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Abstract

In the United States, 3.3 million child maltreatment reports are made annually involving 6 million children with non-biological males responsible for approximately 14% of the reported maltreatment cases. A primary prevention campaign called “Choose Your Partner Carefully” was introduced in Ohio to prevent and reduce the incidence of this problem by educating and raising the awareness of single mothers and the general public on how to prevent maltreatment by non-biological males. The campaign was designed to: 1. inform mothers that the partners they choose have an influence on their children’s lives and 2. provide assessment criteria used to determine if the partner has the potential to abuse or is abusing her children. The campaign used various types of social marketing techniques to distribute the campaign, including radio, television, newspaper, billboards, brochures, social media, and public children’s services websites to promote the campaign message. The campaign materials direct mothers to resources for childcare, parent education, social services, and abuse reporting.

This study evaluated the effectiveness of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign on reducing the incidence of non-biological male-perpetrated child maltreatment in the counties that implemented the program. County factors such as the strength and length of the program implementation, poverty rates, and the availability of social services and childcare availability were included in the analysis. Analysis of
variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the difference in incidence rates of non-biological male maltreatment. A negative binomial regression model controlling for covariates was used to provide a more detailed look at the impact of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign.

The results indicated the strength of the campaign was related to an incidence rate increase in child maltreatment and the availability of child care funds was related to a decrease in incidence rate of non-biological child maltreatment. The findings have implications for further evaluation of child maltreatment prevention interventions, for the promotion of social work practice and research collaborations, for further research into child care policies that promote more availability and research attention, and for social work education to better prepare social workers for evaluation and research as standard practice.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

A five year old boy was beaten unconscious and later died at the hands of his mother’s boyfriend (McNeil, 2013). A two year old boy was left comatose from a beating given by his mother’s boyfriend. The boyfriend had been entrusted to care for the toddler two nights a week (Brignall, 2013). A four year old girl died of severe head injuries after being thrown down a set of stairs by her mother’s boyfriend. He was angry because she would not stop crying (Sedlak, 2012). These stories of child maltreatment are reported regularly in the morning paper and the nightly television news. Living in a home with an unrelated man significantly increases a child’s risk of being maltreated or fatally assaulted by that man (Yampolskaya, Greenbaum, & Berson, 2009). These situations beg for an answer to the question, “How do we prevent this kind of child maltreatment from happening?”

Non-Biological Male Perpetrated Child Maltreatment

Non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment is child maltreatment perpetrated by a man who is not related to the child victim. A non-biological male is defined as a male figure in the child’s life that includes the roles of step-father, adoptive father, legal guardian, unmarried partner of parent, friend, boyfriend, paramour, caretaker of the child, or neighbor. A paramour, a category used by child protective services is
defined as a non-biological male who is usually the mother’s boyfriend, although the *Webster’s Dictionary* (online, 2013) states “an illicit lover of a married woman.”

**Prevalence of Non-Biological Male Perpetrated Child Maltreatment**

Each State has its own definitions of child abuse and neglect that are based on standards set by Federal law. Federal legislation provides a foundation for states by identifying a set of acts or behaviors that define child abuse and neglect. The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA), (42 U. S. C. §5101), as amended by the CAPTA Reauthorization Act of 2010, retained the existing definition of child abuse and neglect as, at a minimum:

Any recent act or failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker which results in death, serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse or exploitation; or an act or failure to act, which presents an imminent risk of serious harm. Most States recognize four major types of maltreatment: neglect, physical abuse, psychological maltreatment, and sexual abuse. Although any of the forms of child maltreatment may be found separately, they can occur in combination (Department of Health and Human Services, 2011, pp. ii).

In the United States, 3.7 million reports of child maltreatment are made to Public Children’s Services annually, involving 6 million children (U. S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), 2010c). Of the 3.3 million reports, 63% or 2.2 million reports involving 3.7 million children are screened in to the child protective system for an
investigation of the allegation of child maltreatment. Following the investigation, 24% of these investigations involving 772,000 children are substantiated for maltreatment. Substantiation is the act of determining through the evaluation of the investigation that child maltreatment is present. More than 75% of child maltreatment substantiations were neglect, followed by physical abuse at 15%, and sexual abuse at 10% (DHHS, 2010c). Approximately 1,740 children die annually from child maltreatment with fatalities of children under the age of four representing 79.8% of all fatalities (DHHS, 2010c).

According to the Public Children’s Services Association of Ohio (2011), 116,216 allegations of maltreatment occurred in the state of Ohio from January 1 to December 31, 2009. In 2011, the Ohio Child Fatality Review Board reported 26 child deaths from physical abuse and neglect. All but three of the deaths were of children under the age of 10 years old. (Ohio Department of Health, 2013). Children with special needs such as developmental disabilities, chronic physical illness, and mental health diagnoses are at increased risk for child maltreatment. Age is also a significant risk factor with younger children at greater risk to experience maltreatment and severe injury from the maltreatment. The need to protect children under the age of five is particularly critical since the abuse of younger children is more likely to result in death because of the child’s size, inability to protect self, and dependency (Mercy, Saul, Turner, & McCarthy, 2011; Crosson-Tower, 2010).

Most child welfare services are provided to women, yet men account for more than 40% of child maltreatment perpetrators (U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2005c). Male perpetrators are generally those charged with the care of the child
and frequently involve fathers, social fathers, or mothers’ boyfriends (National Maternal and Child Health Center for Child Death Reviews, 2011).

Recent data indicates that non-biological males are responsible for approximately 14% of the reported maltreatment cases (Ohio Department of Health 2010). Ohio’s Lorain County Children’s Services reports that approximately seven percent of all substantiated maltreatment cases were perpetrated by the mother’s paramour. The percentages of non-biological male maltreatment increases when physical abuse alone is considered. In Ohio’s Allen County Children’s Services, 18% of reported child deaths by abuse were at the hands of the mother’s boyfriend (Public Children Services Association of Ohio, 2009).

