude to Lewis Walker Ph.D. (previous Dept. Chair), for convincing me Sociology would be a wise choice to complete my scholastic achievements. A special thanks is extended to Subhash Sonnad Ph.D., for his mentorship, availability, and resourcefulness in the Child Sexual Abuse area. I

Acknowledgments—continued

extend high commendations to Griselda Daniels for all her recruiting efforts. Not only does she counsel, she empowers students to complete the graduate program by mandating prioritization, and it worked!

Judge Williams your presence is of true essence in the community of Kalamazoo, Michigan and truly enamored me. I appreciate your faith in my professional ethics, by entrusting me with family court files to conduct my research. Thank you for the opportunity of a lifetime!

In closing, I send many thanks to Dr. VanValey (Department Chair of Sociology), for his candor and “unique” exploratory approach toward gathering empirical data for research, and to the administration (especially Susan for moral support, and Sharon for assistance); I send appreciation to the Family & Children Court administration (especially Jenny and Peggy); also Drug Court (especially Steve), and I extend much gratitude to my family (Fay Wong, Mary & Sharon Williams), friends (Bridgett Gonder & Felisha Flowers), sorority (Alfrelynn Roberts, Vikita Walker, & Delta Sigma Theta, Inc.), and church families (Calvin Center & Trinity Seventh Day Adventist Church).

Rhonda Elliott McGee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Significance of the Study.....	7
Statement of Hypotheses	9
Theoretical Perspectives.....	10
Limitations.....	12
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	15
Introduction	15
Mother's Role in Child Sexual Abuse.....	18
Assigned Maternal Role For Child Sexual Abuse	19
Mothers "Not" Held Responsible For Child Sexual Abuse.....	21
Maternal Dilemmas Regarding Child Sexual Abuse	26
Maternal Uncertainties In Child Sexual Abuse.....	27
Psycho-Social Perspectives Regarding Mothers in Child Sexual Abuse	30
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	35
Overview	35
Conceptual Framework.....	35
Type of Design.....	36
Population and Sampling Procedure.....	37

Table of Contents—continued

CHAPTER		
	Instrumentation	38
	Validity and Reliability	38
	Research Procedure/Subject Selection.....	39
	Risks to Subjects	41
	Protection for Subjects.....	42
	Confidentiality	42
	Informed Consent Process	43
	Analysis.....	43
IV.	RESULTS	45
	Major Descriptive Variables.....	45
	No Contest Pleas and Guilty Adjudications.....	45
	Age/Gender Related Variables.....	47
	Disclosure (Age and Gender).....	48
	Court Protocol.....	49
	Abuse Denials	50
	Age/Gender of Victim.....	51
	Age of Perpetrator	51
	The Perpetrator's Plea.....	51
	Descriptive Variables in Maternal Roles.....	52
	Abuse Type, Age/Gender and Other Variables.....	54
	Abuse Location	56

Table of Contents—continued

CHAPTER

Perpetrators' Relationship to the Victim	56
Variables Related to Court Action and Maternal Role.....	57
Controversial Maternal Roles and Applications.....	59
Ethnic Diversity in Child Sexual Abuse.....	61
Adjudications, Race and Gender of Perpetrator.....	62
Race and Gender of Perpetrator, Gender of Victim.....	63
Reported Authorities, Race/Gender Perpetrator	64
Parental Support, Race/Gender Perpetrator	65
Maternal Role Co-Victim/Race/Gender Perpetrator.....	67
Co-Perpetrator/Race/Gender of Perpetrator.....	68
Protector/Race/Gender of Perpetrator	68
Perpetrator/Race/Gender of Perpetrator.....	69
V. REVIEW, SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	70
Review.....	70
Summary of the Findings	71
Discussions.....	73
Conclusions	77
Implications	77
Recommendations for Further Study.....	78
APPENDICES	
A. TABLES 1-45.....	80

Table of Contents—continued

APPENDICES

B.	DEFINITIONS	107
C.	CODE DATA SHEET FOR CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE FAMILY AND CHILDREN COURT FILES (2003-04).....	112
REFERENCES		116

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A MSN/NBC special “Dark Heart/Iron Hand” was televised (channel 37) on December 3, 2003, regarding research on “Female Child Sexual Abuse Offenders in American State Prisons” (Dr. Patti Devin, 2001). The documentary revealed that out of approximately 600 women serving time in state prisons for child sexual abuse, 33% were mothers of the children who were the victims. One mother was interviewed and admitted, only after several years of therapy that she allowed and engaged in sexual abuse involving her seven year old daughter with her second husband living in the home (the step-father). The sexual abuse inflicted on the child was fondling, touching, pornography, as well as penetration by fingers, small objects, and eventual sexual intercourse with the stepfather, while the mother observed.

Dr. Davin (clinical psychiatrist) treated the daughter, mother, and step-dad. The diagnostic evaluations stated: the daughter suffered Posttraumatic Stress, denial, and disassociation; the mother was both a child and adult victim of sexual abuse, addicted to drugs and sex, and labeled a co-victim as well as co-perpetrator/co-conspirator; the step-dad/husband was a drug & sex addict, and labeled perpetrator and child victim of physical abuse. After numerous interviews were conducted on female offenders in the “American State Prisons”, the report concluded with these results: a) the child victims in sexual abuse cases are more protective of the mothers’ involved as the co-perpetrator/co-conspirator, than the father/step-dad involved in the abuse, and should be investigated more; b) the father/step-dad perpetrators were

convicted before the mothers or co-perpetrator/co-conspirator, due the mothers' constant denials promoting the daughters' recantation of her mothers' guilt.

A brief historic reflection illustrates how child sexual abuse has increased in the United States at a rate, which could be viewed as an epidemic. In 1974 sexual abuse of children was regarded as an uncommon problem, however in the late 1970's the problem received greater attention. Illustrations of child sexual victimization are reflected in: a) The American Humane Association increased from: 1,975 in 1976; 4,327 in 1977; 22,918 in 1982 (Finkelhor, 1984/p. 1); b) and approximately 84,320 new cases in 1997, these figures account for only 8% of confirmed victims (National Committee To Prevent Child Abuse; April 1998). The problem is thus much greater than these statistics revealed.

Literature and prevailing norms label "mothers" as the "protector" of their children. This is considered the "signature" role of the mother in general, and especially in relation to child sexual abuse. Controversies evolved when child sexual abuse cases reflected mother's who failed to protect. The "maternal roles" defining these so-called irresponsible "mothers" became known as: co-perpetrator/co-conspirator, co-victim, and perpetrator (Elbow & Mayfield, 1991; Bolen, 2001). Review of additional articles, and books on this subject reflected significant controversies, and therefore inspired this research to focus on the "maternal roles" of "Intrafamilial" child sexual abuse.

Numerous authors (Tower, 2002; Bolen, 2001; & Levesque, 1999) acknowledged social norms in society to protect women, children, and families. These norms were severed by the increase of child sexual abuse victims, and thus

exposed another realm of “maternal roles” identified as: 1) Protector (provider & nurturer) 2) Co-victim (subjected to physical & sexual abuse) 3) Co-perpetrator/Co-conspirator (joint participation in abuse/failure to protect and/or report) 4) Perpetrator (sexual molestation activity). These “maternal roles” are associated with the children of sexual abuse, and the sexual offenders within the family/social unit as follows:

The designated “co-conspirator” in child sexual abuse are those “mothers”, who did not report the abuse to the authorities whether they were aware of the abuse or not, and failed to protect their children; The mothers are identified as the “co-perpetrator”, when they also engage in sexual activities with their children, and/or allow such activity to take place without isolating and reporting the offender; The mother’s are identified as “co-victims” when they themselves are subjected to domestic violence, physical and/or sexual abuse; The mother’s identified as “perpetrator” engage or promote sexual abuse with foreign objects, fingers, and/or activities of child pornography, and incest. Finally, the mother’s identified as “protector” are those who attempt to prevent, intercede, or report sexual abuse. Elbow & Mayfield (1991) authored a controversial article indicating that these “maternal roles” have become intricate descriptions of situations within “Intrafamilial” Child Sexual Abuse.

According to Bolen (2001), the controversial “maternal role” types in “intrafamilial” child sexual abuse were generated from both previous and current, favored and unfavorable scholarly research, which remains scientifically, socially, and professionally influential. Also, mothers of sexually abused children have been subjected to a continuous mother-blaming trend, (Bolen (2001). Based on 300,200 cases in the Third National Incident Security studies conducted in 1981 (Finkelhor &

Hotaling, 1984); the statistical data imply a distinctive bias toward “perpetrators” in a caretaker role. Reports indicate that (10%) of “professionals” felt that “most” mothers knew about the abuse, and (61%) of the trained “caseworkers” felt that “some” mothers knew about the ongoing abuse. Bolen (2001) found that the culpability of maternal abuse was reflected in (46%) of the mothers being charged as offenders in child sexual abuse for failure to protect, even when they didn’t actually commit the abuse. Should these reports increase on a consistent basis, an investigation regarding institutionalized biases (Police Officers, Case Workers, Child Protective Services, Family & Children Services, etc.) against mothers of child sexual abuse victims may become justified.

The judicial process in family courts are daily confronted by disjointed families consisting of broken homes, extended families (Second & Third generations), and significant others with “live-in” status. These background factors are often associated with the increase in Child Abuse and Neglect Statistics (1998), the nationwide reports regarding a doubled increase of (41%/3,195,000) between 1988 and 1997, along with Child Protective Services experiencing dramatic increases in cases of Child Neglect & Abuse (National Committee To Prevent Child Abuse, April 1998).

Bolen (2001) reviews/evaluates the literature stemming from the past twenty years to illustrate that the mothers of sexually abused victims have been portrayed in a biased manner in the literature. According to Alexander (1985), and Frude (1982) mothers were identified as major contributors to the initiation of the abuse, and believed to collude both in ongoing incest by their not reporting the abuse, as well as

maintaining dynamics in the family that would support the incest. After analyzing numerous historical studies, a summarization of various authors and their early hypotheses concerning mother's role was compiled (Breckenridge & Baldry, 1997; Jacobs, 1990; McIntyre, 1981; Wattenerg, 1985).

The hypotheses tested by these authors reflect and generally emphasize the role of the mother as facilitating the incest passively, by withdrawing from their roles as mother and wife. Therefore, indicating this non-protective mother must have personality defects, which was "not" a product of co-victimization (Bolen, 2001). The same literature suggests that some mothers may derive unconscious pleasure from the father/daughter sexual interaction, while assuming the voyeuristic role (Jacobs, 1990 p. 502). Ironically, the earlier studies (1950-1980) were done by male physicians (Wattenberg, 1985), and upheld a strong bias against alleged maternal neglect in Child Sexual Abuse (Bolen, 2001).

Jon R. Conte, Ph.D., in his publication of "Critical Issues in Child Sexual Abuse" (2002) contributed a more liberal theoretical approach in attempts to alleviate any strong biases. Numerous authors were cited by Conte, for example: Roland C, Summit, a highly respected teacher, consultant, author, confidante, and mentor (Interviews/June 21 & August 13, 1996 conducted by David Corwin, M.D.); John E.B. Myers, JD, a professor of Law at the University of Pacific & McGeorge School of Law in Sacramento, California, and author of "Legal Issues in Child Abuse and Neglect Practice" (1998); "Incest: A Mother's Nightmare and Evidence in Child Abuse and Neglect (both: 1997); and the most noteworthy, Erna Olafson, Ph.D., Psy.D., is Director of the Program on Child Abuse Forensic and Treatment Training

at Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, and Director of the Childhood Trust Forensic Training Institute for the investigative interviewing of children, who is also a historian and co-author of "Victorian Women" (1981), and an article published entitled "Child Abuse" (1993), the history of child sexual abuse awareness. These authors gave more empirical accounts, on father/daughter incest in child sexual abuse, and the paradoxical issues on the child victim and mother figure persecuted both judicially and socially.

Faller (1990) designed a "Conceptual Framework" to define the variability in the contexts in which children are sexually abused (p. 53). A generalized differentiation of "intrafamilial" child sexual abuse was based on the proximity of both victim and offender. Various case studies reflected 14 years of clinical experience and research under the auspices of the Interdisciplinary Project on Child Abuse and Neglect (IPCAN) at the University of Michigan. These case studies were not consistent with general social myths or hypothetical suppositions pertaining to the child sexual abuse incest population. The demographics of "Intrafamilial" child sexual abuse incorporate the conceptual framework based on the proximity of both offender, and victim being inside the family nucleus (Faller, 1990). This paradigm's major focus is based on adult sexual abusers "only", who are recognized in the family unit as a mother/father, relative, friend, or significant other. Most importantly, this research focus is on the controversial "maternal" roles in Child Sexual Abuse (Protector, Co-Victim, Perpetrator, & Co-perpetrator/conspirator), in terms of prevalence.

A major problem in the literature is the absence of studies exploring a broader range of behaviors associated with the “maternal” role in child sexual abuse. Mothers of abuse victims often suffer from acute panic/anxiety attacks, major depression disorder, attachment disorder, and many others. The current researcher’s study should be viewed as an attempt to resolve numerous critical assertions made by scholars in both disciplines of psychology, and sociology regarding the “maternal” blame in child sexual abuse (Finklehor, 1984), while applying “new” research and theories in child sexual abuse. The “code data sheet” (See Appendix C) is the quantitative instrument utilized to implement a more structured, refined method for the process of gathering data, analyzing statistics, and summarizing results.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the literature and explore the data related to controversial “maternal roles” in Child Sexual Abuse. These roles have been identified as: the protector, co-victim, actual perpetrator, co-conspirator, and/or co-perpetrator (when involved in sexual activity). The intent is to use the court cases to determine, which empirical “maternal role” involved in these forty-one cases is most dominant. The data are reported in terms of both number and percents of each of the four “maternal” roles. The researcher was also concerned with the effects of selected variables (age, gender, race, etc.), that may be associated with the abuse cases, and maternal roles in regards to court adjudication, child placement, parental rights termination, and other judicial disposition processes involved in Child Sexual Abuse cases.

Finkelhor's (1981 & 1984) and Bolen's (2001) review of the literature revealed that studies on child sexual abuse were considerably "scarce", in comparison to the speculated rise of unreported cases, which inaccurately portrays a decrease in the crime of child sexual abuse. Due to these criminal and social controversies, Finkelhor (1981; 1984) and Bolen (2001) literally challenged both professionals and scholars to develop "new research" and "new theories".

In this research, the challenge is included in the attempt to construct an innovative research method for investigating "child sexual abuse" cases. In the process of gathering data to test existing theories, it is acknowledged that the results may have no immediate benefits to the mothers, children, or the courts. By utilizing an exploratory approach, however, assumptions drawn from the hypothesis that the dominant maternal role is that of "protector" can be determined in the analyses. The potential results of this research could possibly benefit clinicians, instructors, social services and possibly judicial officials, by clarification and application of the "controversial" maternal roles in "intrafamilial" child sexual abuse cases.

There is a continued necessity for more current research, in order to increase the existing knowledge base of maternal roles in sexual abuse cases for clinicians, families, students, teachers, and the general public in this area. Further explanation of significant research findings may identify more clarity in the profiles of the "victim", and "perpetrator" in terms of the behavioral attitudes, environmental influences, and probable causation of child sexual abuse. These findings may contribute toward significant changes in sociological perspectives regarding stereotypical views regarding the maternal blame, in child sexual abuse cases. Also, the Family Court

system could benefit, as it may possibly acquire new categories and criteria for rendering decisions on the child placement of the victims, and the punishment approach to mothers referred to as perpetrators, co-perpetrators, and co-victims. A prime example would be the term “co-perpetrator” often viewed as ambiguous because it is stereotyped as one of the “acting” child molester, while actually documented as “failure to protect”.

After clarification of the significance for this study, statements that raise significant research questions are addressed in the following section.

Statement of Hypotheses

Society assumes that the dominant role of the mother in child sexual abuse situations should be that of “Protector”. It is also proposed that when “Intrafamilial”, child sexual victimization occurs, if the mother’s lack of knowledge of the behavior, as in denial or does nothing, it justifies immediate child removal, with charges being implemented (Bolen, 2001; Elbow & Mayfield, 1991). Because mothers, who know of child sexual abuse victims don’t always report to authorities, statistics reflect that non-offending mothers in Child Sexual Abuse are characterized as collusive, thereby shifting much of the responsibility from the offender to the mother (Bolen, 2001). Thus, Bolen suggests that justice appears unfair when the boyfriend and/or stepfather in “intrafamilial” child sexual abuse are not subjected to the same court imposed sanctions. This is indicated by (51%) of Child Protective Services involving child sexual abuse cases reporting both male/female parents as offenders. However (49%) of the cases are charged to the mother as sole offender (Sedlak & Broadhurst, 1996;

Bolen 2001). Thus, in the category “mother/father” as offenders and the category of “mother” only, the most prominent offenders were mothers, either acting alone or as a partner.