**Impact of Non-Biological Male Perpetrated Child Maltreatment**

The consequences and costs of child maltreatment are vast. Child maltreatment has many consequences for the victim with effects in the areas of physical, psychological, and behavioral health. These effects can include head trauma, cognitive difficulties, poor mental and emotional health, high risk behavioral responses, juvenile delinquency, alcohol and drug abuse, and abusive behaviors that require intensive levels of care (Mercy, Saul, Turner, & McCarthy, 2011).

Societal consequences of child maltreatment include direct and indirect costs. Several studies have examined the estimated cost of child maltreatment over the lifetime of the child but they have been criticized for methodological and calculation errors as well as lack of transparency in the estimation process. The most highly regarded
estimation to date has been produced by Fang, Brown, Curtis, and Mercy (2012). Using an incidence-based approach of 2008 data, the lifetime economic burden of child maltreatment is estimated to be approximately $124 billion. The direct cost of the lifetime burden of a case of child maltreatment is estimated at approximately $200,000 per person which is equivalent to the lifetime cost of type 2 diabetes per person.

The indirect costs of child maltreatment are the long term costs to society. These costs include the operating costs of children services, law enforcement, health care, juvenile and adult criminal, mental health and substance abuse, and domestic violence systems when addressing child maltreatment (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2013a; Fang, Brown, Curtis, and Mercy, 2012). In light of these costs, child abuse prevention experts suggest taxpayers could save over $104 billion each year with active prevention strategies (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2013a).

**Prevention of Non-Biological Male Perpetrated Child Maltreatment**

Primary prevention is designed to prevent and reduce the incidence of the identified problem through education and raised awareness of the target audience and general public. Prevention programming that specifically addresses children and the families of those children have been shown to effect change at the individual and relationship levels (Daro & Donnelly, 2002). One type of prevention programing is the public awareness approach often used in child maltreatment prevention because this type of programming is designed to raise awareness and diminish stigma associated with the problem at the individual, family, community, and societal levels. Public awareness
campaigns play a frequent and valuable role in child abuse prevention. The campaigns seek to prevent child maltreatment by providing information so that the receiver of the information will voluntarily change their behavior in favor of the target behavior, which in this case is protecting children. This type of prevention can impact the beliefs and the action taking behaviors of the bystander of an abused child (Mudde, Hoefnagels, Van Wijnen, & Kremers, 2007).

The target audience is the mother of the child and any other bystanders in the general public that might act to prevent child maltreatment. In the case of Choose Your Partner Carefully, prevention and public awareness programming raises awareness about identifying child maltreatment and the characteristics of that action. The campaign suggests the path towards change such as reporting the child maltreatment and seeking support services for the victim of the child maltreatment and the family.

In 2006, the Ohio Child Fatality Review board made several recommendations on how to prevent deaths due to child abuse and neglect including: 1. educating professionals to increase mandatory reporting of suspected child abuse, 2. conducting community campaigns to encourage public reporting of suspected cases, and 3. teaching parents to identify responsible adults as caregivers for children (Ohio Department of Health, 2006).

Within two years of the Child Fatality Review boards’ recommendations, the problem of abuse by mothers’ boyfriends in Ohio received heightened attention following several high-profile cases covered in the media involving child fatalities perpetrated by paramours. Media attention of these cases throughout the state of Ohio prompted a call to
develop prevention methods that reduced maltreatment of children by non-biological males by teaching mothers to identify responsible adults as caregivers for their children. The available research on risk factors and causes of child maltreatment informed the development of the prevention program called Choose Your Partner Carefully.

The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign was developed in 2008 by a caseworker, Dorena Gilchrist (P. J. Burtnett, personal communication, January 25, 2011) in Lorain County, Ohio. She addressed this issue while working on a research paper for a social work course that focused on boyfriends and their relationship to family violence, specifically child abuse. Her interest in this topic was prompted by the high profile media cases of boyfriend/paramour abuse and fatalities in Ohio. Ms. Gilchrist, the Lorain County Children’s Services public information officer and a committee of Lorain County child welfare workers researched the statistics in their county and the state of Ohio to determine the extent of the problem. They found that approximately 10% of all substantiated abuse and neglect cases in Ohio were perpetrated by unrelated male adults. In response, the group at Lorain County developed the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign to raise awareness and educate women about who to let into their children’s lives (Public Children Services Association of Ohio, 2009).

The Choose Your Partner Carefully prevention and public awareness campaign was first initiated in Lorain County, Ohio in 2008. The Lorain County public information officer brought the campaign to the attention of other county Public Information Officer’s at a meeting held at the Public Children Services Association of Ohio (PCSAO). A Public Information Officer in children’s services is responsible for communicating with the
public regarding child maltreatment cases in the media and administering prevention
programming. Smaller counties may not have Public Information Officers so the duties
are spread among multiple employees. Public Children Services Association of Ohio
committee refined the campaign developed in Lorain County and developed a tool kit for
ready use at the county level (P. J. Burtnett, personal communication, January 25, 2011 &

In 2008 the campaign was shared with the other 87 counties at the annual Public
Children Services Association of Ohio’s Annual Conference. Soon after the conference,
several other Ohio counties implemented the campaign. To date, approximately eighteen
of the eighty-eight counties in Ohio have implemented the program but no two counties
have implemented the program in exactly the same way. The toolkit developed by
PCSAO and available on their website provides general guidelines as well as several
social marketing strategies that can be used to communicate the Choose Your Partner
Carefully message (P. J. Burtnett, personal communication, January 25, 2011).

The Choose Your Partner program utilizes an array of social marketing methods.
The campaign, directed at single mothers, is designed to inform mothers that the partners
they choose have an influence on their children’s lives and provides assessment criteria
for mothers to use in determining whether her partner has the potential to abuse or is
abusing her children. The campaign also links mothers to resources for childcare, parent
education, social service needs, and abuse reporting.

Public Children Services Association of Ohio posts a toolkit for county public
children service agency use that describes the campaign, the objectives, data sources,
tools, talking points, distribution suggestions, and samples of media tools. The campaign messaging was distributed through postcards, news releases, community interest media stories, public speaking, television and radio public service announcements, advertising, billboards, posters, flyers, magnets, social media, and included in parenting courses. This information was also posted on the websites of county public children services agencies and Public Children Services Association of Ohio. The campaign for each county identified community resources needed by the target population and provided that information printed on the awareness materials for the specific county. This information was made available through the campaign so those targeted would be aware of community resources, such as childcare, mental health, substance abuse, and intimate partner violence agencies.

The objectives of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign in Ohio are:

- Increase awareness among women of the risk their children face when a non-related male is entrusted with their care
- Provide tools to help women better evaluate the likelihood that their paramour could become a perpetrator of abuse
- Educate women to recognize potential signs of abuse to their children
- Increase community awareness of the problem and its overall impact on the community
- Provide local resource information (Public Children Service Association of Ohio, 2009).

The campaign message is as follows:

Choose your partner carefully…your child’s life depends on it.
When you choose a partner for you, you are choosing for your child too.
Your baby is counting on you to make the right decision.
Never leave your child with someone you don’t trust with your child’s life.

Does your partner:

- Show anger or impatience when your child cries or has a tantrum?
- Call your child bad names or put him down?
- Think it is funny to scare your child?
- Stop you from bringing your child to his family events?
- Make all the decisions for you and your child?
- Tell you that you are a bad parent or that you should not have your kids?
- Pretend that when he hurts your child that you are to blame or that it’s no big deal?
- Make your child scared by using guns or knives or weapons?
- Tell you that your child is a nuisance?

If you answered yes to even one of these your child might be at risk!

Never leave your child with someone you don’t trust with your child’s life. (Public Children Service Association of Ohio, 2009)

The Public Children Services Association of Ohio Toolkit provides examples for Postcards, Press releases, Opinion/Editorial writing, Talking Points for Community Presentations, a PowerPoint Presentation, a Curriculum Model, Public Service
Announcement, and Advertising. The Public Children Services of Ohio website provides the following examples of tools with explanations and guidance for distribution in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postcards and Brochures</td>
<td>The campaign is geared toward increasing protective behaviors from mother as well as mother’s friends, family and services providers. The message needs to be presented to mother as frequently as possible and by people that have influence in her life. The campaign then needs to aim toward providing mother with information by providing the information to mother directly and to her friends and family so they can also provide the message to mother. Postcards can be reproduced economically and distributed to the community service providers that are most likely to have contact with the target audience. Additional distribution sites can be local libraries, YMCA/YWCA, pediatric clinics, health clinics, domestic violence shelters, groups, child care providers, preschools, Head Start, health departments, and Department of Job and Family Services workers. To help with distribution and increase community collaboration, agencies can leave room for multiple logos so all interested community organizations can be actively involved and identified with this important campaign</td>
<td>Appendix A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>The media would likely be interested in this campaign because they have the headlines from the child fatalities to demonstrate the severity of the problem. Engage the media through phone calls and discuss any recent incidents. Help them see how this campaign will be valuable in preventing children from being severely harmed or killed. Agencies that do not have a relationship with their local reporter can send a press release. The press release will contain the data you collected to help the reporter see the scope of the problem</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Public Children Services Association of Ohio Toolkit: Social Marketing Strategy and Distribution Methods
Table 1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion/Editorial Writing</th>
<th>Newspapers often welcome opinion or editorial columns that address issues of community interest. An op-ed column, prepared under the name of a county child welfare director or other community leader, can serve to educate the newspaper audience. A similar piece can be effectively posted on community websites. Talking Points - Develop a series of talking points that can be provided to educators, partner agencies, medical professionals, hair salons, churches, day care centers and other gathering places to help them understand the problem, recognize its symptoms and communicate the need for action to mothers.</th>
<th>Appendix C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Point Presentations</td>
<td>The Choose Your Partner Carefully power point was developed for the “Choose Your Partner Carefully” campaign tool-kit and using materials from the starting point website, The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services Website and the Break the Cycle Website. PowerPoint presentations can be used to both “teach the teacher” and educate mothers about this problem.</td>
<td>Appendix D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Model</td>
<td>A 6 week curriculum targeted at pregnant teens, teen mothers, and single adult mothers and aimed at increasing awareness among women of the risk their children face when a non-related male is entrusted with their care. Other objectives include: •Provide tools to help women better evaluate the likelihood that their paramour could become a perpetrator of abuse •Educate women to help them recognize potential signs of abuse to their children •Educate women about potential community resources for child care (other than non-related male) •Increase community awareness of the problem and its overall impact on the community The curriculum describes activities which can be used in small group settings to provide more awareness on the issue.</td>
<td>Appendix E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Service Announcement</th>
<th>Develop 30 second and 60 second PSAs addressing the issue of paramours being perpetrators of child abuse. Distribute to local radio stations. Consider asking a local official or media personality to appear in a radio or TV spot.</th>
<th>Appendix F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>The message sent to mothers via the individuals important in their lives (via postcard campaign) can be supported by paid advertising or public service message placement. While the campaign will be most effective with a grassroots message, the advertising message will support the community as a whole and identify this issue and an important issue for your community to tackle. Advertising can include radio message, print advertising, billboard, poster, television or Internet campaign. Lorain County Children Services for example, sent a newsletter article and supporting image (postcard image) to partner agencies and they included the message in their newsletter to their constituents (Public Children Service Association of Ohio, 2009).</td>
<td>Appendix G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Choose Your Partner Carefully Campaign Logic Model