This exploratory approach attempts to identify those factors that are pertinent, contributive, and problematic in explaining and understanding the “maternal roles” in child sexual abuse. These following questions serve as guidelines for analyzing and interpreting the data:

1. What is the dominant role the mother plays in child sexual victimization: protector, co-victim, perpetrator, or co-conspirator (also called a non-offending co-perpetrator)?
2. How does the most dominant “maternal role” effect, if any, the legal decisions (child placement, foster care, parental rights termination, etc.), and/or court adjudications (Guilty or No Contest Plea)?
3. Are the “maternal role” types of any significance for understanding child sexual abuse, in terms of being a predictive factor for possible abuse?

In order to effectively address the above research questions, finding the most appropriate theories are essential. Theories dealing with complex familial dynamics need broader, and more flexible conceptualizations.

Theoretical Perspectives

For the purpose of this “Intrafamilial” Child Sexual Abuse investigation, an eclectic theoretical approach is useful in identifying and explaining diverse factors

that impact maternal roles, and the adjudication process of mothers in family court. Kelly's Theory of Attribution (1967) provides a theoretical framework that relates to individual perceptions, and judgments toward environmental entities, or dispositional factors (Ford, 1998). The major significance of Kelly's theory is the flexibility that allows any and all attributing factors of an individual person, place, environmental influence, or object to be considered and/or included in research analyses. By enabling scientifically generated data on child sexual abuse to be quantitatively and qualitatively measured, Kelly's theory also contributes to the analytical process involved after the data are gathered for this particular research topic, because it requires a more social/psychological theoretical approach.

The "Family System Model" compliments "Kelly's Theory because both theories respect the individual, social, and environmental influence on the family unit. The "family system model" is often not considered user friendly when conducting a quantitative research, because the variables are difficult to measure using quantitative indicators. According to Finkelhor (1984), it is not favorably accepted by many theorists due to the perceived preoccupation with father/daughter incest and biased implications regarding mother/daughter responsibilities in sexual abuse. However, this model seems more conducive in to qualitative analyses, and is highly acclaimed and accepted by clinicians, and the mental health field (Babbie, 1998).

Alexander (1985), also viewed the Family Systems Model as more concerned with the family dynamics of incest, and proposes that initiating factors are derived from dysfunctional dynamics within the family. Based on this thesis, Larson & Maddock (1986) found that incest is symptomatic of a pervasive pathology within the

family. In an application of Alexander's theory, they introduced four types or patterns in "Intrafamilial" child sexual abuse (mother/father, step-mother/father, boyfriend/girlfriend, etc.). These patterns were: (1) Affection-exchange (the nurturing expression of sexual abuse as a substitute for affection); (2) Erotic-exchange (sexual activity as family interaction); (3) Aggressive-exchange (negative, hostile, humiliation/punishment family interaction); (4) Rage-expression (physical/sadistic usually non-consensual family interaction).

Several aspects of "Kelly's Theory", and "Family Systems Model" can be found in Finkelhor's major theoretical framework, which is compiled from his "Precondition Model for Sexual Abuse" (Child Sexual Abuse, 1984). The four (4) preconditions are: (1) Factors related to motivation to sexual abuse; (2) Factors predisposing to overcoming internal inhibitors; (3) Factors predisposing to overcoming external inhibitors; (4) Factors predisposing to overcoming child's resistance. Each factor represents variables, which have been identified as contributors to the social and personal behaviors associated with child sexual abuse. In family terminology this model explains that social, economic, physical, and mental/emotional factors effects the level of risk in child sexual victimization.

All theoretical perspectives can have negative and positive attributions in research as well as limitations, which are discussed in the next section.

Limitations

The following limitations to the methodology and data are recognized:

1. This study will be limited to a middle- sized county involved in Family & Children Courts regarding Child Sexual Abuse cases. The demographics are as follows: (1) Total population in year 1990 was 223,411, and in year 2000 it was 238,608. (2) Male population was 115,376 (48.4%) and female population was 123,227 (51.6%). (3) Median age was 32.7. (4) Children population (ages 0-17) were 57,396 (24.1%), and ages 18 & over were 181,212 (75.9%). (5) The recorded races were; Whites 206,278 (86.5%), Blacks 25,686 (10.8%), American Indian/Alaskan Native 2,805 (1.2%), and Other 4,839 (1.5%) (6) Family households were 57,936 (62%), and the same married were 44,548 (47.7%); the above with children under 18 there were 28,414 (30.4%) (7) Females without husband present were 10,260 (11%) and the same females with children under 18 in the home were 6,895 (7.4%).
2. There are no empirically established criteria for identifying mothers into any, of the four “maternal roles”. The 41 cases are limited to only one researcher’s identification, while another researcher may define an individual case differently.
3. This study is limited to the concentration on the “maternal” roles: protector, co-victim, perpetrator, co-perpetrator/conspirator in Child Sexual Abuse cases adjudicated Guilty and No Contest Plea. This is a skewed population not inclusive of all cases presented in 1999, 2000, & 2001.

4. Due to the exploratory approach significant observations drawn from the findings of this study, are limited to the maternal roles determined and defined by the researcher, based on the literature and cases studied involving child sexual abuse.
5. This study is limited to Intrafamilial Child Sexual Abuse consisting of both blood-related and non-blood related family members.
6. No data were collected relative to why the “behavior” occurs.
7. The possibility that “maternal roles” varied by ethnicity, religion, or class was not explored.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The mother is considered the central figure in the “Family Systems Model”. Her contribution balances the fluctuating familial roles, which defines the social norms and culture of a functioning or dysfunctional family unit (Tower, 2002; Levesque, 1999). An explicit illustration of such a norm is the “social familial” expectation. This social norm requires that the mother’s primary concern be the “protection” of her children from any obstacle of misfortune, *especially* sexual abuse (Bolen, 2001).

Various controversial literatures characterize the maternal roles in child sexual abuse as either villains, victims, or protectors (Elbow & Mayfield, 1991). Other terminologies more recently used are; perpetrator, co-perpetrator/co-conspirator, co-victim, non-offender, and offender (Faller, 1990). Articles that focus on mothers as co-conspirator/co-perpetrator argue that mothers do not always respond to revelations of incest with denial and passivity. Another perspective redirects the responsibility (Wattenberg, 1985) of the mother, suggesting that mothers are collusive in numerous incest (intrafamilial child sexual abuse) cases (Elbow & Mayfield, 1991).

Numerous scholars of “good intentions” have studied various components of child sexual abuse, using numerous synonyms such as: incest, intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse, pedophilia, molestation and/or maltreatment. Due to

definitional overlap and ambiguity in defining child sexual abuse, the focus here is on research, which specifically defines “child neglect and abuse” concentrating on “intrafamilial” child sexual abuse. Bolen (2001), Elbow & Mayfield (1991), and Finkelhor (1984; 1981) are researchers, who explicitly define “intrafamilial” sexual abuse as involving “*anyone*” considered inside of the family nucleus, that commits abusive acts, leaving “extrafamilial” abusers as anyone considered outside of the family nucleus. The family court files containing the research data for this study focuses entirely on intrafamilial child sexual abuse cases. Adult perpetrators in extrafamilial child sexual abuse are prosecuted in criminal court.

This research is designed to explore various explanations accounting for the maternal role in child sexual abuse. A few authors are concerned primarily with theoretical paradigms reflecting the “mothers” as literal villains, co-perpetrators/co-conspirators, and inadequate mothers, whose actions perpetuate the behavior of their abusive partners, without defense (Elbow, M. & Mayfield, J., 1991). The intention of this literature review is to investigate how previous researchers have explained or described the diversified maternal roles evidenced in “intrafamilial” child sexual abuse. The adjudications in Child Sexual Abuse cases reflect a stern judicial response toward mothers, due to their inability to protect the victim/child from sexual abuse by the offender. Mothers are subjected to a higher percentage of guilty adjudications and the stigma associated with this example is “bad” for mothers.

One particular author suggests a political and social bias against the mother’s of child victims:

Once a policy is set in motion on a particular course, it is difficult to change. This pattern has dictated the course for non-offending mothers. As a result it

is not surprising that mothers are still required to provide primary protections from the offender. It is not surprising that so many of them fail given the historic and, pejorative attitudes against them as they carry the full weight of society's failure, for its inability to protect its young members (Bolen 2001; p. 198).

If this pattern of offending mothers is demonstrated or revealed in these data, it can possibly lead to legal reforms, which are more egalitarian and less judgmental toward the maternal role. If this is not revealed in the data, a more in-depth accountability of distinct contributing factors regarding the "maternal role" needs further study.

"Literature in the 70's, and 80's adheres to the theoretical explanations that focus on the mother's personality, rather than on the perpetrator's behavior (Dietz & Craft, 1980) coupled with the need to protect the child victim, often contribute to practitioners overlooking how mothers cope with revelation of incest. Mothers are portrayed as villains and inadequate mothers, whose actions perpetrate the behavior of their abusive partners (Elbow & Mayfield, 1991; p. 79)". Other perspectives gleaned from literature reflect social norms governing issues on maternal blame. Theoretical perspectives reviewed describe the mother's behavioral and environmental influence, which contributes toward her reactions and explain the relationship of the victim, protector and perpetrator in terms of their identifications.

In the remainder of this chapter, a review of research and clinical literature reflecting the role of the mother as a major influential character in the family dynamics of child sexual abuse is completed. The mother's interaction with, and her relationship to both the victim and perpetrator is documented and reviewed. The first section addresses both current and dated literature on the mother's role in child sexual

abuse, the maternal blaming factors in child sexual abuse, and the literature defining specific maternal characteristics and behaviors involving child sexual abuse. The second section addresses literature on maternal dilemmas in child sexual abuse, and the third section concludes with social-psychological perspectives on mothers of child sexual abuse victims.

After a generalized conception of the literature on “maternal roles” in child sexual abuse, the following sections will highlight major descriptive roles of the “mother” in various situations.

Mother’s Role in Child Sexual Abuse

The mother is considered an intricate component of the family unit in the “family systems model”. Her contribution balances the fluctuating familial roles and mandates the course of a functioning or dysfunctional family core. In cases of child sexual abuse, the mother is investigated by a caseworker in Child Protective Services, and then usually categorized by the court as: (a) a protector because she reported or cooperated (b) co-victim, and/or co-perpetrator because of failure to protect/failure to report (c) perpetrator because of alleged guilt or “No Contest Plea” regarding child sexual abuse cases. This section discusses research and clinical literature utilized to clarify accusations of neglect, sexual abuse and/or failure to protect against such abuse, as well as acknowledging those mothers not held responsible, due to their own victimization (Towers, 2002).

Assigned Maternal Role For Child Sexual Abuse

Social and cultural norms, including values have induced extreme responsibilities to the maternal care of children creating a maternal ideal that is seldom, if ever reached. Once a social norm evolves into social policy, it is an extremely difficult process to change. An illustration of such a norm is the “social familial” expectation, which requires the mother’s primary concern be the protection of her children from any obstacle of misfortune, *especially* sexual abuse (Bolen, 2001).

According to some research, mothers in sexual abuse cases are often portrayed as literal villains, and inadequate mothers, whose actions perpetuate the behavior of their abusive partners, and are without defense (Elbow, M. & Mayfield, J., 1991). Literature in the 70’s and 80’s propagated numerous theoretical explanations, such as: (1) Predisposition of a sexually abused mother is passivity toward sexual abuse of her child victim. (2) A physically abused mother is usually collusive with the perpetrator. These statements focus on the mother’s personality, rather than researching the pathology of the perpetrator’s behavior (Dietz & Craft, 1980). The need to protect the “child victim” often contributes to practitioners overlooking how mothers cope with revelation of incest (Elbow, & Mayfield, p. 79).

Conte (et.al., 1991) commented that an apology from mothers who fail to protect their child from sexual abuse may seem pointless. However, in the finding of Conte, Fogarty, and Collins (1991), out of 1,971 sexual abuse incidents (59%) of professionals agreed that the mothers of incest victims should apologize to their child for failure to protect. This type of literature, depending on the research focus, could

be used in justifying “blame on the mother camp”, while instituting another social norm, if never challenged. Bentovim, (1991) is one who views most families as doubtful for rehabilitation when the mother, although accepting that the abuse took place cannot see that she had any role in being unavailable to her child (p. 194). This could be the justification for “apologies”.

To perceive that culpability of the mother in child sexual abuse describes an emotionally unstable female perpetrator may be viewed as extremely judgmental. However, by ignoring the impact of empirical data validation, literature reiterates “case studies” and theories on the “attribution of blame”. This alludes to partial maternal responsibility in child sexual abuse cases (Bolen, 2001). Studies found that (10%) of the 1,971 of professionals “felt” that “most” mothers knew about the ongoing abuse, and another (61%) “felt” that “some” mothers “knew”. Those who were most likely to hold this belief were professionally trained caseworkers, as compared to post-disclosure counselors and other professionals (Bolen, p. 193).

Research by the National Incidence Study (1981) began to indicate that, the judicial system was seriously becoming biased in child abuse and neglect cases. As the allegations and adjudications increase annually percentage wise, so have the charges against mothers of abused victims. According to Bolen (p. 193), in 1981, out of the 1,971 cases reported (46%), of the mothers of child sexual abuse victims were charged and listed as “offenders” (mothers), according to the National Incidence Study (NIS). The charges against mothers were not allegations or charges of committing sexual abuse, instead they were charged for failure to protect (Bolen, 2001).

It is imperative that a longitudinal study be conducted in order to bring attention to possible patterns of justice or injustice applied to mothers of abused victims. The trend of maternal prosecution of abuse victims is supported in third National Incident Study conducted in 1993, representing 225,000 abuse cases, where (87%) of “parental abuse” involved males and out of parental abuse (28%) involved female sexual abuse (Sedlak & Broadhurst, 1996). This finding implies that (13%) of all abuse was perpetrated solely by mothers and that another (15%) of all abuse involved both a mother and father (Bolen, 2001; p. 82).

In the most recent National Incident Study done through the National Child Abuse and Neglect Defense System (NCANDS) there were 126,065 sexual abuse incidents (51%) of child sexual abuse cases identified by child protective services, which were committed by parents (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2000c). In Bolen’s study (p. 194), more than half of these cases were mothers charged as the sole offender (4% of all abuse) or co-charged as co-offenders (23% of all abuse) (Bolen, p.194). These reports could be viewed as implications that mothers are held more accountable than fathers in parental child sexual abuse.

Mothers “Not” Held Responsible For Child Sexual Abuse

Some literature concerning the role of the mother in the prevention of and intervention into child abuse addresses the blame of the mother for child sexual abuse. The extent to which such sexual abuse occurs alone is cited as evidence that mothers are not doing their jobs of protecting their children from abuse. A study

done on 930 women by Russell (1983) revealed blatant disputes in terms of blaming the mother:

Further research shows 30% to 40% of females and 13% or more of males are sexually abused in childhood (Bolen & Scannapieco, 1999), suggesting that child sexual abuse is of epidemic proportions. Also, emphasizing that so many of our children being abused is a failure of our society-not of our mothers (Bolen, 2001; p. 195).

Some scholars suggest that to use such figures to disparage mothers is possible only because of the inappropriate sense of responsibility and mountainous expectations of the maternal role (Bolen 2001). Such expectations, they suggest, are largely responsible for utilizing mothers as the “scapegoat” on this issue.

According to Bolen & Scannapieco (1999), there is a most unfortunate preconception that the “all knowing” mother is therefore “all responsible” in child sexual abuse cases. The fact remains that epidemic proportions of child sexual abuse contribute to complexities in the filial and nonfilial relations, which hinders protection by the non-offending guardian (Bolen & Scannapieco, 1999). In fact oversights by legal authorities, such as “joint” legal and physical custody tend to hinder the mother’s ability to protect and support the abused victim (Elbow & Mayfield, 1991; p. 79). This social and legal bias is especially evident, when suspicions arise regarding ulterior motives in divorce and child custody battles, and reported child abuse cases occurs (Deaton & Sandlin, 1980; Henderson, 1980; Justice & Justice, 1977; et al. p. 79).

Bolen observed that other scholars develop these suggestions that mothers, per se are not to blame, by citing studies that the mothers’ “own” sexual abuse as children is not related to their ability to support their child/children after disclosure about

abuse (2001). Even under these difficult circumstances, such mothers are as likely to support their children. Also, there are significant obstacle courses designed for the “maternal” sexual offender, which may suggest judicial partiality, in terms of the enormous bureaucratic hoops a mother endures on behalf of reunification with their children, and to absolve themselves of blame. Elbow & Mayfield are considered feminist scholars that counter the predilection to blame mothers for the sexual abuse of their children by suggesting they should be viewed as co-victims (1991). This perspective attempts to vindicate mothers from their current label of *co-perpetrator* (Herman & Hirshman, 1981; McIntyre, 1981). Both are recognized as legitimate concerns and need further exploration.

Still other scholars suggest the inappropriateness of blaming mothers for child sexual abuse using the metaphor of the police officer. In other words, just as police officers cannot be blamed for every crime, these scholars suggest that mothers are characterized as police officers within their own homes (Bolen, 2001). We must conceptualize the enormity of crime, calculate the propensity of crime, and analyze the diversity of crime before we blame all police officers for “not” preventing the crime. This analogy creates various probabilities toward significant findings, which indicated that most sexual abuse cannot be prevented by non-offending guardians. Sexual abuse occurs in too many locations, by too many types of filial, and non-filial relations using too many different methods of approach, for guardians to adequately protect their children” (Bolen, 2001; p. 196).