A logic model is a way to describe a program by linking the program elements to the sequence of events that bring about the desired change. It also sets up the program components with outcomes and creates a map for the program evaluation. It is a way to visually and concretely display the program (Grinnell, Gabor, & Unrau, 2012). The logic model contributes information towards the decision making about the research design and analysis methods of a program evaluation. The logic model was developed through reverse engineering with information from the toolkit. Figure 1 is the logic model for the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign. (Developed with information from Public Children Service Association of Ohio Toolkit, 2009).
Figure 1. Choose Your Partner Carefully Campaign Logic Model

Purpose of Current Study and Hypotheses

This dissertation is an evaluation of The Choose Your Partner Carefully prevention and public awareness campaign and its relationship to the outcome variable: incidence rates of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment. The Choose Your Partner Carefully prevention and public awareness campaign was implemented without a plan for evaluation and to date no data has been collected by the participating counties on the effectiveness of the campaign. The study intent is to provide information on the effectiveness of a prevention campaign designed to prevent child maltreatment by non-biological males or mother’s boyfriends by increasing mother awareness of the possible
risks associated with leaving her children with a non-related male caretaker. The evaluation assessed the campaign effectiveness for reducing the incidences of child maltreatment by non-related male caretakers, whether the strength and length of the campaign has an impact on outcomes, and whether confounding variables such as poverty, supportive child care and social services influence the outcomes. The results of this evaluation has implications for the design and implementation of future prevention programs, data collection and management, social work practice and education in the field of child welfare, the use of evaluations to determine intervention effectiveness, evaluation policy, research on child care and child maltreatment, child care policy, and academia and practice community collaborations.

The Research Hypotheses to be tested are:

Research Hypothesis

The Choose Your Partner Carefully public awareness and prevention campaign decreases the incidences of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment over time.

Null Hypotheses

The Choose Your Partner Carefully public awareness and prevention campaign does not change the incidences of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment over time.

The research questions to be addressed in this study are:
1. Does county participation in a child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign change the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

2. Does the strength and length of the county child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign and county factors such as poverty, childcare and social service availability impact the child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign effect on the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

**Methodology and Analysis of Current Study**

The methodology used in this dissertation is a pre- and post-intervention design with non-equivalent groups in the analysis of secondary and survey data. Multiple data sources are used in this study. The National Child Maltreatment Data System (NCANDS) Child File, FFY 2000-2011 is used to provide data on the number of child maltreatment cases perpetrated by non-biological males, i.e. the dependent variable. The Choose Your Partner Carefully County Program Survey was used to gather information on the presence or absence of the campaign, the strength of the campaign as measured by the number of marketing strategies used, and the length of time that the Choose Your Partner Carefully prevention and public awareness campaign was implemented. The Ohio Poverty Report data provides the county poverty level of each county in the study. Ohio Census demographic data is used to construct child care burden by creating a county level ratio of children under the age of fourteen to adults over the age of eighteen. The Ohio
Department of Job and Family Services County Profile- Childcare Services and Funding provide the number of child care facilities and funding level of child care by county. Information on county size was obtained from The Ohio Department of Development to define a proxy variable for county social service availability. The analyses used to address the research questions are an Analysis of Variance and a Negative Binomial Regression.

The methodology and analysis will be addressed in Chapter 3: Methodology and Chapter 4: Analysis, respectively. Finally the results and implications will be presented in Chapter 5: Results and Implications.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Child maltreatment is a significant public health problem involving over 6 million children annually. The effects of child maltreatment are far reaching and include physical and emotional harm for the individual child and family, possible child fatality, and the output of multiple resources by society to address the results of child maltreatment. Some individuals responsible for protecting children are also responsible for perpetrating child maltreatment. In Ohio, approximately 14% of the child maltreatment cases involve non-biological males who are providing child care (Ohio Department of Health, 2010).

The Choose Your Partner Carefully prevention campaign exposes mothers to a message designed to prevent and reduce the incidence of non-related male perpetrated child maltreatment by increasing the ability of mothers to protect their children. The message of the program is designed to inform mothers that the partners they choose have an influence on their children’s lives and provide assessment criteria they can use to determine the partner’s potential to mistreat their child. The campaign also provides information on available child care and social services to support the mother.
Having a protective adult is an important factor for increasing the safely of a child but other protective and risk factors associated with child maltreatment must be considered in evaluating the Choose Your Partner Carefully prevention campaign. Several factors are highly correlated with the presence of child maltreatment such as poverty, lack of child care, and the need for social services to address parental problems and stresses.

Poverty of the family and locality contribute to the variety of stresses on families and is associated with child maltreatment. Poverty and the resulting insufficient support systems can increase the stress and drain on parents and diminish emotional availability to their children. Poverty and the need for income and resources prompt the need for employment. Being employed and faced with insufficient child care resources results in high child care burden. Child care burden is the scarcity of child care in the community. Available resources in these areas act as protective factors by lowering the stress and drain on families while the lack thereof acts as a risk factor for child maltreatment (Crosson-Tower, 2010).

Parent problems such as depression, mental health disorders, substance abuse disorders, and intimate partner violence can reduce parental resiliency, add to the stress and drain, and reduce the ability to cope. These parental factors are associated with the risk of child maltreatment. The availability of social services to address these issues for families in a variety of income levels acts as a protective factor for child maltreatment (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2013a; McGuinness & Schneider, 2007).
This chapter will examine and summarize the literature on non-biological child maltreatment and how the covariates of poverty, lack of child care, and the availability of social services can impact the incidences of child abuse or neglect. The use of prevention programming to interrupt the process of maltreatment and the underlying theories of prevention will be examined and summarized as well.

**Biologically Unrelated Men and Child Maltreatment**

Non-biological and transient caregivers in the home, such as a mother’s male partner, are a risk factor for child maltreatment (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2013a). In the child protection system, perpetrators are defined and reported in state and federal databases by their relationship to the victim but the categories and definitions of perpetrators are not standardized or always clearly defined. The most common categories of perpetrator types include parent, boyfriend, stepparent, unmarried partner, and paramour. The most common categories of parent relationship types include biological, adoptive, stepparent, and unknown parent type. Friends, legal guardian, unmarried partner of parent, and unknown are listed under nonparental perpetrator. Approximately 46% of perpetrators are male and of those about 50% are male non-parents which include adoptive fathers, step-fathers, and mother’s boyfriends. Parents are responsible for most of the reported maltreatment at 81.2% of perpetrators falling into this category. Others reported as responsible for maltreatment include: relatives other than parents (6.1%), unmarried partners of parents (4.4%), others, not defined (3.8%); unknown (2.8%) and the remaining undefined (less than 1%). Nonparent perpetrators
victimize more females than males and are associated with higher rates of physical and sexual abuse with a higher percentage of preteen and teenage victims (DHHS, 2005c).

Many children who do not live with their biological father reside with ‘social fathers’. Social fathers are defined as men who are not biologically related to the children and are connected through their relationship with the children’s mother. These men may be stepfathers, boyfriends, or paramours. Mothers who live with men who are not biologically related to their children are significantly more likely to be involved with Child Protective Services than mothers who live with the biological father of all children in the household (Berger, Paxson, & Waldfogel, 2009; Chooey, C. & Zhang, Y. 2006; Margolin, 1992; Radhakrishna, Bou-Saada, Hunter, Catellier, & Kotch, 2001; Stiffman, Schnitzer, Adam, Kruse, & Ewigman, 2002). In a study of runaway and homeless youth, households that included a non-related parent figure were associated with a greater than expected risk of physical and sexual abuse to the children in the family (McRee, 2008). “At the very least, CPS should work with mothers to minimize the potential dangers of children’s exposure to unrelated men vis-a-vis child maltreatment while also operating under the assumption that most unrelated men do not engage in child maltreatment” (Berger, Paxson, & Waldfogel, 2009, p. 275).

In terms of maltreatment patterns, mother’s boyfriends tend to fall between biological fathers and the remainder of the nonparent group in the perpetration of sexual abuse. Approximately two-thirds of the sexual abuse cases reported to CPS involve male nonparents. In a study by Margolin and Craft (1989), the findings showed the younger the non-parental caregiver, the higher the risk of child maltreatment. Additionally, if this
maltreatment was sexual, the maltreatment was more likely to be perpetrated by a male and to involve intercourse and physical assault.

Biological fathers are less likely to act alone in the perpetration of child maltreatment where as non-related males tend to act alone rather than in concert with the mother (DHHS, 2005c). Recidivism of child maltreatment is lowest among mother’s boyfriends and stepfathers. Ejection from the family system by the mother or protective services following the maltreatment may explain this rate (DHHS, 2010e).

Being male is a stronger predictor of child maltreatment than being female. Starling, Holden, and Jenny (1995) examined the relationship of perpetrators to the victims of abusive head trauma and found that 68.5% of the perpetrators were male. This included fathers, boyfriends, and step-fathers. It is speculated that one explanation for this may be that men are less educated about child development and child behavior because of less involvement in the nurturance and care taking roles within our society (Guterman & Lee, 2005). Abusive parents and caregivers tend to have unrealistic expectations of children, lack parenting skills, and lack knowledge of normal child development and behavioral management (Daro & McCurdy, 1994).

One study operationalized unrealistic expectations as the lack of knowledge about developmental milestones which increased the likelihood of child maltreatment (Azar & Rohrbeck, 1986). This study specifically suggests that further research in this area focus on families that include abusive boyfriends, spouses, or paramours who may be limited in their knowledge of child development.
When women have relationship instability with men who are unrelated biologically to their children, greater relationship instability seems to occur also for the child relationships (Radhakriskna, Bou-Saada, Hunter, Catellier, & Kotch, 2001). Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, Newman, Fagan, and Silva (1997) found a positive correlation between the frequency and severity of domestic violence towards mothers and physical aggression towards children. Even when children are not the direct victims of violence, emotional harm can occur from witnessing intimate partner violence. Witnessing intimate partner violence is considered physical child maltreatment by CPS (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2013b). In a study of fatal child abuse cases in Britain, 62% of the perpetrators were stepfathers who were also engaged in intimate partner violence. The findings revealed batterers were more frequently violent against children in their care (Cavanagh, Dobash, & Dobash, 2007). When intimate partner violence is severe, the child abuse is generally more severe (Hartley, 2005).

Yampolskaya and Greenbaum (2009) examined the case record reviews of child maltreatment perpetrators in Florida, and found that being a biologically unrelated caregiver was the strongest predictor of fatal child maltreatment. Perpetrators who were not biologically related were 17 times more likely than biological parents to commit fatal child maltreatment. In addition to being a biologically unrelated male caregiver, other characteristics such as living with the victim, having a domestic violence history, being of younger age, having a juvenile justice history, and having substance abuse and mental health disorders were consistently linked to fatal child maltreatment (Yampolskaya and Greenbaum, 2009).
Data from the Missouri Child Fatality Review for children less than five years of age during a seven year period in the 1990’s, indicate that children who live with unrelated adults are at high risk of inflicted-injury death. Most of the perpetrators were male and lived in the household at the time of the death (Schnitzer & Ewigman, 2005).