Bolen introduced another approach that scholars take regarding those who believe that to blame the mother for child sexual abuse is unfair and inaccurate

suggests there are others who are, and need to be, involved in the processes of prevention and intervention. Authoritative power is a significant factor, which legitimizes appropriate law enforcement within agencies to effectively deal with child sexual abuse. The protection of both the victim and protective guardian reporting sexual abuse can be sustained under enforcement of the law within its jurisdiction. Unfortunately, with enormous limitations in producing valid evidence to match numerous complaints of child sexual abuse, a severe loss in familial protection could emerge. The myth perpetuated by the professional literature and practices, that mothers are all knowing and therefore all responsible is no longer acceptable (2001).

Bolen also suggests that fathers, not just mothers, are and should be central to the process. A recent study on sexually abused children undergoing a forensic exam observed that only mothers of the victims were routinely asked to accompany the victim. The striking component of this study revealed that one important predictor of the child's outcome was whether both parents accompanied their child to the hospital. Children who had the participation of both parents experienced lower posttraumatic symptoms, symptomatology scores, and total behavioral problems. Preoccupation with the non-offending mother and failure to include the father may be detrimental to the well-being of the child (2001).

Some scholars absolve mothers of blame by citing the activities in which mothers do, and do not engage which suggest their concern for the protection of their children, and willingness to intervene. The fact that mothers tend to be the ones who talked to their children about sexual abuse is used as one such means of support to suggest that mothers should not be blamed for this condition. One study revealed

that, “mothers tend to advise talking to the child before the father at the mean age of (8.6) years compared to the father mean age of (9.8) years” (Finkelhor, 1984; p. 138). The mothers communicated better than fathers on the subject of sexual abuse, which coincides with their provisionally assigned responsibility to translate concerns on sexual abuse to their children (Finkelhor, 1984). More recent studies reflect that much has changed since 1984.

Similarly the fact that mothers report and believe their children’s disclosure in high percentages, also suggests they are aware, concerned, and have assumed responsibility on this issue. In fact, a review of 16 available studies on guardian support found that an average of (81%) of mothers across studies responded with some, or full support, and (65%-85%) believed their child’s disclosure (Bolen, 2001; p. 197).

The defense that most mothers participate in collusion “purposely” is not empirically supported. There should be fair recognition to maternal denials of fraudulent accusations, in reference to Webster’s definition of collusion being “two (2)” people in fraudulent agreement for “deceitful” purposes. Bolen (2001) and his constituents imply that empirical data has not confirmed that maternal collusion is dominant within intrafamilial, and/or extrafamilial child sexual abuse.

The fact that the vast majority of mothers do not collude with perpetrators in ongoing incest is also cited to suggest, they do not deserve blame for the sexual abuse of their children (Bolen, 2001). The factor of non-disclosure by the children of sexual abuse confirms, that mothers can’t report what they “do not” know (Russell, 1983). A strong feminist perspective dictates that collusion requires equal access to power

and information, which is not accessible to the majority women in male/female parental roles (Bolen & Scannapieco, 1999; Driver, 1989). Further studies challenge the theory of collusion by referencing the widespread increase of mothers reporting child sexual abuse perpetrators, who are live-in partners to the authorities (Elbow & Mayfield, 1991; Siries & Lofberg, 1990).

Maternal Dilemmas Regarding Child Sexual Abuse

The literature cites numerous uncertainties which mothers face when extrafamilial and especially “intrafamilial” child sexual abuse is uncovered. A few prominent scholars have gathered data, which documented the response to these traumatic situations.

The role of the mother is historically associated with nurturing and protection. Ironically, the theory of collusion is formulated by the same cultural system, without significant empirical validation. A review of 16 studies of 1,518 guardians reflected that, when sexual abuse was inflicted by the mother’s live-in partner, only 5% of the mothers knew about the ongoing abuse by the father, but “felt powerless to stop it” (Faller, 1990; p. 67).

Another study on the same population reflected that in sexual abuse by grandfathers, (87%) of mothers were unaware of the ongoing abuse (Margolin, 1992). In those cases, which the mother had been sexually abused by this same man (her father and the victim’s grandfather) (79%) were unaware of the ongoing abuse as compared to (92%) of mothers not involved in “tri-generational” abuse. Myer (1985)

found (75%) of mothers were unaware of the ongoing abuse by their partner (Bolen, 2001; p. 190).

Another major indication that mothers are unaware of their child's abuse is massive lack of disclosure to anyone (Russell, 1983). The cliché "mothers can't report what they do not know" is an appropriate response toward maternal accusations. Many statistics that defend this cliché indicate mothers whose partners are guilty of abusing their child are responsible for legal disclosure (Elbow & Mayfield, 1991; Siries & Lofberg, 1990). Clearly, the theory of collusion is incongruent with numerous widespread studies revealing the powerlessness or the lack of knowledge regarding mothers of child sexual abuse victims (Bolen, 2001).

Maternal Uncertainties In Child Sexual Abuse

There have been various commentaries on mothers claiming suspicions of child sexual abuse, without any proactive measures implemented. Another major component to a mother's dilemma in child sexual abuse is the discovery and fact-finding process (Hooper, 1992). Suspicions of one incident, or many incidents over a long duration, are due to the lack of or inaccessibility to clear information pertaining to child sexual abuse. The mother is often burdened with changing, multiple, and conflicting versions from the child and denial from the perpetrator. Not to mention the discernment between "daddy's girl" and peculiar behaviorisms concerning a father and his daughter or son (Bolen, 2001).

Events performed in secrecy become jigsaw puzzles to be solved in a timely process. Even though it is difficult to believe, few studies acknowledge lack of

physical evidence, and/or no observation of the abuse, especially when the victim is in denial and/or recants (Bolen, 2001).

Even though it should not be that difficult to understand specific maternal limitations under the dire circumstances of child sexual abuse, some professionals beg to differ. Expectations of extremely heightened vigilance are familiar mandates by professionals as an appropriate “first response” to suspicions, even though lacking proof regarding sexual victimization. When the suspected offender is the father of the victim, the mother is instantaneously subjected to tremendous pressure by authority figures such as: Child Protective Services, Family & Children Services, and Family & Children Courts (Bolen, 2001).

There are numerous guilt stressors involved, when the mothers of abuse victims realize the enormous repercussions involved in terms of; one (1) oversight, error in suspicion, allegation, and/or judgment of child sexual abuse, which is overwhelmingly evident in the court system. When the knowledge becomes public, the chaos initiates confusion, which creates a sequence of denial and recantation by both victims and perpetrators. Hooper (1992) recognized the mothers’ desire to accommodate familial necessities by her attempts to mask her ambivalence. Both Hooper and Humphreys (1998) discussed how mothers yielded to their unstable fluctuating and/or contradictory positions of belief and disbelief from day to day. It is not uncommon to witness the characteristics and behaviorisms displaying spontaneous, emotional, defensive, hysterical, along with sometimes combative, legal, and hostile consequences, which are often followed by familial and social isolation (Bolen, 2001).

Few scholars have described the emotional responses of a mother confronted with the sexual abuse of her child by her partner. To produce an imagery of such a crime it is necessary to understand the conflicting images and emotions of the mother. She must reflect on numerous perceptions of the relationship with her child, the offender, and their views of marriage vows, monogamous commitments, parenting, along with the immediate actions of separation, living arrangements, employment, foster care, and possible divorce proceedings (Elbow & Mayfield, 1991). All of this complexity of feelings and anguish can occur within the mother, without anyone knowing what she is experiencing. It is the lack of this information that may hinder a more appropriate evaluation and adjudication in family courts.

In extrafamilial (a non-family member) child sexual abuse there is seldom a question on protocol, because there are clear and precise, social, judicial, and emotional expectations to pattern after. The dogma in relations to Intra-familial (inner-family) Child Sexual Abuse is not officially etched in stone, on a consistent basis socially, judicially, and emotionally. Still, there are several questions remaining; "What's a mother to do when she is not sure?" Aren't the major factors in marriage and family built on love and trust? How swiftly must the maternal role respond to possibly catastrophic situations involving intrafamilial child sexual abuse allegations? The "two words" "I Do" in marriage can be terminally eradicated by the "two words" "I believe" in Child Sexual Abuse allegations. Hooper views such action as impositions, which sometimes permanently damages family relationships, based on mere suspicions (1992).

Bolen indicates that the support system for legitimate errors in judgment or false allegations in child sexual abuse is lacking, to say the least (2001). If this is true, then maternal dilemmas regarding intrafamilial child sexual victimization could rapidly become detrimental to the mental physical, social, and economic well-being of family systems.

Psycho-Social Perspectives Regarding Mothers In Child Sexual Abuse

Abbot (1995), and Cohen (1983), essentially view marriage as instituted for the patriarchal system's requirement of loyal dependence. Wives were expected to produce children and were viewed as weak, helpless, powerless, needy and dependent upon their husbands to fulfill their great emotional needs. Zuelzer and Reposa (1983, p. 101; Bolen, 2001) propose a more controversial and "blaming the mother" perspective when they suggest that "incestuous mothers" function at a "pre-genital level" and will go to "any" length to satisfy their needs for affection, attention and support, even if at the cost of their own children" (Bolen, 2001; p. 189). This perspective indicates that the mother's role as "protector" is relinquished for sexual gratification provided their children in replacement intimacies of an adult male.

The labeling of these mothers as "incestuous" could promote a legal basis for incarceration, based on allegations of intrafamilial sexual abuse. This supposition feeds into the assumption that wives are dependent on their husbands, and that the eventual strain caused by marital conflicts eventually promote the inability to protect their daughters from sexual abuse (Elbow & Mayfield, 1991). Other characteristics of "mothers who failed to protect" found in early clinical literature refer to the denial

and repression by both the mother and her children's sexual victimization, which is mentioned as the major contributor to her maternal negligence (Jacobs, 1990). Frude (1982) indicates the probable posttraumatic stress disorder may add to the misery of the victimized matriarch and cause total denial of the plight of her child as the abused victim (Bolen, 2001).

A legitimate concern would be the absence of affection within the mother-child relationship. This is considered another primary feature of incest, which may stimulate intrafamilial child sexual abuse according to Tierney & Corwin, in Finkelhor (1981; p. 108). Daughters of incest reported to clinicians of the UCLA Family Support Program that a very cool disposition existed between the mother and daughter before the sexual abuse incident. Also research statements published by Herman and Hirschman (1987) revealed daughters of incest reporting estrangement from their mothers throughout childhood (Finkelhor, 1981).

It is apparent that for whatever reason, some wives abandon and reject their role as a nurturing wife and mother. Clinical and medical explanations reveal the lack of and inability to tolerate intimacy and ambivalence about her sexuality (James & Mackinnon, 1990).

The next theory attributed a conscious or subconscious rejection of the maternal role in the family and promoting the oldest daughter to fulfill the emotional, physical and sexual needs of the husband. Evidently this action induced the father to seek satisfaction of his sexual desires with his daughter (Cohen, 1983; Frude, 1982; Bolen, p. 188).

The theory of withdrawal of the mother often appears in tandem with that of collusion (Cohen, 1983). It is probable that instruments utilized in psychosocial research are producing conflicting findings on victims of role reversal. One example is a study done on 40 adults, who experienced father-daughter incest as children. Herman, (1981) found that (45%) of the victims, as compared to (5%) of non-abused women reported that they were in the role of a parental child. The same researcher argued that a positive rationale for maternal role reversal is associated with severe burdens, multiple stressors, and exhaustive obligations that require extra assistance. Since traditional social norms and familial roles preclude the mother's assistance by their male partners, the next responsible female child is summoned usually without question by both parents (Herman, 1981; Bolen, 2001; p. 191).

Early theorists hypothesized that because these families displayed social isolation and mother-daughter role reversal, the possibility of incestuous behavior may exist (Frude, 1982). The Herman (1981) study of 40 adult cases of father/daughter incest, as children found it ironic that incest offenders are both intra/extrafamilial abusers of multiple families inclusive of both blood relatives and non-blood related families. A few prime examples are: (49%) of incest offenders abused non-related female children; (12%) abused non-related male children; (19%) committed rape; and (20%) committed exhibitionism in a study done by Abel, et al., (1988). These findings do not concur with the theoretical approach that isolated family systems with mother/daughter role reversal are predominant factors in child sexual abuse cases.

Any mother who thought of her needs over her husband's sexual desire and demands was considered deviant within the context of the cultural norm requirement of servitude to others first and self last (Bolen, 2001). McIntyre's analysis of this literature labels this lack of commitment as "flight of responsibility" and defines mothers as unable or unwilling to satisfy their husbands sexually. These mothers became labeled frigid or hostile as opposed to sexually dysfunctional (1998; p. 463). Regardless of the motivation behind the mother's sexual and emotional withdrawal, be it her lack of desire or desirability of the fathers, it raises the likelihood of marital discord (Cohen, 1983). This seems to exacerbate the husband's sexual preference for children (Faller, p.67; Bolen, 2001).

It is evident that intra/extrafamilial structures are extremely important components in recognizing and studying the family incest process (Pozanski, & Blos, 1975; Finkelhor, 1979). The reconstituted "stepfather" is recognized in the increase in child sexual exploitation. It is assumed that the mother's abdication, or inability to perform facilitates the father's illicit contact with his step-daughter (Bolen, 2001). The feminists view male culture and socialization as the initiator in sexual objects of interest, and sexual relationships. An example is the value that male socialization puts on being dominant, powerful, and engaging in sexual relationships (Gross, 1978; Hite, 1981; Russell 1982b). Therefore the analogy of male preference toward sexual partners younger, smaller and weaker than themselves illustrates male cultural expectations and a "child's" qualifications in sexual abuse (Bolen, 2001).

Nakhle Tamraz (1996) ran studies comparing personality and psychological characteristics in mothers of sexually abused children to mothers of other populations.

Three studies were done comparing characteristics of mothers of victims of father-daughter incest to mothers of non-incestuous abuse (Bennett, 1980; Harrer, 1981; Archer, & Winstead, 1990). These studies revealed that mothers who were victims of father-daughter incest reported higher levels of depression and interpersonal guardedness, greater weaknesses in reality testing and more separation and threats of separation from their children.

In summarization of the studies, it should be noted that women who lose their spouses due to the child sexual abuse judicial process, could have legitimate reasons for being depressed and guarded. It was further noted that there were more similarities than differences found in both mothers of sexually abused children, and mothers of other populations. The most astounding finding was that in one out of the five studies it was revealed that mothers of sexually abused victims scored as more problematic on personality and psychological characteristics, than the victims (Peterson et al, 1993; Bolen, 2001). This may suggest that, not only the children but the mother's of sexually abused victims may suffer from Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, and/or Major Depression due to the sexual abuse of her child. Also the mother could induce more emotional instability in the victim.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Overview

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived maternal role of “protector” in Child Sexual Abuse. The objective was to determine, if maternal roles introduced in more recent studies, on Child Sexual Abuse cases were present in this sample. These additional maternal roles identified were: perpetrator, co-victim, and co-perpetrator/conspirator.

The research methodology for this study is discussed in the following sections of this chapter: (1) Conceptual Framework, (2) Type of Design, (3) Population and Sampling Procedure, (4) Instrumentation, (5) Validity and Reliability, (6) Data Collection Procedure, (7) Statistical Analysis.

Conceptual Framework

In an attempt to explore the descriptions of “Intrafamilial Child Sexual Abuse”, a “Family Systems Model” was utilized as the core reference. In theoretical terms the family represents the “core unit” within the societal system’s operation, which both affects the outside environment and is effected by the outside environment through continuous daily functional interaction. This model was perceived as the most useful approach, which provided the best rationale for the research perspective related to the methodology for this study. This approach assesses the effects of numerous variables on a small number of family units (41)

gathered from Child Sexual Abuse court files. Rather than viewing this crime as originating solely from a male perpetrator with adjustment, or dysfunctional family problems (Finkelhor, 1981; Tierney & Corwin), an exploration was done with the “maternal roles” as defined in the literature: protector, co-victim, co-perpetrator/conspirator, and perpetrator. Exploratory research on the adjudications also applied to the mothers of Child Sexual Abuse victims, and other significant contributing factors.

Type of Design

The nature of this research involved an effort to obtain qualitative data from family court files, which contain information about child sexual abuse cases. This research method is defined as “Content Analysis of Secondary Data”. This method entails a coding system, and a survey instrument with categories that allows one to conduct an “aggregate analyses”, and for this study it entails the process of gathering qualitative data from the court files.

The “Code Data Sheet” is the research instrument utilized to gather the specific data relating to the maternal role and relationships in intrafamilial child sexual abuse cases. The independent variables are: the age, gender, and race of the victim, parent/guardian, and perpetrator. The age covers one (1) day old to one hundred (100) years, and the race is defined in accordance with the categories established by the U.S. Census Bureau. The assumptions supporting the descriptive variables are: (1) The child who experiences sexual abuse is considered the victim; (2) The court recognizes the adult responsible for the sexually abused victim as the

parent/guardian; (3) The court recognizes the “adult” responsible for sexual abuse toward the child victim as the sexual offender, or perpetrator.