Similarly, in-depth interviews with men in Bogotá, Columbia who were reported to authorities for child maltreatment were analyzed for risk factors. Qualitative and quantitative analysis showed that 44% of the perpetrators were stepfathers and that these men reported more stress, less social support, a tendency to have unrealistic expectations of children, and to react explosively in discipline matters. Marital conflict and domestic violence also were associated with the child maltreatment in this study (Klevens, Bayón, & Sierra, 2000).

In a study that looked at the overrepresentation of boyfriend abuse, Margolin (1992) interviewed single mothers and reviewed children services abuse data. The study showed overrepresentation of abuse by boyfriends. Proposed explanations included the boyfriend’s undefined role with his girlfriend’s children, lack of societal legitimization of the role of boyfriend to the family, and the competing roles of the mother-boyfriend dyad and the mother-child dyad.

Additionally several demographic variables increase the risk of abuse. Single parents tend to be poorer than married mothers and poverty limits access to childcare. Boyfriends commit more child abuse while providing childcare than females (Gelles, 1992). Mother’s boyfriends who perpetrated child maltreatment and were the caregivers
of the children were also associated with a higher incidence of substance abuse and
domestic violence (DHHS, 2005c).

More research is needed to explain the dynamics of non-related male child
maltreatment. Although single parenthood for women has been established as a risk
factor for child maltreatment (CDC, 2013a), studies on the specific dynamic of non-
related male presence in the household are needed. Low socioeconomic status has been
established as a risk factor for child maltreatment but how this factors into a mother’s
relationship with a non-related male perpetrator needs further study. Mothers’ difficult or
unstable relationships have been correlated with child maltreatment. Child abuse by
fathers is three times more likely than abuse by mothers and intimate partner violence in
the home means a child is 15 times more likely to experience child abuse (McKay, 1994).

“Despite such links, there remains little precise understanding of the specific ways that
mothers’ relationships with fathers shape the family system to potentially heighten
physical child maltreatment risk or, conversely to potentially lower such risk in a
protective fashion” (Guterman & Lee, 2005, p. 137).

Poverty

As far back as the early 1601 Elizabethan Poor Laws, poverty and the fate of
children have been viewed as intertwined. Poverty is highly correlated with child
maltreatment and is a strong predictor of repeat maltreatment. Child maltreatment is
reported across all socioeconomic groups, although it is disproportionately reported
among poor families (Center for Disease Control, 2013a). “Poverty, the erosion of
neighborhoods, and geographic mobility (p.424)” are significant stressors for families (Crosson-Tower, 2010). The multiple stressors resulting from poverty erode the ability of families to emotionally care for children.

In a study of the 1985 National Family Violence Survey, Berger (2004) explores the effects of income, family characteristics, and state characteristics on physical violence towards children. In single parent families there is a significant relationship between poverty and physical violence towards the children in the family. Several theories have been proposed to explain the interactional link between poverty and child maltreatment.

Poor families may be more likely to maltreat and neglect their children because they have fewer resources. Families who lack adequate resources may not be able to provide adequate housing, clothing, food, quality child care, and health care for their children (Berger, 2004). Poverty and the consequential lack of resources may contribute to a higher overall level of stress for parents, thereby making parenting more difficult and the parenting style harsher (Waldfogel, 2000; McGuiness & Schneider, 2007).

Shook (1999) found support for the resource inadequacy theory of child maltreatment through the analysis of administrative and survey data of welfare recipients in the Chicago area. Families receiving welfare income had an increased risk of child welfare involvement. Stressful life events related to economic and environmental hardships, such as housing loss, birth of a child, or accident/ injury, mediated the relationship between child welfare involvement and welfare income. The loss of welfare income during a period of unemployment increased the risk of child welfare involvement. However, employed parents were more likely to leave their children unattended or in
unreliable child care while at work. Statistical analysis showed this specific situation increased the risk of child welfare involvement (Shook, 1999).

Garbarino and Sherman (1980) found increased social isolation, an indirect result of poverty, to be associated with child maltreatment. Families that experienced social isolation described high levels of stress and no expectation of support from neighbors. The author suggests the family’s perception of the neighborhood transfers to the parent-child relationship. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2013a), social isolation is a family risk factor for child maltreatment. Families who are free from drain or stress can afford to give and share with others. In higher poverty areas, families subject to drain may operate on a scarcity economy when it comes to neighboring behavior which results in keeping to oneself. Increased social isolation is associated with areas higher in poverty. Economic resources, personal resources, and parenting abilities influence resiliency and finally the way children are cared for. Deccio, Horner, & Wilson (1994) replicated Garbarino and Sherman’s study finding the same results.

Poverty at the individual and community level is associated with child maltreatment. A family’s ability to overcome poverty and associated stress is influenced by the neighborhood in which it lives (Crosson-Tower, 2010). In rural communities, poverty is consistently higher than in urban communities (DHHS, 2013a). One study of communities in Israel found neighborhood characteristics associated to rates of child maltreatment. Single parent families and poverty of the locality were associated with higher rates of child maltreatment (Ben-Arieh, 2010).
Community risk factors including high poverty, residential instability, unemployment, high density of alcohol outlets, poor social connections, and other indirect results of poverty, such as inadequate housing, lack of quality child care, parental stress, and neighborhood crime are associated with child maltreatment. Higher maltreatment rates are found in disadvantaged communities (Coulton, Crampton, Irwin, Spilsbury, & Korbin, 2007). Maltreatment is correlated with community/neighborhood indicators of social distress such as infant mortality, child care burden, lack of community social services, crime, drug trafficking, economic disadvantage and poverty, juvenile delinquency, vacant housing, residential mobility. This may reflect an interaction of family and neighborhood effect on maltreatment. Living in impoverished areas may nest families in communities with higher risk and less protective factors (Coulton, et al., 2007; Coulton, Korbin, & Su, 1999).

Child Care

Child care is an important issue to employed women with children. Time away from home for employment, the need for quality child care, and an inability to stay home with a sick child are stressors for a working parent (Crosson-Tower, 2010). Quality childcare provides a respite from parental stress and ensures children are under the care of qualified providers. Child care burden is the scarcity of resources to care for children within a community. Child care burden has been measured as the ratio of children under the age of 13 to adults over the age of 18 (Klein, 2011). The availability and generosity of subsidized child care to meet child care burden affects a woman’s decision to be
employed and self-reliant. Generosity in the eligibility levels of subsidized child care increase the likelihood that mothers will work more hours and hold full time employment. Mothers are less likely to increase their hours of work if child care subsidy level cut-offs are set low. It is also suggested that women’s decisions about employment are not explained by child care subsidies alone (Joo, 2008). Poverty, child care burden, and lack of quality childcare reduce the choices of childcare for single mothers and may contribute to the utilization of partners for that childcare (Rosenberg & Reppucci, 1985). Boyfriends commit more child abuse while providing childcare than females (Gelles, 1992).

“Crisis child care programs are critical components of the social support deemed necessary for secondary prevention interventions” (Cowen, 1998, pg. 148). In a study that compared child maltreatment rates in rural counties with and without crisis and respite child care programs, the rates of child maltreatment were significantly lower in the presence of child care. Mother stress was measured prior to and following enrollment in crisis and respite child care. Availability of child care resulted in decreased measured mother stress. The findings suggest child care is a protective factor in the prevention of child maltreatment by lowering mother stress and providing a safe child care environment (Cowen, 1998). In a study that examined administrative data on child care burden, the availability of child care and rates of child maltreatment in neighborhoods, results demonstrated greater availability of child care to meet child care burden is associated with lower rates of child maltreatment (Klein, 2010).
Social Services Availability

Little has been written on the association of child maltreatment and social service availability, including mental health, substance abuse, and intimate partner violence services. Mental health, substance abuse, and intimate partner violence in the family are risk factors for the perpetration of child maltreatment while access to health care and social services are family protective factors for child maltreatment (CDC, 2013a). When families have access to health care and/or social services in their community, they are more likely to utilize these services.

Berger’s national study (2005) indicates family characteristics including maternal alcohol use, depression, and intimate partner violence are significantly linked to child abuse. In a longitudinal study of risk factors for child maltreatment (Dubowitz, Kim, Black, Weisbart, Semiatin, & Magder, 2011), maternal drug use and maternal depression were identified as two of the five highest risk factors for child maltreatment reports. When the primary reason for child maltreatment was substance abuse, alcohol was the primary substance. Freisthler, Gruenewald, Remer, Lery, and Needell (2007), examined the relationship between the number of alcohol outlets in a zip code and the incidence rates of child maltreatment. The results showed zip codes with higher numbers of alcohol outlets had higher levels of child maltreatment.

Poor physical and mental health of parents is associated with substance abuse disorders. Poor parental health in all of these areas is associated with their children’s diminished health including child maltreatment and neglect. Family access to a
continuum of social service care is a protective factor that can improve the health of parents, children, and prevent child maltreatment (McGuinness & Schneider, 2007).

Belanger, Price-Mayo, and Espinosa (2007) completed a national evaluation of the Child and Family Services Review finding availability and accessibility of social services including travel time to be a safety factor for children. Lack of services in rural counties was related to the increased likelihood of repeat maltreatment. Lack of services for children and families negatively impacted the child and family well-being in these rural areas. Well-being is related to a child and family having access to social services. Health care professionals that accept Medicaid and provide mental health and substance abuse care are often in short supply in rural areas. With a shortage of social services in rural areas, distance and transportation becomes a barrier to access these services. As a result of service shortage in rural areas, child welfare faces significant challenges in the protection of children. The authors of the study suggest an increase in rural resources for children and families is likely to prevent child maltreatment (Belanger, Price-Mayo, & Espinosa, 2007).

Child Maltreatment Prevention

Preventing child maltreatment is the best way to avoid the long–term debilitating effects of maltreatment that can result in developmental delays, poor school performance, mental health disorders, substance abuse disorders, depression, diminished interpersonal abilities and aggressive behaviors (Salazar, Keller, & Courtney, 2011; Crosson-Tower, 2010; Mercy, Saul, Turner, & McCarthy, 2011).
The complexities that children and their families face including societal problems such as poverty, lack of childcare, single parenthood, and domestic violence are additional concerns and complications for the effect of the abuse. Viewing the identified problems through a complex social-ecological model provides a realistic framework to understand child maltreatment etiology. Child maltreatment is not related to one risk factor but rather to risk factors within and across the child and family environment. Because of the severe and life-long effects of child maltreatment, prevention is preferable to child maltreatment and the treatment of children and families. But successfully preventing child maltreatment requires intervention at multiple levels including strategies that target children and their families as well as factors associated with the problem at the community and societal levels (Daro & Donnelly, 2002). This expanded focus results in a larger “prevention program basket” (p. 734) to increase the audience that can be reached.

The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign’s prevention strategy was designed to help increase awareness of the problem among single mothers and the general community and to identify alternatives for safe child care, and connections to social services communicated with a social marketing approach. Social marketing strategies are commonly used in public awareness programs to bring about behavioral change. Social marketing is a strategy borrowed from the marketing industry that is informed by a variety of theories and disciplines that explain human behavior and how it can be influenced. Social marketing seeks to influence voluntary behavior through non-coercive methods. Instead, the benefits of change are emphasized in the message.
Social marketing was first used in the 1960’s to promote family planning. It differs from general marketing in that the focus is on the well-being of the target population rather than the product being promoted by the marketer. The benefit of behavioral change to improve individual welfare and ultimately societal good is the key to social marketing (Stead, Gordon, Angus, & McDermott, 2007, Andreasen, 2003). For example, the message can promote change for a specific behavior, raise awareness about behavior in order to prevent a specific outcome, or advance knowledge about resources that support behavioral change and prevent specific behaviors.