Population and Sampling Procedure

This research population was drawn from a mid-sized city (Kalamazoo, MI), with the reputation of being a “college town” given the presence of Western Michigan University. The total population (according to the government census) in 1990 was 223,411 increasing in 2000 to 238,608 reflecting 115,376 (48.4%) males and 123,227 (51.6%) females. The racial population was: Whites 205,278 (86.5%); Blacks 25, 686 (10.8 %); American Indian/Native Alaskan 2,805 (1.2); Other 4,839 (1.5%).

The ethnic diversity represented in this study is not a common characteristic of studies included in the literature review. This study produces a “keener” insight on age, race, and gender influence pertaining to each child sexual abuse case. The focus on controversial “maternal roles” of “intrafamilial child sexual abuse resulted in limitations on available resources. Thus, the diversity of this sample provided a unique opportunity to explore the relationship between race/ethnicity and Child Sexual Abuse.

A universe or total population study is considered ideal for sociological investigations. However, this study consists of (41) adjudicated Child Sexual Abuse cases. These cases represents the 1999, 2000, and 2001 court cases that were “Guilty” and “No Contest Plea” adjudications in the Family & Children Courts of Kalamazoo County, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Instrumentation

Information pertaining to the purpose of this study was gathered for the court files. Given this researcher's credentials (Ph.D. Candidate/Sociology, CSW, MSW), training, experience, and professional position (Family Therapist) relative to the courts, access to court records was permitted, which resulted in the (41) cases reported. In consultation, a professional child abuse researcher and member of my committee (Dr. James Henry, 1997) allowed me the privilege to review his research instrument, and permission was granted for revisions to accommodate this research.

The appropriate revisions were made by the choice of categories, which described specifics in child sexual abuse cases. Based on the literature review, specific descriptive categories from Henry's code data sheet were retained, and some were omitted, when the major focus was on the victim's disclosure, and/or lacked relevance to the "controversial maternal role in child sexual abuse".

Validity and Reliability

The validity of this study depends on accurate interpretation of the available data and the appropriate assignment to one of these four categories: (1) Protector (2) Co-Victim (3) Co-Perpetrator/Co-Conspirator and (4) Perpetrator. The research instrument "Code Data Sheet" utilized was borrowed from the publication of Dr. James Henry's article, "System Trauma; Following The Disclosure Of Child Sexual Abuse" (1997). In order to gather relevant data and maintain significant focus on the "maternal roles" (instead of disclosure) of child sexual abuse, the "code data sheet" was revised. The revision was initiated to meet the limitations associated with

gathering data from these confidential files, by eliminating categories not associated with the present research focus.

The reliability for the “code data sheet” utilized in this study as a research instrument depends on the quality of the existing data in the court files, and the researchers ability to conduct the analysis. The child sexual abuse case files are sealed (closed to the public), which reduces the possibility of someone outside of the court system tainting the files. Unfortunately, due to human error there are still possibilities for problems involved in the accuracy of the reports, as well as the possible unconscious limitation of the “investigator”. A few very common investigator biases are: gender, race, and culture. When dealing with a delicate and also highly controversial subject, such as child sexual abuse, a keen awareness is necessary at all time for possible unconscious biases. Cross-tabs were produced with significant variables to determine the association (if any) between independent variables and dependent variables, and to identify patterns in the data.

Research Procedure/Subject Selection

The data were collected from “family court” adjudicated case files on child sexual abuse and neglect charges, covering years 1999, 2000, and 2001, in the Kalamazoo County Family and Children Courts. Forty-two (41), of a total of one hundred thirteen (113) case files, forty-one were found in the categories of “guilty” or “no contest plea” only. The other seventy-one case files were excluded in the adjudication and categorized as: dismissed, not guilty, denied, and withdrawn cases.

Research cannot begin without formal permission granted from HSIRB, which was successfully accomplished. A letter (with official seal) was sent from the “presiding judge” of Family & Children Courts permitting access to court files on child sexual abuse for “research purpose only”. The letter was received and forwarded to the “Western Michigan University Committee.” The committee found the proposal acceptable and the research was allowed to proceed.

Once the permission was granted and the court files were made available, the research began with “Content Analysis of Secondary Data”, as the chosen research method. This research method entails gathering secondary data from written documents and recording pertinent information into categories listed on a “code data sheet”, which were utilized for the research analyses. Careful consideration was taken to ensure that information being recorded was consistent with categories on the code data sheet.

If the information was inconsistent or could not be placed in any of these categories, new categories were created. After coding was completed various categories were reviewed to see if they could be collapsed into a dichotomous (1 variable with 2-classifications) set of categories for the data analysis. If and when there were cases that could not fit into the collapsed categories, further collaboration with my committee led to the application of the most appropriate procedure for analyzing additional categories.

This project gathered information on the “mother’s role” vis-a-vis the victim, and the maternal “relationship” with the victim and perpetrator. The research data were

scattered throughout various sections of the file, and could not be found in systematic categories

The revised “Code Data Sheet” was used to collect demographics and specifications on the victim, on the maternal role, and on the maternal relationship to both victim and offender. These data were then cross-tabulated in order to identify any patterns of relationships.

The court files contains pertinent demographics in relation to the maternal role in child sexual abuse. This means that the files contain: information, perceptions, evaluations and specifically the support/non-support provided by the maternal figure. There are specific indicators that pertain to the mother’s interaction, and her relationship to both the victim and perpetrator as documented by the assigned caseworker/social workers responsible for the intake assessment/evaluation. The researcher’s expectation in reading the files are: (1) The ability to collect meaningful data, which corresponds with specific theoretical frameworks pertaining to the mothers’ “maternal abilities”; (2) The ability to collect meaningful data, which corresponds with specific theoretical frameworks pertaining to the mothers’ “inabilities” to *protect* their children from “intrafamilial sexual abuse”.

Risks to Subjects

Identifiable data about the child, victim and perpetrator in child sexual abuse court files was respected and recognized as highly sensitive materials by employees, social workers, lawyers, prosecutors, and therapists, like myself. Even though this research was being conducted by a social scientist/sociologist/therapist, legalities

were professionally bound, under a nationally acclaimed allegiance to the “Professional Code of Ethics and Confidentiality” entrusted in the therapeutic (clinical social worker) role. These were decisive factors that influenced the courts trust in the researcher, and data analysis regarding these particular files.

Protection for Subjects

It necessary to reaffirm that subjects contained in this research were protected, and that identifiable characteristics such as particular specifics surrounding the court allegations, names, addresses, and religious preferences were not the focus of this research. Also, there are no identifiable documentations on the correspondence or communication regarding the victims, or perpetrators involved in the child sexual abuse court cases. Because this was an aggregate analysis, identifiable characteristics like names, phone numbers, and addresses were “*not*” questions on the “Code Data Sheet” and these were not identifiable in the final research analysis. Variables, such as race, gender, and age are not considered identifiable characteristics, and therefore considered safe retrievable data.

Confidentiality

The access to the court approved child sexual abuse files were provided by the “court clerk” in charge of child sexual abuse files. The printouts of approved files for “research purpose only” were identifiable by case numbers. The files do not leave the office, and data were gathered at all times in this controlled (supervised) environment.

Confidentiality of all collected data in this research project was ensured by

the following procedures: (1) Transportation of all research data collected (court files not included) was in a locked briefcase. (2) Storage of all research data was in a locked file cabinet. (3) Data will be stored in a locked file in the principal investigator's office (Dr. Douglas Davidson's office in Sangren Hall) for at least three years. (4) A letter (or addendum) was sent to Family Court affirming the above statements of confidentiality.

In order to ensure, and secure the intentions of an unbiased research, along with the privacy of subjects and confidentiality of information, additional safeguards were taken during this research such as: (1) As the "Investigator/Researcher", I was "not" available to accept "any" child sexual abuse referrals until this research project reached completion. (2) As the Investigator/Researcher", there were no "expectations" to participate in sexual abuse cases (pending or subpoena) in Family Court throughout the duration of the research.

Informed Consent Process

Due to the elimination of "all" identifiable data from the court files during the "coding" process and in the "finalized report", there was not a "consent document" submitted.

Analysis

In the analysis, a search for association, relationship, and correlation were performed, by the cross-tabulation of variables. The calculated percentages of the dependent variables (protector, co-conspirator, perpetrator, & co-victim) and cross-

tabs of the independent variables (age, race, and gender) produced descriptive statistics, reflecting the nominal data collected from child sexual abuse case files. After the data collection was completed, the data was transferred to SPSS (Software Program for Social Science) and cross-tabs were run. It was from this procedure, that questions attributed to the most “prevalent maternal role” in intrafamilial child sexual abuse cases were evaluated. Given the smallness of sample and lacking of cases in certain categories, tests of significance were not computed.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results and analysis based on calculated percentages of each item on the code data sheet. It is organized in the following sections: (a) major descriptive variables in percentage form with brief explanations, and ethnic/racial/gender diversity (b) maternal role variables. The first section identifies selected variables found to be associated with the various “maternal roles” identified in child sexual abuse cases. This section also presents percentages for the dominant factors in each variable such as age gender, race and other pertinent factors.

The second section both defines, and describes the dominant “maternal role” in these child sexual abuse cases. The cross-tabulation of variables should provide a keen insight to correspond with the exploratory approach. The variables age, race, and gender, should reflect diversity, and conclude with the conceptualization of the “dominant maternal” role in Child Sexual Abuse victims from the findings.

Major Descriptive Variables

No Contest Pleas and Guilty Adjudications

The “No Contest Plea” is considered an “admission” of guilt, and automatically waives any testimony, evidence, or cross-examination on the individual’s behalf. This allows for an expeditious dispositional hearing, which expedites the jurisdiction process. The court has the right to exercise official authority over the child, and the appropriate placement of a child victim. The

“Guilty” verdict is delivered after “all” allegations are presented before a judge and court officials, while the final judgment is based on the relevance of testimonial, and documented evidence.

Before a case is arraigned (court decision), the allegations found in the petition are thoroughly examined, the evidence and/or testimony is reviewed and evaluated. A “Guilty” verdict is determined after a “Not Guilty” plea has been refuted. The court recognizes that when a “No Contest Plea” (admittance of guilt) is entered, both cost and time factors are significantly decreased.

The court cases studied for this research were “all” adjudicated with either “Guilty” or “No Contest Plea” in Child Sexual Abuse and/or Neglect. The courts will allow the alleged perpetrator(s) to plea “No Contest”, “Guilty”, or “Not Guilty”. The court cases proven “Not Guilty” were dismissed, and therefore not relevant in the research count, however the “Not Guilty” pleas adjudicated “Guilty” and “No Contest Plea” were counted.

In the (41) cases studied in this research, (46) victims were identified in the guilty cases, due to more than one victim found in a family. Out of these (46) cases there were (9) without substantial evidence of sexual abuse, and therefore in only (37) cases sufficient evidence was found. With a total of (46) pleas entered, one (1) plea was transferred to the adult Criminal Court because the perpetrator’s age was eighteen (18), when sexual abuse occurred. Of the actual cases (37) to be analyzed, the majority (60.5%/23) of the accused entered a “Not Guilty Plea”, while (62.2%/23) of the child sexual abuse cases were found “Guilty” (See Appendix A, Tables 1 & 11 for results).

Age/Gender Related Variables

The ages of child sexual abuse victims in this study ranged between (age 1-15 yrs.). Cases in the age category (age 1-8 yrs.) were adjudicated “Guilty” (57.9%/11), while the “No Contest Pleas” followed with (42.1%/8). In the age category (9-15 yrs.), (66.7%/12) cases were adjudicated as Guilty, and (33.3%/6) with No Contest Pleas. (See Appendix A, Table 1).

Although both “Guilty and No Contest” illustrates a high percentage in adjudications for both (1-8 and 9-15) age categories, due to the small sample size, it could not be determined if the approximate (9%) difference was significant. However, these data do suggest that for the older victims in Child Sexual Abuse cases, the perpetrators were adjudicated guilty more often than those perpetrators who abused younger children. This suggests older victims may have produced more substantiated evidence toward the conviction (See Discussions).

For victims ages (1-8 yrs.) both males and females, there was very little difference (5.8%) between the perpetrators who were judged “Guilty” and those who plead “No Contest”. Turning to the victim’s ages (9-15 yrs.), a large majority of the accused were those found “Guilty” (66.7%/12) of child sexual abuse versus those who plead “No Contest Plea (33.3%/6): a substantial difference (See Appendix A, Tables 1 & 2 for results). Once again these results suggests that cases involving older victims possibly had substantial proof of sexual abuse.

Looking at the abused victims’ ages ranging from (1-15), for the ages (1-8), nearly fifty-three percent (52.6%) were females, and for the ages (9-15) over three fourths (77.8%) were female. The male’s ages (1-8) account for nearly half (47.4%),

of the younger victims, and for the ages (9-15), their number accounts for less than one-fourth (22.2%) overall. Females were victims in nearly sixty-five percent (64.9%) of the victims, while just over one-third (35.1%) of the victims were males. The current cases being analyzed reveal that females overall are twice as likely to be victims of sexual abuse than boys (65% vs. 35%). Yet, when considering the ages (1-8 yrs.) of younger victims of sexual abuse, boys with (47%) were in close proximity to girls (1-8 yrs.) with (53%) in terms of sexual abuse. (See Appendix A, Tables 1 & 2 for results). These data indicates that both genders are vulnerable to sexual victimization at a younger age.

Disclosure (Age and Gender)

The child sexual abuse cases lacking sufficient evidence, were dismissed, withdrawn, and denied, therefore are not included within this study. The child sexual abuse cases brought to Family & Children's Court were determined by the victim's disclosure statement, medical evidence, caseworker's report, and other pertinent factors. Therefore age, in conjunction with the maturation of the victim, and level of communication are critical factors in the court's decision-making process.

In regards to the age levels of (1-15), the most often reported age of when child sexual abuse "began" was age (5) with (21.1%). This does not always reflect the first actual offense, but does refer to the beginning stage of sexual abuse pertaining to the case reviewed in court. (See Appendix A, Table 3 for results). After the initial stage of abuse has been established, the age of disclosure reflects the victim's age at the time allegations are legally documented. Interestingly, the

common age of disclosure for the above abuse cases were also age (5) with (15.6%). (See Appendix A, Table 4 for results).

It would be logical to assume that child victims would report sexual abuse to their mothers' first, because they are generally considered as the primary caregiver. While the data indicate that just over thirty percent (32.3%) of the mothers were confidantes of the victims, the overall allegations of Child Sexual Abuse by the victims in these court cases were most often reported to professionals representing (56.3%). Children between the ages (1-8) reported to professionals more often with (66.7%), than those age (9-15) with (47.1%). The male victims reported more often to "professionals, as did the females except at a lower percentage. (See Appendix A, Table 5 for results). It is important to differentiate between when the victims' abuse began, in terms of the family court case (Appendix A, Table 3), age of their first disclosure (Appendix A, Table 4), and whom they reported sexual abuse to (Appendix A, Table 5).

These reporting differences between professionals, and mothers were also evident when considering whether the victim was male or female such as: 1) males victims report to mothers (40%) vs. female victims (30.4%) 2) male victims report to professionals (60%) vs. female victims (52.2%). (See Appendix A, Table 6 for results).

Court Protocol

"Guidelines For Achieving Permanency In Child Protection Proceedings" (Foley, 1999), is utilized to aid the court administration in appropriate procedures and

protocol. In order to determine the accuracy of allegations directly involved with Child Sexual Abuse cases, a formal investigation is done. The caseworker, Child Protective Services, psychologist/therapist, medical physician etc. performs the intake assessment, evaluation, and then produces a thorough report.

Child Protective Services submits the report to the judge, who is at liberty to collaborate with the above authorities on the immediate danger and suggested placement of victims, before an informed decision is made. A victim is questioned, and depending on the allegations, anatomical dolls are utilized to indicate, if sexual abuse occurred. If the victim verbally states, or indicates with the use of the anatomical dolls that sexual abuse occurred, immediate actions may follow. Should the victim say “no” to the sexual abuse allegations, a “denial” statement is recorded and the investigations may still be conducted.

Abuse Denials

The data indicate that it is the male child who “denies” sexual abuse most often in both Guilty & No Contest Plea court cases with (60%), and there were fewer denials of child sexual abuse by females reflecting only (29.2%). Based on substantiated evidence bringing these cases to trial, the data implies that most victims agreed that “abuse” occurred (59%) compared to those who denied that they had been subjected to abuse (41% denials). (See Appendix A, Table 7 for results).

Age/Gender of Victim

The data collected pertained to the age range (1-15) of male/female sexual abuse victims. The most common victim's age was (5) with the highest percentage of (16.2%). Age (11) followed with (13.5%), age (15) was next with (10.8%), and age (7) was next with (8.1%). The modal age was (5), the median (8). The median ages of the female victims (10) were considerably older (See Appendix A, Table 8 for results).

Age of Perpetrator

The ages of the perpetrators ranged from (18-58). The most common age of perpetrators was age fifty-one, (17.6%). The next percentages for female victims were ages (33,40,41,47, & 50) with (9.5% each). The most common ages of the perpetrator of the male victims are (39) with (23.1%), and also the ages (30 & 40) with (15.4%) each. (See Appendix A, Table 9 for results).

The Perpetrator's Plea

Nearly two-thirds (65.7%) of the sexual offenders' plea were "Not Guilty" to the charges of sexual abuse. The "Not Guilty" plea was similar for the victims age (1-8) with (64.7%/11), while ages (9-15), were recorded as "Not Guilty" in (66.7%/12) of the cases. The "No Contest Plea" for the age group (1-8) was reported in (35.3%/6) of the cases, while the age group 9-15 percentage was slightly lower with (33.3%/6). (See Appendix A, Table 10 for results).

The sexual perpetrators of female abuse victims pled “Not Guilty” in (56% of the cases; followed by “No Contest” with 36%, and Guilty with 8%. Thus, the data indicates that sexual perpetrators of male victims pled “Not Guilty” in 69.2% of the cases, followed by “No Contest Plea” with 23.1%), and “Guilty” with 7.7%. (See Appendix A, Table 11 for results). These statistics may be relevant in later discussions regarding correlating factors, which possibly lead to adjudications of Guilty 60% vs. No Contest Plea 40%.

Descriptive Variables in Maternal Roles

In Child Sexual Abuse court cases, intake assessments are performed by caseworkers to establish the parental/guardian status out of concern for the immediate safety of the alleged victim. Several categories defined the support or lack thereof of the documented parent or guardian. The options delineated in the review of these cases were: non-belief without support; belief and support; belief without support; doesn’t know/doesn’t support; ambivalence with support; and also ambivalence without support.

Ambivalence is a response that captures, or reveals the presence of contradictory emotions, ideas, and/or statements concerning the victim’s allegations of Child Sexual Abuse. When the case involves one-half (50%) of the male victims parents were reported in the ambivalent and does not support the child category. One quarter (25%) of the parents were reported as being ambivalent, yet did support the child. Rarely was a male child not believed, yet a different pattern was reflected in the female victims data. The female victim’s parental support ranged from “didn’t

believe/did not support” (32%), to the parent being “ambivalent and non support (32%) categories. As to why there were so few parents who believed and supported the child is not immediately evident. For both male and female victims “parental ambivalence without support” emerged as the dominant category for (39%) of the cases, followed by “parental disbelief without support”. In one in five cases (19.5%) parents believed the child, for example: “belief with support” (9.8%); and “ belief without support (9.8%) (See Appendix A, Table 12 for results).

Essentially, the research problem “Controversial Maternal Roles of Intra-familial Child Sexual Abuse” is derived from society’s assumption and expectation of the mother’s role as “protector”. The antithesis of that maternal role would be considered the mother as “perpetrator” of sexual abuse. Additional maternal roles derived through research studies and considered as alternate explanations were the mothers described as: co-victim, or as co-conspirator/co-perpetrator. The co-victim is often revealed in a domestically violent family where the mother is emotionally or physically endangered along with the sexually abused victim. When a co-conspirator is identified there is a failure to “protect” or failure to “report” issue pertaining to victims of abuse. It is when a co-perpetrator is identified, that the sexual abuse act is inflicted by both parental guardians, and failure to protect and report is included in the investigation report as well.

In order to produce an informed decision, a preliminary hearing is held to determine if probable cause exists for allegations of Child Sexual Abuse. The next procedure assists in making a fair determination, which consists of relevant information compiled in a detailed assessment. These documents are court mandated,

and conducted out of concern for the child's safety. The court's decisions on the placement of the victims depend on the professionals, their assessment of family dynamics, and their documentation of statements rendered.

The parental support or the lack thereof contributes to the court's decision of where, and with whom the child is placed. The data revealed (65.1%) of the victims were placed outside of the home, while the remainder (34.9%) were allowed to remain in the home. When placed outside of the home, foster care was used in (52%) of the cases, with (40%) in relative care, and (8%) in residential care. (See Appendix A, Tables 13 and 14).

Abuse Type, Age/Gender and Other Variables

When dealing with a population representing children and the sensitive subject of sexual abuse, preparation for the review of graphic details is essential. There are many forms of molestation that are included in the category of Child Sexual Abuse which are liable to the penalization by the law. Some of the more common forms of molestation dealt with in this study are: touching and/or penetration, verbal and/or written seducement (phone or internet grooming, which are based on the appearance of intentions), and any physical actions related to sexual contact by an adult with a child, or individual lacking adult legal status (18 yrs. And older,) including the lack of mental discernment, or psychological stability). Although this research revealed variations of child sexual abuse, specific types appeared more often.

The type of sexual abuse categories with the highest percentage of “yes” responses to sexual misconduct are as follows: fondling, (73.3%) Yes; abuse/touching thru clothes, (60%) Yes; finally abuse/touching under clothes, 60%. (See Appendix A, Tables 15,16 & 17 for results). The publicly condemned, and most heinous sex crimes such as: anal (2/6.7%); oral (3/10%); intercourse (3/10%); and penetration (6/20%) received the lowest percentages answered with a “Yes”. (See Appendix A, Tables 18-21). These data indicate that for the most part, the occurrence of the most extreme forms of sexual abuse were not present in this sample population, in large numbers. However, the fact that these abusive types did, in fact happen to some children affirms that there are adults, who do indeed commit these acts.

It should be noted that regardless of the percentage range, any type of Child Sexual Abuse is considered criminal. Therefore an analysis of those victimized by the most serious forms of Child Sexual Abuse reveals that male victims have experienced the highest percentages in the “Yes” category, of the following types: penetration with males 25% vs. females 18.2%; oral with males 12.5% vs. females 9.1%; anal with males 25% vs. females 0.0%; and intercourse with males 12.5% vs. females 9.1%. (See Appendix A, Tables 10-18 for results).

Ironically the male sexual abuse victims continued to rank highest in the “Yes” category in the following abuse types: fondling with males 75% vs. females 72.7%; touching through clothes with males 75% vs. females 54.5%; and touching under clothes with males 62.5% vs. females 31.8%. The fact that in this study the number of female victims (58.7%) exceeds the number of male victims (41.3%), and produces a skewed percentage due to the differences in the number of abuse cases. In

the category of “being touched through their clothes”, for example: 6/males “Yes” (75%) vs. 2/males “No” (25%) compared to 12/females “Yes” (54.5%) vs. 10/females “No” (45.5%). (See Appendix A, Tables 18-21 for results).

Abuse Location

The major location where sexual abuse occurred pertaining to these cases was the home with (97.4%) and the school with (2.6%) (See Appendix A, Table 22 for results).

Since medical evidence was not always available, documentation was not provided, and no medical testimonies were logged in the files, which accounted for (95%) of the cases. Medical evidence of the abuse was available for only five-percent of the victims. (See Appendix A, Tables 23 for results).

Perpetrators’ Relationship to the Victim

Over one-quarter (28.6%) of the “mothers” of these victims were married to the abuser. While the data reflected that the mother’s relationship to the perpetrator most often recorded was the “Wife”, the next highest category was “self” with (26.2%), also known as a single mother/female head of household labeled as the perpetrator. Additional relationships categories that reflect the mother’s complex role, in a form of companionship with the perpetrator are recorded in sequential order as follows: “Other” with 16.7% (ex. neighbor), ex-girlfriend with 11.9%, Ex-wife with 9.5%, and girlfriend with 7.1%). (See Appendix A, Table 24 for results).

For the male victims, (37.5%) of their mothers were married to the perpetrator. The mother labeled as “self/mother” was categorized as the “mother/perpetrator” with (31.3%). There were three categories with (23.1%) each representing the mother’s relationship to the perpetrator: (1) “self” (perpetrating mother) (2) “wife” (spouse to perpetrator) (3) “other” (neighbor, friend, employee, etc. to the perpetrator). The categories of “ex-girlfriend” and “ex-wife” followed with (3/11.5% each), and the “current girlfriend” had the lowest percent (7.7%). (See Appendix A, Table 24 for results).

These data reflect the complexities of family dynamics and family structures in Child Sexual Abuse cases. However, it is important to recognize that this study has a skewed data base because of the fact this research covers only the “Guilty” and “No Contest Plea” cases, of child sexual abuse in Family Children Courts. There were probably numerous cases found “Not Guilty” and were dismissed due to the lack of substantial evidence involving child sexual abuse, that were not included in this research. The rationale was to focus on the controversial maternal roles in intrafamilial child sexual abuse.

Variables Related to Court Action and Maternal Role

According to the Family & Children Courts’ mission statement, and textbook guides, their ultimate goal is to seek “reunification” if and when significant factors reveal a healthy, safe environment for children of victimization. The ultimate goal and process is modified, only if there are extenuating circumstances of abuse, which necessitate a different solution. Child Sexual Abuse and any other type of child

endangerment, such as neglect, physical abuse, or domestic violence influences and expedites the Family Courts' decision. An example are cases with any of the above child endangerment characteristics, the court could proceed with the "parental termination of rights".

In this study, the decision to terminate the rights of parents occurred for (40%) of the cases. The rights of female victims were terminated more often than the male victims (42.3% vs. 35.7%). It is important to reemphasize that the court reviews numerous alternatives before implementing parental termination, such as relative foster care. Adoption can only occur if there is termination. This study reveals that children are usually returned to the parent/guardian in (55%) of the cases. This research also shows that long-term foster care is implemented in 22.5% cases, when either proof or serious doubt is established based on neglect, and/or failure to protect abuse victims. After parental termination occurs, and foster care is implemented, adoption may take place after a court-approved investigation is completed with above satisfactory results. For these cases, adoption only occurred in a minority (12.5%) of the cases, which may indicate a progressive judicial system for family reunification. Although the termination rate is close to (50%) and considered rather high, usually parents are given more than one chance to redeem their parental rights. Usually, adoption is considered within the family structure (if suitable) before other measures are taken (See Appendix A, Tables 25-28 for results).

Unemployment status was a factor in several of Child Sexual Abuse families. Nearly one third (32.5%) were unemployed. The majority of the families had stable employment situations (47.5%). Only one in ten (10%) of sexual abuse parents

depended on Family Independent Agencies (FIA), and 7.5% on Disability. The “Other” category (self-employed, sheltered, homeless, etc.) was recorded in only 2.5% of the cases. (See Appendix A, Table 29 for results).

There was evidence of “Domestic Violence” in several of the cases. Domestic Violence was recorded for (55%) in “all” of the sexual abuse cases. However, this research found that (32.5%) of the adjudicated cases consisted of “suspected” instances of domestic violence. While only (27.5%) cases of domestic violence were reported, only (12.5%) cases of domestic violence included physical evidence (photographs), or documented verbal and/or written proof (witness testimony) on file. These data may indicate, that domestic violence could be underestimated, and may be a major factor associated with child sexual abuse. (See Appendix A, Tables 34-37 for results).

Controversial Maternal Roles And Applications

The social guidelines for the maternal roles in Child Sexual Abuse may be considered fairly rigid in making the distinction between “protector” and “perpetrator”. It is because social norms and opinions change, that other categories were added in keeping with the literature, and other studies regarding maternal roles in Child Sexual Abuse (Elbow & Mayfield, 1991). A prime example is the addition to the maternal role labeled as “Co-Victim”, which was added due to the presence of domestic violence in many of the families where Child Sexual Abuse has occurred (Bolen 2001).

The maternal role of “Co-perpetrator/Co-conspirator” was identified in prior studies to indicate the mother’s complicity with the perpetrators in child sexual abuse cases (Herman & Hirshman, 1981; McIntyre, 1981; Bolen 2001). It is important to distinguish between the literature and judicial perspective, which clarifies co-conspirator and co-perpetrator as separate entities. A maternal Co-conspirator is aware of child sexual abuse and colludes with perpetrator in not reporting it to the authorities. A maternal co-perpetrator physically, verbally and emotionally engages in child sexual abuse along with the perpetrator. The Protector role has been socially assigned to the “mother’s role, with the expectation that she is the primary caregiver. Although the male Perpetrator is the well-known villain of sexual abuse, the stigma of “neglect/failure to protect” seems to fall primarily to the maternal role (Russell, 1983; Bolen 2001).

The majority of the court cases had documentation indicating (72.5%) of the maternal role to be “Co-perpetrator/Co-conspirator”. This is due to the facts that nearly three-fourths of the cases received, both male and female participated in the abuse. The other maternal roles were recorded less often, such as: a) 25% of the mothers were identified as “Co-Victims” b) 15% Perpetrators, and c) 5% Protectors. The lowest percentage (5%) reflects a disproportion of “protectors” as described in the “maternal roles” because of a skewed population. The majority of mothers who protected their children from, or reported child sexual abuse are not subjected to “Guilty” or “No Contest Plea” court cases in this research. (See Appendix A, Tables 33-35 for results).

In this study Co-Victims (25%) were the second highest percentage), which indicate an association with domestic violence because it was recorded in (55%) of the cases. This is in reference toward situational, physical, sexual, and verbal abuse possibly imposed on both the child and parental victim.

Ethnic Diversity in Child Sexual Abuse

The literature on the controversial maternal roles of intrafamilial child sexual abuse rarely includes any relevant data on ethnic diversity. However, in the skewed population represented in this study, ethnic/racial distribution in child sexual abuse cases is present, but under-represented. Although, these data were retrieved from a small population, the factors of race and ethnic culture were present. Also, discovered in these data are various intra-familial dynamics, which are identified as juvenile deviance, unemployment, and domestic violence. These familial descriptions indicate, that victims of abuse often contribute to the same and/or worse abusive victimization of others (Towers, 2002).

This research data contained cases of Child Sexual Abuse in the following racial/ethnic categories: White, Black, Bi-racial (Black & White), and Other (Native American, West Indian, African, Asian, etc.). The awareness that child sexual abuse occurs among all racial and ethnic groups has been established and stimulates a continuous search for “new theory & new research” (Finkelhor, 1984). Specific categories related to the race and gender of the victims, and perpetrators of child sexual abuse may reveal significant differences, as well as similarities. Again, the

ethnic/racial data within these cases provides the researcher with an opportunity to explore these comparisons.

Adjudications, Race and Gender of Perpetrator

The adjudications (court hearings) are formalized after the allegations are entered with an admission of guilt, otherwise known as a “No Contest Plea”, or testimonial evidence providing cause for a “Guilty” adjudication. In court cases included in the study, the analysis of adjudications pertaining to Child Sexual Abuse revealed that a “Guilty” plea (60%) was more prevalent than “No Contest Plea” (40%). (See Appendix A, Table 1 for these results).

White male perpetrators (70.8%) represented the dominant gender in the “Guilty” category. The female “Guilty” adjudications (46.2%) were significantly lower than that for males (70.8%) however, numerically the male population was more than double the females. Also, White females were the largest group in the “Guilty” adjudications (83.3%), while Black females were the vast majority in the “No Contest Plea” adjudications (85.7%). (See Appendix A, Table 38 for results).

In the manual “Guidelines For Achieving Permanency in Child Protection Proceedings” it is explained that both adjudications express the factor of guilt, yet lawyers may convey that one offers a less severe outcome. The “No Contest Plea” may offer a determination that mandates compliance toward a possible family reunification plan, with counseling and observed visitations. The Guilty adjudication, depending on the circumstances could lead to parental termination, and incarceration for perjury child neglect/sexual abuse, and other charges. In order to be found

“Guilty” one must first enter a “Not Guilty Plea”, for which a court appointed lawyer is assigned if not already represented by legal counsel (Foley, 1999).

This study reflects “Not Guilty” as the most common plea entered by both males (69.2%/9) and females (56.0%/14). “Guilty” adjudications were dominated by White males accounting for (85%/17), and White females (83.3%/5). The data reflects over two-thirds (85.7%/6) accounting for Black females documented as “No Contest Pleas (See Appendix A, Table 11 & 38 for results). Although both pleas are forms of guilt, in terms of neglect, failure to protect or the actual sexual offense, lesser charges are considered depending of the degree of the maltreatment.

There are stereotypical views regarding the female as head of the household; the female as responsible guardian; and the female portrayed as the alleged perpetrator in “Child Neglect & Failure to Protect” cases. If the maternal guardian cannot explain her innocence beyond a reasonable doubt, her adjudication is usually “Guilty”. On the other hand, if allegations are minor, and if there is no evidence of a major threat, recommendations may be entered that the parent be reunited with the child by entering a “Guilty or No Contest Plea”. This plea allows the court to require counseling and state supervision immediately while allowing the child to remain in the home.

Race and Gender of Perpetrator, Gender of Victim

Two-thirds (70.8%; 17/24) White female victims in this study were victimized by White male perpetrators, while one-third (29.2%; 7/17) of White male victims were victimized by White male perpetrators. (See Appendix A, Table 39 for results).

These data also revealed that female perpetrators are not bias in terms of molestation. This statement is supported by percentages revealing that female perpetrators molested both (50%) female and (50%) male children. The racial and numerical compositions of female perpetrators of female victims were identical to the racial and numerical compositions of female perpetrators of male victims. Thus, these data reveal that female perpetrators victimized both males and females at the same rate, each representing (50%) as 4/Black and 3/White are linked to male victims, and 4/Black and 3/White are linked to female victims. Also, it is apparent that the White male perpetrators are dominant in this sample reflecting a preference for White female children. It is important, however to recognize that this population represents members considered within the family nucleus (home of parents, relatives and friends). (See Appendix A, Table 39 for results).

Reported Authorities, Race/Gender Perpetrator

The data indicates that out of a total of forty-one cases only (30) victims reported the crimes to the mother, their peers, or a professional. In 19 sexual abuse cases by White male perpetrators, the “professional” (68.4%) was the highest percent of authorities reported to. The mother was reported to in (26.3%) cases, (1/Other; 4/White). The 1/Other represented a White male perpetrator identified as a “peer”, or child associate. It is highly possible, that “Professionals” were selected most often by the victims to disclose, because they gained the trust and confidence, of those children who were sexually abused. Mothers (26.3%) were the second person

selected most often, with a significantly lower percentage. (See Appendix A, Table 40 for results).

Parental Support, Race/Gender Perpetrator

Parental support is an essential element in the courts decision for final adjudication and child placement. A prime example would be a child rebuked by parents and/or maternal guardians for confiding in authorities, and reporting sexual abuse, which in return may lead to child placement outside of the home until further investigation. It is the major concern of the court to assure the child's safety within a supportive environment.

Pertinent literature reviews (see bibliography), and case studies involving Child Sexual Abuse served as the foundation for the categories used in this research, and code data sheet. Both previous and current research described the views and attitudes of both the perpetrator and the victim. The court files combined the reports of social workers, psychologists, child protective services, etc., to explain probable causations for adjudications. Categories that related to each child sexual abuse case were applied to produce these data.

Terms such as ambivalent (contradictive) were used in research articles to describe a type of parental response and behaviors toward the victims of Child Sexual Abuse. For example, there were cases when the mother would say she believed her child was sexually abused, yet chose "not" to remove the alleged perpetrator from the home. This is a classic example of the "Ambivalent to statement/supports child", and stimulated further examination of case data, and the various patterns found therein.

It is important to reiterate that many times the parent/guardian, and the perpetrator were synonymous. These significant factors helped to establish the patterns of behavior, and created a much better understanding of the data and the various support categories (The rationale behind this theory recognizes a small and skewed population representing a large percentage of female parents, already charged with “Child Neglect” and investigated for “Sexual Abuse”).

Male perpetrators were subject to judgments by the courts in (23) Child Sexual Abuse cases. The data collected recorded the parental support provided for the victims of sexual abuse, and was divided into four (4) categories. The category “Ambivalent to statement/does not support child” describes unstable support, and/or non-support was identified in (10/43.5%) cases: 7/White and 3/Other (Native American, Asian, West Indian, etc.) male perpetrators. The second category “Ambivalent to statement/does support child” describes a parent, who “does not” believe sexual abuse has occurred, and yet continues to provide nurturing support identified (6/26.1%), White male perpetrators “only” in this category. The third category “Does not believe or support child” describes absolute non-support, and reflected “only” White male perpetrators (17.4%/4). The fourth category “Believes & supports child”, describes “absolute support” (3/13%) with 1/Black and 2/White male perpetrators. (See Appendix A, Table 41 with results).

The female perpetrator was subject to judgments by the courts in fourteen (14) Child Sexual Abuse cases, which were divided into the 5 categories reported. The category “Ambivalent to statement/does not support child (5/35.7%), included 2/Black and 3/White female perpetrators. The second category “Does not believe or

support child” makes up (4/28.6%) of the female perpetrators in this category (4/Black females). Twenty-one percent of female perpetrators (3/21.4%) were found in “Believes but does not support child” category as White females. The fourth category “Ambivalent to statement but supports child”, had only one (1/7.1%) Black female perpetrator, and one Black female recorded in the category “Believes and supports child”.

In the parental support category, “White” male perpetrators were most frequently identified with the category “Ambivalent to statement/does not support child” (7/36.8%), and 6/31.6%) with “Ambivalent to statement/but supports child” category. The female perpetrators were most often “Ambivalent to statement/does not support child”, (5/37.5%) included 2/Blacks and 3/Whites. The lowest percentage and considered least significant were the categories “Does not believe, nor support”, with Black female perpetrators (4/28.6%), and White females with “Believe/does not support” (3/21.4%). Please note; the criteria for these categories were found in written investigative reports, evaluation, and court testimonies. (See Appendix A, Table 41 for results).

Maternal Role Co-Victim/Race/Gender Perpetrator

The data in this research indicates that the maternal role in Child Sexual Abuse cases was often threatened by domestic violence (55%; 22/40). (See Appendix A, Table 30 for results). It is from various Child Sexual Abuse studies that the maternal role has been revised to include the category “Co-Victim”. This type defines and recognizes the maternal role as the expectant protector being subjected to

a domestic violent environment, and other abuse (mental, verbal, and/or sexual). This definition indicates maternal negligence and/or failure to protect her children from sexual abuse, and herself from physical and possibly sexual abuse. In these maternal co-victimized cases the White male perpetrator (37.5%; 9/24), another indication that domestic violence may be a factor. (See Appendix A, Table 42 for results).

Co-Perpetrator/Race/Gender of Perpetrator

In this category, a large number (20/26) of Child Sexual Abuse cases involved both male and female perpetrators. The rationale that substantiated the category of co-perpetrator/conspirator was if more than one parent was aware of Child Sexual Abuse, more than one parent was responsible. Also, the mother may be an active participant in sexually abusing the child/children. The maternal role of co-perpetrator/conspirator cases involving female perpetrators rated the highest with (76.9%); 6 Black & 4 White), and reveals that a higher rate of females were held accountable. The same maternal role of co-perpetrator/conspirator involved (66.7%) male perpetrators, and represented 12 White, 3 Other, and 1 Black. (See Appendix A, Table 43 for results).

Protector/Race/Gender of Perpetrator

The maternal role of protector is the traditional expectation of the mother in any situation, but particularly in Child Sexual Abuse cases. Logically one would perceive that mothers labeled “protector” in child sexual abuse cases would not be in the court system. This is only partially true because case allegations of abuse brought

before the court already are strongly suspected, but must be “proven” guilty or not guilty. The male/female parental support is a major source for determinations, however offenders’ plea, child placement, outcome of case categories, and others were used also to qualify the “protector” maternal role.

Only (7.1%; 1/14) of the female perpetrators believed and supported child victims. Because this study reflects a small population with allegations of child sexual abuse/neglect, there weren’t any data reflecting the female genders, Black/White in the maternal role of “protector”. White males with (8.3%) presented (2) cases listed in the maternal role of protector. This occurrence reflects male parental custody, or legal guardianship. (See Appendix A, Table 44 for results).

Perpetrator/Race/Gender of Perpetrator

The category of “Perpetrator” relates to the actual hands on sexual molestation of the child victim by molester/offender in the maternal role category. The determining factors in this study were the adjudication, plea, and mothers’ relationship to perpetrator. Data on the maternal role of perpetrator involved only (1) Black and (1) White male perpetrator presenting (8.3%). There were (30.8%) female perpetrators (2 Black and 2 White) involved in the maternal role of perpetrator. It is apparent that the female perpetrator in the “maternal role” exceeds the male perpetrator in the “maternal” role. (See Appendix A, Table 44 for results).

CHAPTER V

REVIEW, SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Review

Previous research by Finkelhor (1979, 1981, 1984, 1990) and numerous theoretical replications by Tower, 2002; Bolen, 2001; & Levesque, 1999 etc., concentrate on the victimization of child sexual abuse through both psychological, and sociological perspectives. The theoretical framework of “Family Systems” directed the research interests toward the “mothers’ roles” in child sexual abuse cases. Finkelhor’s general model of “Four Preconditions of Child Sexual Abuse” describes the systematic familial roles in terms of sociological factors, geographic isolation, family structure, and individual predisposition, which are profiled in child sexual abuse victims (Finkelhor, et al., 1981).

Based on the theoretical framework of “Family Systems”, this research was directed toward the controversial “maternal role”, and maternal relationships with both the victim and perpetrator. The research foci were concerned with these major questions: (1) What role does the mother play in child sexual victimization: protector, perpetrator, co-victim, or co-perpetrator/conspirator? (2) What maternal role is most prevalent: protector, perpetrator, co-victim, or co-perpetrator/conspirator, and (3) How does the maternal role effect the legal decision, or adjudication?

An existing research instrument was modified and utilized to categorize data derived through content analysis of court case files. Forty-one child sexual abuse cases were reviewed following a computer search from the Kalamazoo County

Family and Children Courts. These cases entered in court for child sexual abuse as No Contest, Guilty, or Not Guilty pleas and their adjudications were either No Contest or Guilty for years 1999, 2000, and 2001. The research tool was designed to obtain other pertinent and/or contributing factors relating to the maternal role in child sexual abuse.

Summary of the Findings

Previous literature and findings of other published research introduced assumptions in family dynamics and child sexual abuse not found in this research.

The major assumptions “not” found in this data are:

1. The most dominant role in child sexual abuse cases was “Protector”.
2. Co-victimization was predominant in child sexual abuse cases.

Based on the results of this study, the following was revealed (percentage reference is based on 100%; for definitions see Appendix B):

1. The most dominant maternal role identified with the court records was Co-perpetrator/conspirator. This role was recorded in more than half of all maternal role types. The second highest category of mothers identified as Co-victims representing less than one third of the cases. The mother’s identified as the Perpetrator, and/or Protector were the least typical patterns recorded in the case files.
2. The Black female is recorded most often in the maternal role category of co-perpetrator/conspirator in this small population. According to these data White male perpetrator was numerically dominant.

3. Medical evidence recorded in the case files for child sexual abuse victims was scarce. This may have produced insignificant results in the adjudications of all male/female perpetrators.
4. The data sheet section labeled Parental/guardian belief/support system reflects the parental attitude and the gender/race of perpetrators (child sexual abusers). White male perpetrators were dominant in three areas: (1) ambivalent/nonsupport (2) ambivalent/supports child (3) no belief/no support together exceeding three fourths of the percentage. Female perpetrators (synonymous with neglect/failure to protect) reflected Black females as dominant in the category “believe/not support” with half of the percentage (100%), and White females as dominant in the category ambivalent/non-support with the other half of the percentage (100%).
5. The dominant category reflecting “the mother’s relationship to the male perpetrator” was “wife”, with the highest percent among White males as perpetrators. The term “female perpetrator” is sometimes used synonymously with neglect/failure to protect and/or possibly co-perpetrator). Interestingly, the mother’s relationship to the male perpetrator as his wife, rates extremely close numerically and in percentage form to the category of “self” representing the “Black” mother as the dominant perpetrator.
6. Age five was the dominant age of sexually abused victims between the ages (1-15).

7. The most common age of male perpetrators in this study (in sequence of highest percentage first) were ages (39), (40), and (30). The most common age of female perpetrators were (51) with the highest percentage, and the next highest percentage shared equally were ages (33,40,41,47, and 50).
 - A. The Black female perpetrator was in the majority at the ages 51 and 18.
8. The most common abuse type imposed on victims was “fondling” by White males. There were very few cases of the more invasive sexual crimes toward child victims such as: penetration, oral, and anal, for White male perpetrators.
9. The highest percent of cases whose parental rights were terminated were White male and Black female perpetrators.
10. The highest percentage of children reporting sexual abuse to authorities was recorded in the “professionals” category. The next highest percentage was less than half the percentage of “professionals” in the “mother” category of White and Bi-racial female victims.

Discussions

The stereotypical view of mothers in society is predominately the nurturer and protector. Should the maternal role display anything less than social expectations, institutional (Child Protective Services & Family Courts) chastisement is implemented. The rationale in defense of this social chastisement can be traced to

numerous studies (previous and current) on child sexual abuse victims. Society may have misinterpreted the maternal role, by designating it as either the role of “protector” or “perpetrator”. Due to increased complexities in familial dynamics, there are more gray areas (co-victim and co-perpetrator) within “intrafamilial” child sexual abuse (Elbow & Mayfield, 1991). Bolen on the other hand has alerted the public to “mothers” being used as the primary “scapegoat” in child sexual abuse cases. Bolen also blamed society for failure to protect children of sexual abuse, instead of suggesting failure in the mothers (Bolen, 2001).

This study is composed of a small population, reflecting the “co-perpetrator”, as the most dominant maternal role and “protector” as the least dominant. The family systems model recognizes both parents as “protector”, however the maternal role is still considered the most nurturing (Tower, 2002). An example of this model is found in the norms of society, some of which expect the mother to protect her children from any obstacle or misfortune, especially sexual abuse (Bolen, 2001).

There were numerous variables in this study that produced important findings linked to the dominant maternal role of co-perpetrator/conspirator such as: the majority of parental/guardian were ambivalent with nonsupport; the perpetrator’s relationship to victim was mother; the mother’s relationship to the male perpetrator was wife, her relationship to the female perpetrator was self (the mother); the dominant abuse type was fondling; and majority of parental rights were terminated.

The age levels (1-15 yrs.) were divided into sections of (1-8 yrs.) and (9-15 yrs.). Interestingly, both “Guilty” (57.9%/11) and “No Contest Plea” cases (42.1%/8) were more evenly balanced in the (1-8 yrs.) age categories, in terms of child sexual

abuse cases being reported, investigated, and reaching the final stage of adjudication. The age category (9-15 yrs.) received the highest percentage (62.2%/23) in cases found “Guilty”. It is probable that maturation in age increases better communication, and clearer perceptions, in terms of detailed information. Also, when the fear factor of continued molestation is removed, this could produce more trust for disclosure. The facts involving child sexual abuse are usually disclosed after the victims are convinced that their safety and healthy environment is the court’s primary goal. This type of secured environmental assurance increases the opportunity for gathering, and obtaining necessary evidence for the appropriate adjudication.

A few key factors, which are easily overlooked are the relationships between: age, gender, disclosure, and parental support in these child sexual abuse cases. The most common age of sexual abuse disclosure was age (5 yrs.), also both male (47.4%/9) and female (52.6%/10) victims (ages 1-8 yrs) were equally balanced in victimization, and both male (50%/8) and female (32%/8) received the highest percentage in terms of revealing the lack parental support to sexual abuse disclosure categorized as “ambivalent/without support”.

Clearly, the dominant age of disclosure (5 yrs.) is astonishingly young. And it is important to note that the usual documented gender preference in child sexual abuse being “female” has been definitely challenged by the results of this study. It is also quite apparent in this study, that credit for these research findings are reflected by the “lack” of maternal/parental support. It appears that both the professionals and the court’s administration should be commended for consistent investigation and adjudication toward the protection of sexually abused children.

The “Not Guilty” plea was one of the major theoretical paradigms supported by the data, as the most common plea in child sexual abuse cases. There were also a few major theoretical assumptions the data “did not” support such as; males were the dominant perpetrators in child sexual abuse cases. Another speculation for child sexual abuse was it was prevalent in the homes of low levels of support, family violence, and distorted or disrupted family roles (separation/divorce. Another speculation was based on the system’s process requiring social workers to submit an investigative report, from the victim’s house to the court, sometimes without sufficient time for adequate inquiries to the victim, or alleged perpetrator. Important information gathered in that time frame carries significant legal contributions in the “Guilty” or “Not Guilty” adjudication. Thus, social workers have been accused of holding a bias against the mothers of sexually abused children, based on their reports against mothers for “failure to protect” (Levesque, 1999).

The literature reviewed in this study summarized correlated research on Intrafamilial Child Sexual Abuse, and the maternal role in a small population, which did not seem to adequately express ethnic diversity in terms of Child Sexual Abuse crimes. Also critiques by associated scholars and professional mentors were acknowledged regarding the lack of ethnic/racial statistics presented in this study. This prompted the analysis of the racial/gender population in the maternal roles concerning perpetrators, and victims in child sexual abuse.

There is valued detailed information obtained in reviewing each child sexual abuse case, which expands the process of completing a study with productive results. The time frame, cost, and tedious work involved often limits availability of more

quality research. There will be a continuous need to investigate and study controversies surrounding the “maternal roles in “Intrafamilial” child sexual abuse cases, thus explaining why a need for further research and theory still exists.

Conclusions

Based on the findings derived from the results of this empirical study, the following conclusions were reached:

1. This study reflects a significant number of female offenders in co-perpetrator/co-conspirators “maternal roles” in child sexual abuse.
2. The maternal role “protector” has become more complex in terms of the assumed identification in child sexual abuse cases, especially in relationship to this study. The “protector role” is easily diminished when allegations of denial, and failure to report occur.

Implications

The following implications derive from cases studied in this research, and are offered to the judiciary system, professionals, and any concerned individuals working in the area of child sexual abuse.

1. Mothers’ of child sexual abuse victims who were psychologically evaluated, were sometimes referred to as victims of domestic abuse, and diagnosed as depressed and experiencing severe traumatic episodes. Maternal roles labeled; perpetrators, co-perpetrators/co-conspirators, and co-victims may occasionally invoke more disgust and less empathy from well-meaning inclusive paraprofessionals and/or

professionals (i.e., administration, intake workers, case workers, social workers, psychologists and/or therapists). Without extensive education and continuous experience along with training, an antagonistic perspective offered to the judicial system may be biased by ethical, religious, social, ethnic/cultural, and gender beliefs. The rationale supporting this theory stems from the acknowledgement of human frailties in regards to subconscious biases.

2. In this study professionals significantly out numbered male/female parents in terms of child confidantes in sexual abuse cases. For this reason essentially professionals should be aware of their institutional power of influence. Professional ethics should serve as a instrument for checks and balances, as well as a keen awareness, should any form of prejudicial bias consciously become a possible threat to judicial decisions. This professional safeguard will assist to enhance vigilant and objective psychological evaluations, intake assessments, and court reports.

Recommendations for Further Study

In order to extend the findings of this study, the researcher recommends that:

1. In order to compare the “maternal” vs. “paternal” roles in child sexual abuse, further studies should be conducted to examine the relationship on the “paternal role” in Child sexual abuse in term of protector, co-victim, co-conspirator, and perpetrator.

2. A study to examine what impact gender and race may have on: child removal, parental termination, and adjudication in child abuse/neglect in failure to

protect, in child sexual abuse cases. The goal of this study would be to measure the maternal vs. paternal role in regards to “Guilty” adjudicated cases.

APPENDIX A

TABLES 1-45

Table 1
adjudication * new age victim Crosstabulation

		new age victim		Total	
		1 to 8 years old	9 to 15 years		
adjudication	gl	Count	11	12	23
		% within new age victim	57.9%	66.7%	62.2%
	ncp	Count	8	6	14
		% within new age victim	42.1%	33.3%	37.8%
Total		Count	19	18	37
		% within new age victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 2
gender victim * new age victim Crosstabulation

		new age victim			
		1 to 8 years old	9 to 15 years	Total	
gender victim	male	Count	9	4	13
		% within new age victim	47.4%	22.2%	35.1%
	female	Count	10	14	24
		% within new age victim	52.6%	77.8%	64.9%
Total		Count	19	18	37
		% within new age victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 3
age began * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
age began	1 Count	1		1
	% within gender victim	20.0%		5.3%
	2 Count	1		1
	% within gender victim	20.0%		5.3%
	3 Count		2	2
	% within gender victim		14.3%	10.5%
	4 Count		2	2
	% within gender victim		14.3%	10.5%
	5 Count	1	3	4
	% within gender victim	20.0%	21.4%	21.1%
	6 Count	1	2	3
	% within gender victim	20.0%	14.3%	15.8%
	7 Count	1		1
	% within gender victim	20.0%		5.3%
	9 Count		1	1
	% within gender victim		7.1%	5.3%
	11 Count		3	3
	% within gender victim		21.4%	15.8%
	15 Count		1	1
	% within gender victim		7.1%	5.3%
Total	Count	5	14	19
	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 4
age disclosure * new age victim Crosstabulation

		new age victim		Total
		1 to 8 years old	9 to 15 years	
age disclosure	1	Count	1	1
		% within new age victim	6.3%	3.1%
	2	Count	2	2
		% within new age victim	12.5%	6.3%
	3	Count	3	3
		% within new age victim	18.8%	9.4%
	5	Count	5	5
		% within new age victim	31.3%	15.6%
	7	Count	3	3
		% within new age victim	18.8%	9.4%
	8	Count	2	2
		% within new age victim	12.5%	6.3%
	9	Count	2	2
		% within new age victim	12.5%	6.3%
	10	Count	2	2
		% within new age victim	12.5%	6.3%
	11	Count	3	3
		% within new age victim	18.8%	9.4%
	12	Count	2	2
		% within new age victim	12.5%	6.3%
	13	Count	2	2
		% within new age victim	12.5%	6.3%
	14	Count	2	2
		% within new age victim	12.5%	6.3%
	15	Count	3	3
		% within new age victim	18.8%	9.4%
Total		Count	16	32
		% within new age victim	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5
reported to * new age victim Crosstabulation

			new age victim		Total
			1 to 8 years old	9 to 15 years	
reported to	mother	Count	4	6	10
		% within new age victim	26.7%	35.3%	31.3%
	peer	Count		1	1
		% within new age victim		5.9%	3.1%
	professional	Count	10	8	18
		% within new age victim	66.7%	47.1%	56.3%
	other	Count	1	2	3
		% within new age victim	6.7%	11.8%	9.4%
	Total	Count	15	17	32
		% within new age victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 6
reported to * gender victim Crosstabulation

			gender victim		Total
			male	female	
reported to	mother	Count	4	7	11
		% within gender victim	40.0%	30.4%	33.3%
	peer	Count		1	1
		% within gender victim		4.3%	3.0%
	professional	Count	6	12	18
		% within gender victim	60.0%	52.2%	54.5%

Table 6 continued

Total	other	Count	3	3
		% within gender victim	13.0%	9.1%
		Count	10	23
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%

Table 7

child deny * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
child deny	yes	Count	9	7
		% within gender victim	60.0%	29.2%
	no	Count	6	17
		% within gender victim	40.0%	70.8%
Total		Count	15	24
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%

Table 8

age victim * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
age victim	1	Count	1	1
		% within gender victim	7.7%	4.2%
	2	Count	1	1
		% within gender victim	7.7%	2.7%
	3	Count	2	2
		% within gender victim	15.4%	5.4%
	4	Count	1	1
		% within gender victim	7.7%	2.7%
	5	Count	3	3
		% within gender victim	23.1%	12.5%

Table 8 continued

6	Count		2	2
	% within gender victim		8.3%	5.4%
7	Count	1	2	3
	% within gender victim	7.7%	8.3%	8.1%
8	Count		2	2
	% within gender victim		8.3%	5.4%
9	Count		2	2
	% within gender victim		8.3%	5.4%
10	Count		2	2
	% within gender victim		8.3%	5.4%
11	Count	2	3	5
	% within gender victim	15.4%	12.5%	13.5%
12	Count		1	1
	% within gender victim		4.2%	2.7%
13	Count	1	1	2
	% within gender victim	7.7%	4.2%	5.4%
14	Count		2	2
	% within gender victim		8.3%	5.4%
15	Count	1	3	4
	% within gender victim	7.7%	12.5%	10.8%
Total	Count	13	24	37
	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 9

age perp 1 * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
age perp 1	18			
	Count		1	1
	% within gender victim		4.8%	2.9%
	19			
	Count	1	1	2
	% within gender victim	7.7%	4.8%	5.9%

Table 9 continued

20	Count	1	1	2
	% within gender victim	7.7%	4.8%	5.9%
30	Count	2		2
	% within gender victim	15.4%		5.9%
31	Count	1	1	2
	% within gender victim	7.7%	4.8%	5.9%
33	Count		2	2
	% within gender victim		9.5%	5.9%
39	Count	3	1	4
	% within gender victim	23.1%	4.8%	11.8%
40	Count	2	2	4
	% within gender victim	15.4%	9.5%	11.8%
41	Count	1	2	3
	% within gender victim	7.7%	9.5%	8.8%
47	Count		2	2
	% within gender victim		9.5%	5.9%
50	Count	1	2	3
	% within gender victim	7.7%	9.5%	8.8%
51	Count	1	5	6
	% within gender victim	7.7%	23.8%	17.6%
58	Count		1	1
	% within gender victim		4.8%	2.9%
Total	Count	13	21	34
	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 10

offenders plea * new age victim Crosstabulation

			new age victim		Total
			1 to 8 years old	9 to 15 years	
offenders plea	not guilty	Count	11	12	23
		% within new age victim	64.7%	66.7%	65.7%
	no contest	Count	6	6	12
		% within new age victim	35.3%	33.3%	34.3%
Total	Count		17	18	35
	% within new age victim		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 11

offenders plea * gender victim Crosstabulation

			gender victim		Total
			male	female	
offenders plea	guilty	Count	1	2	3
		% within gender victim	7.7%	8.0%	7.9%
	not guilty	Count	9	14	23
		% within gender victim	69.2%	56.0%	60.5%
	no contest	Count	3	9	12
		% within gender victim	23.1%	36.0%	31.6%
Total	Count		13	25	38
	% within gender victim		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 12
parent support * gender victim Crosstabulation

			gender victim		Total
			male	female	
parent support	not believe not support	Count	1	8	9
		% within gender victim	6.3%	32.0%	22.0%
	believe support	Count	1	3	4
		% within gender victim	6.3%	12.0%	9.8%
	believe not support	Count	2	2	4
		% within gender victim	12.5%	8.0%	9.8%
	ambivalent to statement supports child	Count	4	4	8
		% within gender victim	25.0%	16.0%	19.5%
	ambivalent to statement does not support child	Count	8	8	16
		% within gender victim	50.0%	32.0%	39.0%
	Total	Count	16	25	41
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 13
out home placement * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total	
		male	female		
out home placement	yes	Count	9	19	28
		% within gender victim	52.9%	73.1%	65.1%
	no	Count	8	7	15
		% within gender victim	47.1%	26.9%	34.9%
Total		Count	17	26	43
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 14
where * gender victim Crosstabulation

			gender victim		Total
			male	female	
where	relative care	Count	5	5	10
		% within gender victim	71.4%	27.8%	40.0%
	foster care	Count	2	11	13
		% within gender victim	28.6%	61.1%	52.0%
	residential care	Count		2	2
		% within gender victim		11.1%	8.0%
	Total	Count	7	18	25
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 15
type of abuse - fondling * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim			
		male	female	Total	
type of abuse - fondling	yes	Count	6	16	22
		% within gender victim	75.0%	72.7%	73.3%
	no	Count	2	6	8
		% within gender victim	25.0%	27.3%	26.7%
Total		Count	8	22	30
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 16
type of abuse - touch thru clothes * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
type of abuse - touch thru clothes	Count	6	12	18
	yes % within gender victim	75.0%	54.5%	60.0%
	Count	2	10	12
	no % within gender victim	25.0%	45.5%	40.0%
Total	Count	8	22	30
	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 17
type of abuse - touch under clothes * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
type of abuse - touch under clothes	Count	5	7	12
	yes % within gender victim	62.5%	31.8%	40.0%
	Count	3	15	18
	no % within gender victim	37.5%	68.2%	60.0%
Total	Count	8	22	30
	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 18
type of abuse - penetration * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
type of abuse - penetration	yes	Count	2	4
		% within gender victim	25.0%	18.2%
	no	Count	6	18
		% within gender victim	75.0%	81.8%
Total		Count	8	22
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%

Table 19
type of abuse - oral * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
type of abuse - oral	yes	Count	1	2
		% within gender victim	12.5%	9.1%
	no	Count	7	20
		% within gender victim	87.5%	90.9%
Total		Count	8	22
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%

Table 20
type of abuse - anal * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
type of abuse - anal	yes	Count	2	2
		% within gender victim	25.0%	6.7%
	no	Count	6	22
		% within gender victim	75.0%	100.0%

Table 20 continued

Total	Count	8	22	30
	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 21

type of abuse - intercourse * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total	
		male	female		
type of abuse - intercourse	yes	Count	1	2	3
		% within gender victim	12.5%	9.1%	10.0%
	no	Count	7	20	27
		% within gender victim	87.5%	90.9%	90.0%
Total		Count	8	22	30
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 22

abuse location * gender victim Crosstabulation

			gender victim		Total
			male	female	
abuse location	home	Count	14	24	38
		% within gender victim	100.0%	96.0%	97.4%
	school	Count		1	1
		% within gender victim		4.0%	2.6%
Total		Count	14	25	39
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 23

medical evidence * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
medical evidence	yes	Count	2	2
		% within gender victim	7.7%	5.0%

Table 23 continued

Total	no	Count	14	24	38
		% within gender victim	100.0%	92.3%	95.0%
		Count	14	26	40
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 24

perp1/mother relationship * gender victim Crosstabulation

			gender victim		Total
			male	female	
perp1/mother relationship	wife	Count	6	6	12
		% within gender victim	37.5%	23.1%	28.6%
	girlfriend	Count	1	2	3
		% within gender victim	6.3%	7.7%	7.1%
	ex-wife	Count	1	3	4
		% within gender victim	6.3%	11.5%	9.5%
	ex-girlfriend	Count	2	3	5
		% within gender victim	12.5%	11.5%	11.9%
	self	Count	5	6	11
		% within gender victim	31.3%	23.1%	26.2%
	other	Count	1	6	7
		% within gender victim	6.3%	23.1%	16.7%
	Total	Count	16	26	42
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 25
case outcome - termination * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
case outcome - termination	yes	Count	5	11
		% within gender victim	35.7%	42.3%
	no	Count	9	15
		% within gender victim	64.3%	57.7%
Total	Count		14	26
	% within gender victim		100.0%	100.0%

Table 26
return to mom * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
return to mom	yes	Count	9	13
		% within gender victim	64.3%	50.0%
	no	Count	5	13
		% within gender victim	35.7%	50.0%
Total	Count		14	26
	% within gender victim		100.0%	100.0%

Table 27
longterm foster care * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
longterm foster care	yes	Count	2	7
		% within gender victim	14.3%	26.9%
	no	Count	12	19
		% within gender victim	85.7%	73.1%

Table 27 continued

Total	Count	14	26	40
	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 28

adoption * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
adoption	yes			
	Count	2	3	5
	% within gender victim	14.3%	11.5%	12.5%
	no			
	Count	12	23	35
	% within gender victim	85.7%	88.5%	87.5%
Total	Count	14	26	40
	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 29

parent employment status * gender victim Crosstabulation

			gender victim		Total
			male	female	
parent employment status	employed	Count	4	15	19
		% within gender victim	28.6%	57.7%	47.5%
	unemployed	Count	6	7	13
		% within gender victim	42.9%	26.9%	32.5%
	FIA	Count	2	2	4
		% within gender victim	14.3%	7.7%	10.0%
	disability	Count	1	2	3
		% within gender victim	7.1%	7.7%	7.5%
	other	Count	1		1
		% within gender victim	100.0%		100.0%

Table 29 continued

	% within gender victim	7.1%		2.5%
	Count	14	26	40
Total	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 30

domestic violence exists * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
domestic violence exists	yes			
	Count	8	14	22
	% within gender victim	57.1%	53.8%	55.0%
	no			
	Count	6	12	18
	% within gender victim	42.9%	46.2%	45.0%
Total	Count	14	26	40
	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 31

domestic violence - physical evidence * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
domestic violence - physical evidence	yes			
	Count		5	5
	% within gender victim		19.2%	12.5%
	no			
	Count	14	21	35
	% within gender victim	100.0%	80.8%	87.5%
Total	Count	14	26	40
	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 32
domestic violence - reported * gender victim Crosstabulation

			gender victim		Total
			male	female	
domestic violence - reported	yes	Count	6	5	11
		% within gender victim	42.9%	19.2%	27.5%
	no	Count	8	21	29
		% within gender victim	57.1%	80.8%	72.5%
Total		Count	14	26	40
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 33
domestic violence - suspicion * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total	
		male	female		
domestic violence - suspicion	yes	Count	3	10	13
		% within gender victim	21.4%	38.5%	32.5%
	no	Count	11	16	27
		% within gender victim	78.6%	61.5%	67.5%
Total		Count	14	26	40
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 34
maternal role co-victim * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total	
		male	female		
maternal role co-victim	yes	Count	6	4	10
		% within gender victim	42.9%	15.4%	25.0%
	no	Count	8	22	30
		% within gender victim	57.1%	84.6%	75.0%

Table 34 continued

Total	Count	14	26	40
	% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 35

co-perpetrator/conspirator * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
co-perpetrator/conspirator	yes	Count	9	20
		% within gender victim	64.3%	76.9%
	no	Count	5	6
		% within gender victim	35.7%	23.1%
Total		Count	14	26
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%

Table 36

protector * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
protector	yes	Count	2	2
		% within gender victim	7.7%	5.0%
	no	Count	14	24
		% within gender victim	100.0%	92.3%
Total		Count	14	26
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%

Table 37

perpetrator * gender victim Crosstabulation

		gender victim		Total
		male	female	
perpetrator	yes	Count	3	3
		% within gender victim	21.4%	11.5%

Table 37 continued

	no	Count	11	23	34
		% within gender victim	78.6%	88.5%	85.0%
	Total	Count	14	26	40
		% within gender victim	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 38

adjudication * race perp * gender perp 1 Crosstabulation

gender perp 1		race perp				Total	
		black	white	other			
male	adjudication	gl	Count	17		17	
		% within race perp	85.0%		70.8%		
		nep	Count	1	3	3	7
		% within race perp	100.0%	15.0%	100.0%	29.2%	
	Total	Count	1	20	3	24	
		% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
female	adjudication	gl	Count	1		5	6
		% within race perp	14.3%	83.3%		46.2%	
		nep	Count	6	1	7	
		% within race perp	85.7%	16.7%		53.8%	
	Total	Count	7	6	13		
		% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	

Table 39
gender victim * race perp * gender perp 1 Crosstabulation

gender perp 1				race perp			Total
				black	white	other	
male	gender victim	male	Count		6	1	7
			% within race perp		30.0%	33.3%	29.2%
		female	Count	1	14	2	17
			% within race perp	100.0%	70.0%	66.7%	70.8%
	Total		Count	1	20	3	24
			% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
female	gender victim	male	Count	4	3		7
			% within race perp	50.0%	50.0%		50.0%
		female	Count	4	3		7
			% within race perp	50.0%	50.0%		50.0%
	Total		Count	8	6		14
			% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Table 40
reported to * race perp * gender perp 1 Crosstabulation

gender perp 1				race perp			Total
				black	white	other	
male	reported to	mother	Count		4	1	5
			% within race perp		22.2%	100.0%	26.3%
		peer	Count		1		1
			% within race perp		5.6%		5.3%
		professional	Count		13		13

Table 40 continued

female	Total		% within race perp	72.2%		68.4%	
			Count	18	1	19	
			% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	reported to	mother		Count	1	3	4
				% within race perp	20.0%	50.0%	36.4%
		professional		Count	1	3	4
				% within race perp	20.0%	50.0%	36.4%
		other		Count	3		3
				% within race perp	60.0%		27.3%
	Total		Count	5	6	11	
			% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 41

parent support * race perp * gender perp 1 Crosstabulation

gender perp 1				race perp			Total
				black	white	other	
male	parent support	not believe not support	Count		4		4
			% within race perp		21.1%		17.4%
		believe support	Count	1	2		3
			% within race perp	100.0%	10.5%		13.0%
		ambivalent to statement supports child	Count		6		6
			% within race perp		31.6%		26.1%
		ambivalent to statement does not support child	Count		7	3	10
			% within race perp		36.8%	100.0%	43.5%

Table 41 continued

female	Total	Count	1	19	3	23
		% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	not believe not support	Count	4			4
		% within race perp	50.0%			28.6%
	believe support	Count	1			1
		% within race perp	12.5%			7.1%
	parent support believe not support	Count		3		3
		% within race perp		50.0%		21.4%
	ambivalent to statement supports child	Count	1			1
		% within race perp	12.5%			7.1%
	ambivalent to statement does not support child	Count	2	3		5
		% within race perp	25.0%	50.0%		35.7%
	Total	Count	8	6		14
		% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Table 42

maternal role co-victim * race perp * gender perp 1 Crosstabulation

gender perp 1			race perp			Total	
			black	white	other		
male	maternal role co- victim	yes	Count	9		9	
			% within race perp	45.0%		37.5%	
		no	Count	1	11	3	15
			% within race perp	100.0%	55.0%	100.0%	62.5%
		Total	Count	1	20	3	24

Table 42 continued

female	maternal role co-victim		% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
			Count		1		1
		yes	% within race perp		16.7%		7.7%
			Count	7	5		12
		no	% within race perp	100.0%	83.3%		92.3%
			Count	7	6		13
	Total		% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Table 43

co-perpetrator/conspirator * race perp * gender perp 1 Crosstabulation

gender perp 1			race perp			Total	
			black	white	other		
male	co- perpetrator/conspirator	yes	Count	1	12	3	16
		% within race perp	100.0%	60.0%	100.0%	66.7%	
		no	Count		8		8
		% within race perp		40.0%		33.3%	
		Total	Count	1	20	3	24
	% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
female	co- perpetrator/conspirator	yes	Count	6	4		10
		% within race perp	85.7%	66.7%		76.9%	
		no	Count	1	2		3
		% within race perp	14.3%	33.3%		23.1%	
		Total	Count	7	6		13
	% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%		

Table 44
protector * race perp * gender perp 1 Crosstabulation

gender perp 1			race perp			Total	
			black	white	other		
male	protector	yes	Count	2		2	
			% within race perp	10.0%		8.3%	
		no	Count	1	18	3	22
			% within race perp	100.0%	90.0%	100.0%	91.7%
	Total		Count	1	20	3	24
			% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
female	protector	no	Count	7	6		13
			% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
	Total		Count	7	6		13
			% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Table 45
perpetrator * race perp * gender perp 1 Crosstabulation

gender perp 1			race perp			Total	
			black	white	other		
male	perpetrator	yes	Count	1	1	2	
			% within race perp	100.0%	5.0%	8.3%	
		no	Count		19	3	22
			% within race perp		95.0%	100.0%	91.7%
	Total		Count	1	20	3	24
			% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
female	perpetrator	yes	Count	2	2	4	
			% within race perp	28.6%	33.3%		30.8%
		no	Count	5	4		9

Table 45 continued

	% within race perp	71.4%	66.7%	69.2%
	Count	7	6	13
Total	% within race perp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

APPENDIX B
DEFINITIONS

APPENDIX B

Definitions

1. **Adjudication:** A court determination is established during an adjudicatory hearing (sometimes called the trial or formal hearing), and is based on the allegations presented by Child Protective Services. The adjudication relies significantly on whether factual grounds exist to assume legal authority (wardship) over a child. The alleged perpetrator at this time has either chosen the plea of admission (guilty) or, no contest, or seeks modification of the allegations. The courts depend on accurate and objective facts to make the appropriate decision regarding the allegations presented.
2. **Children Protective Services:** A service instituted to protect the rights of children. If a perpetrator (parent/non-parent) is suspected of placing a child at an unreasonable risk of harm, due to the parent's failure to take reasonable steps to intervene to eliminate that risk, then an automatic petition to terminate parental rights must be filed in the following circumstances: Abandonment of a young

Child; Criminal sexual conduct involving penetration, attempted penetration, or assault with intent to penetrate; Battering, torture, or other severe physical abuse; Loss or serious impairment of an organ or limb; Life-threatening injury; Murder or attempted murder.
3. **Child Sexual Abuse:** Child sexual abuse is forced, tricked, or coerced sexual behavior between a young person and an older person.

4. Co-Perpetrator/Conspirator: The active participator, or silent observer in a Child Sexual Abuse offense.
5. Co-Victim: The coerced maternal (mother's) role subjected to the same physical/sexual abuse as the child victim.
6. Dispositional Hearing: The purpose of the dispositional hearing is to determine, who will have custody of the child during the court wardship and to put in place the case service plan for the child and family.
7. Extrafamilial: Represents persons of not-related by blood, and located outside the family unit.
- (a) Intrafamilial: Represents persons both related and not related by blood, and considered inside the family unit.
8. Guilty Plea: A statement issued to the court when the perpetrator admits to committing the offense.
9. Mother's in Child Neglect & Child Sexual Abuse:
Apathetic Futile Mothers: are withdrawn from social interaction, with no remorse/no feeling, and total disparity; Impulse Ridden Mothers have a low frustration tolerance with little ability to delay gratification and uses extremely poor judgment demonstrated by unfavorable actions; Mentally Retarded Mothers lack certain abilities to discern and logically apply common sense factors in child care and parenting; Reactive- Depression Mothers demonstrate an inability to adjust to life stressors which disallows their capabilities to parent adequately; psychotic mothers are usually delusional with possibly

hallucination, and sometimes unable to identify with ethics, moral codes, social norms, and effective parenting skills.

10. Neglect is divided into three categories: physical neglect, educational neglect and emotional neglect. Physical neglect is the category usually referred to in protective services.
11. Parent's Rights: Parental authority based in the child's developmental dependence on a nurturing parent-child relationship. Only with strong allegations supporting parental failure in this capacity should intervention be considered (Tower, 2002).
12. Perpetrator: Individual responsible for sexual molestation of a child under the age of 18, or an adult (retarded or slightly challenged) incapable of comprehending rape or sexual intercourse.
13. Protector: Parental expectations based on the person responsible (usually the mother's role) for ensuring the safety and well-being of vulnerable children from predators, who commit Child Sexual Abuse.
14. Roles: The assigned responsibility of each family member is delegated in general by social norms. A series of activities performed daily by each individual are utilized to stabilize the intra-familial existence. Each family member (father, mother, brother, sister, etc.) is assigned a role, which may enhance familial cohesion, or cause familial dysfunction. These universal roles are: Communication which facilitates patterns of interaction within regulatory subsystems, and sets boundaries that produce patterns of interaction through specific body language, facial expressions, silence, and verbally;

Bonding and Attachment is a vital aspects in the maternal/parental roles provided by the family through nurturing and appropriate child care; Rituals are roles generated by family member's repetitive ethnic/cultural celebratory interactions (i.e. Thanksgiving).

15. Sexual Abuse Types: Physical/psychological acts consisting of; nudity, disrobing, genital exposure, observation of the child, kissing, fondling masturbation or genital contact, child pornography, digital penetration, and vaginal or anal intercourse (NCPCA, 1996).
16. Sociological Approach to Neglect: Economic causes of neglect emphasizes the role of material deprivation and poverty, which can lead to stress in the family unit, as well as the socio-political environment; ecological factors of neglect appear to stem from living inside poverty stricken neighborhoods, which breed maltreating parents; societal causes of neglect infer that the values and institutions, which contribute to neglectful situations also produce deviant behaviors.

APPENDIX C

CODE DATA SHEET FOR CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE FAMILY AND CHILDREN COURT FILES (2003-04)

CODE DATA SHEET FOR CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE
FAMILY AND CHILDREN COURT FILES (2003-04)

1. ADJUDICATION: GL__ NCP__
2. GENDER OF VICTIM: M__ F__
- " " PARENT/GUARDIAN __ __
- " " PERPETRATOR __ __ 3.
- RACE/ETHNICITY OF VICTIM: B__ W__ BR__ OTHER__
- " " PARENT/GUARDIAN __ __ __ __
- " " PERPETRATOR __ __ __ __
4. CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE ACTION: YES__ NO__
5. PRESENT AGE AT LEGAL DISCLOSURE: _____
6. AGE WHEN SEXUAL ABUSE BEGAN: _____
7. PERSON/S TO WHOM CHILD REPORTED SEXUAL ABUSE PRIOR TO
LEGAL AUTHORITIES:
MOTHER__ STEP-MOTHER (FOSTER MOM)__ PEER__
PROFESSIONAL (DOCTOR, MINISTER, TEACHER, THERAPIST)
__ FATHER__ STEP-FATHER__ RELATIVE (AUNT, UNCLE,
COUSIN)__ OTHER (MOM'S BOYFRIEND, NEIGHBOR, RENTER)__
8. DID THE CHILD INITIALLY DENY SEXUAL ABUSE? YES
__ NO__
9. DID THE VICTIM(S) RECENT DISCLOSURE? YES
__ NO__
10. SUPPORT OF MOTHER/PARENT/GUARDIAN:

CODE DATA SHEET (CONTINUED)

____ DOES NOT BELIEVE NOR SUPPORTS CHILD'S STATEMENT
____ BELIEVES CHILD'S STATEMENT AND SUPPORTS CHILD'S
STATEMENT

_____ BELIEVES CHILD'S STATEMENT BUT DOES NOT SUPPORT
CHILD'S STATEMENT

_____ DOES NOT KNOW BUT DOESN'T SUPPORT CHILD

_____ AMBIVALENT REGARDING STATEMENT BUT SUPPORTS
CHILD

_____ AMBIVALENT REGARDING STATEMENT BUT DOES NOT
SUPPORT CHILD

12. CHILD PLACED OUT OF HOME? YES _____ NO _____
_____ RELATIVE CARE _____ FOSTER CARE _____ RESIDENTIAL
CARE _____ FRIENDS _____ SHELTER _____
_____ PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALIZATION

13. LENGTH OF TIME (APPROX.) CHILD PLACED OUTSIDE OF
THE HOME:
DAY/S _____ WEEK/S _____ MONTH/S _____ YEAR/S _____

14. TYPE OF SEXUAL ABUSE/MOLESTATION
_____ PENETRATION _____ ORAL _____ ANAL _____ INTERCOURSE
_____ FONDLING _____ TOUCHING OF GENITALS OVER CLOTHES
_____ TOUCHING OF GENITALS UNDER CLOTHES

15. LOCATION OF ABUSE: HOME _____ SCHOOL _____ CHURCH _____
SITTER _____ OTHER _____

16. ANY MEDICAL EVIDENCE SUPPORTING SEXUAL ABUSE? YES _____
NO _____

17. ALLEGED OFFENDERS PLEA: GUILTY _____ NOT GUILTY _____ NO
CONTEST _____

CODE DATA SHEET (CONTINUED)

18. ADULT PERPETRATOR'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE CHILD:
MOM _____ DAD _____ STEP-MOM _____ STEP-DAD _____ FOSTER MOM _____
FOSTER DAD _____ RELATIVE _____ OTHER _____ LIVE IN _____ NON-
LIVIN _____

19. MOTHER'S RELATIONSHIP TO ADULT PERPETRATOR: WIFE
_____ GIRLFRIEND _____ EX-WIFE _____ EX-GIRLFRIEND _____
SELF _____ OTHER _____

20. AGE OF VICTIM _____

21. AGE OF PERPETRATOR: _____

22. OUTCOME OF CASE: TERMINATION__ RETURN TO MOM__
LONGTERM FOSTER CARE__ ADOPTION__
23. PARENT/GUARDIAN: EMPLOYED __ UNEMPLOYED__ FIA__
DISABILITY__ OTHER__
24. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: Y__ N__ PHYSICAL EVIDENCE ____
REPORTED ____ SUSPICION ____
25. MATERNAL ROLE CLASSIFICATION: CO-VICTIM ____
CO-PERPETRATOR/CO-CONSPIRATOR ____ PROTECTOR ____
PERPETRATOR ____

REFERENCES

- Allan, G. (1999). The sociology of the Family. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Baber, K. & A. K. (1992). Women and families: Feminist reconstructions. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Babbie, E. (1998). The practice of social research (8th ed.) Westford, MA: Wadsworth Publishing Company
- Bedard, M. E. (1992). Breaking with tradition: Diversity, conflict, and change in contemporary American families. New York: General Hall, Inc.
- Bolen, R. M. (2001). Child sexual abuse: Its scope and our failure. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Carter, E., & McGoldick, M. (Eds.). (1988). The changing family cycle: A framework for family therapy (2nd ed.). New York: Gardner.
- Conte, J. R. (2002). Critical issues in child sexual abuse: Historical, legal, and psychological perspectives. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Elbow, M. & Mayfield, J. (1991). Mothers of incest victims: Villains, victims, or protectors? Families in society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services CEU Article No. 9, 78-84.
- Faller, K. (1990). Understanding child sexual maltreatment. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Finkelhor, David (1984). Child sexual abuse: New theory and research. New York: Free Press.
- Finklehor, D., Gelles, R. J., Hotaling G. T., & Straus, M. A. (Eds.). (1981). The dark side of families. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Fowley, M. (1999). Guidelines for achieving permanency in child protection proceedings. Children's Charter of the Courts of Michigan, Inc.: United Way of Michigan.

- Goodwin, J. M. (1989). Sexual abuse: Incest victims and their families (2nd edition). Chicago: Year Book Medical Publishers, Inc.
- Greenstein, T. (1993). Maternal employment and child behavioral outcomes. Journal of Family Issues, 14, 323-354.
- Haveman, R., & Wolfe, B. (1994). Succeeding generations. New York: Russell Sage.
- Hill, R. B., Bilingsley., & Teele, J. E. (1993) Research on the African-American family. In W. L. Reed (Ed.), A Holistic Perspective (pp. 1-154). Boston, Mass: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
- Hite, Shere (1995). The Hite report on the family. New York, New York: Grove Press.
- Jacobs, J. L. (1983). Victimized daughters: Sexual violence and empathic female self. Signs:Journal of women in culture and society, 19 (1), pp. 126-141.
- Kline, David M, & White James M. (1996). Family theories: An introduction. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Levesque, J. R. (1999). Sexual abuse of children: A human rights perspective. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Noller, P., & Fitzpatrick, M. (1993). Communication in family relationships. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ross, J. J. (1994). The virtues of the family. New York: The Free Press.
- Roth, S. & Lebowitz, L. (1988). The experience of sexual trauma. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 1 (1), 79-107.
- Smith, J. (1997). "System Trauma Following "The Disclosure Of Child Sexual Abuse". Volume 12 (4); August 1997).
- Sulloway, F. J. (1996). Born to rebel: Birth order, family dynamics and creative lives. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Summit, R. (1983). The child sexual abuse accommodation syndrome. Child Abuse Neglect, 7: 177-193.

- Thomas-Cooper, I. K. (2001). Child welfare professionals and incest families: a difficult encounter. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Towers, C. C., (1999). Understanding child abuse & neglect (Fourth Ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon (A Via Con Company).
- Wazir, R. & Oudenhoven, N. (1998). Child sexual abuse: What can governments do? (Eds). A comparative investigation into policy instruments used in Belgium, Britain, Germany, the Netherlands, and Norway. Cambridge, MA: Library of Congress Cataloging –in-Publication Data.
- White, J. (1991). Dynamics of family development: The theory of family development. New York: Guilford.
- Winton, C. A. (1990). Frameworks for studying families. Guilford, CT: Dushkin.
- Wyatt, G. E., & Newcomb, M. (1990). Internal and external mediators of women's sexual abuse in childhood. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58, pp. 758-767.
- (1985). The sexual abuse of Afro-American and White women in childhood. Child Abuse and Neglect: The International Journal 9, 5-7-519.