It has been suggested by Horsfall, Bromfield, and McDonald (2010) that public awareness campaigns designed to prevent child maltreatment need to focus on all parents, not just abusive parents, connect parents to resources, and empower parents to make changes. “Social marketing aims to generate social good by influencing individual behavior and the wider community (Horsfall, Bromfield, & McDonald, 2010, pg. 2).”

Typically, two types of prevention public awareness campaigns are utilized in efforts to reduce child maltreatment. The first type attempts to create public will that seeks to bring about change on an identified issue and the other type of campaign is directed towards changing an individual’s behavior and fostering pro-social behavior (Wrisley, 2005; Horsfall, Bromfield, & McDonald, 2010). The Choose Your Partner Carefully Campaign uses elements of both approaches to facilitate behavioral change by mothers and to raise public awareness of the need for community changes.

A systematic review of social marketing effectiveness “found reasonable evidence that interventions developed using social marketing principles can be effective” (Stead,
Gordon, Angus, & McDermott, 2007, pp. 180) in changing individual behavior, the community, practice, and policy. The systematic review of 54 total studies included 22 random control trials that met specific inclusion criteria for the definition of social marketing and research design. The studies reviewed used social marketing to influence individual behavior and policy on the issues of tobacco, illicit drugs, and physical activity. The findings showed social marketing effectiveness across a range of behaviors, in a range of target groups, and through multiple settings. The authors suggest social marketing as an “effective framework for behavior change interventions” (Stead, et al., 2007, pp. 126).

In one evaluation of a child sexual abuse prevention program designed to assess the personal, social, and political factors that relate to the prevention of child abuse through adults taking action to identify and report child abuse found success in the prevention strategies. These strategies included the use of a social marketing campaign targeting adults. A shift in the public awareness and willingness to take action by reporting child abuse was verified through surveys and focus groups (Chasan-Tabor & Tabachnick, 1999).

In social marketing, a message is disseminated through a mix of media to effect behavioral and community change. Typical strategies used in social marketing include: 1. education as a method of convincing, 2. marketing as a method of enticing, and 3. law as a method of coercion. Social marketing designed to educate and entice one towards behavioral change paired with the additional design component of knowledge
development about tangible resources and ways to access those resources is most
effective (Wrisley, 2005).

Social marketing programs seem to be more effective when focused on the wider
society than just the individual. This creates a network of people who can identify the
targeted behavior, pass on the marketing message, and support the targeted audience.
Messages need to use strength base language and focus on positive factors of parents and
family life in order to adequately entice and convince (Wrisley, 2005).

Theoretical Framework and Key Constructs that Support Child Maltreatment Prevention

Social-Ecological Model as a Framework for Prevention

The goal of prevention is to stop child maltreatment before it occurs.
Understanding the factors that influence child maltreatment provides a framework for
prevention program development. A four-level social-ecological model is used by the
Center for Disease Control (2013c) and the World Health Organization (2006) to better
understand general violence and the effect of prevention strategies to reduce the presence
of violence in family settings. This theoretical framework acknowledges complex
interactions between individual, relationship, community, and societal factors (Figure 2).
One of the main principles of the social-ecological model is that a combination of the
individual and the environmental/ community and societal levels of intervention are
needed to make potent changes. Understanding the risk and protective factors associated
with child maltreatment provide direction for prevention strategies. “Prevention strategies
should include a continuum of activities that address multiple levels of the model. These
activities should be developmentally appropriate and conducted across the lifespan. This approach is more likely to sustain prevention efforts over time than any single intervention” (CDC, 2013c, pg. 1).
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Figure 2. The Social-Ecological Model

The social-ecological framework focuses on multiple interactions among the individual (intrapersonal), the relationships the individual has with others (interpersonal), the individual’s community, and the societal (organizational and public policy) levels. This model for prevention offers the following assumptions for studying family violence:

1. Children and their families exist as part of their environment; 2. Children are the primary responsibility of the family and society should support the family so that families
have the ability to care for their children; and 3. Since the family is the cornerstone of a healthy society, society is responsible for taking care of families through the provision of and universal access to health and support services and programs (CDC, 2013c).

The four-level social-ecological model provides a framework for examining the context in which non-related males are trusted to care for children, the conditions that are likely to create risk and protection for children, and child maltreatment prevention strategies. At the individual level, the model seeks to identify the individuals involved in the child maltreatment, including the child, the perpetrator and the protector along with the risk and protective factors associated with their interactions. Using this individual level information, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors that can promote prevention of the maltreatment are identified and developed for use in a prevention approach. Prevention approaches at these levels may include raised awareness, education, skill training, and support system identification (CDC, 2013c).

At the relationship level of the model, risk and protective factors of relationships are identified that may contribute to child maltreatment. Using this relationship level information, prevention strategies that promote healthy relationships can be used to develop peer support and mentoring programs as well as education and skill training for conflict reduction and problem solving (CDC, 2013c).

The social-ecological model seeks to identify the community settings and the relationships that occur in these settings that are associated with child maltreatment. At the community level, prevention strategies such as public awareness and social marketing
campaigns are developed to influence healthy relationships through community norming, and changes in practice processes and policies (CDC, 2013c).

At the societal level, the social-ecological model seeks to identify the protective and risk factors of society as a whole that contribute to and inhibit child maltreatment. Prevention strategies at this level focus on risk and protective factors that influence entire populations such as health, education, and economic policies as well as societal norms and inequities between groups (CDC, 2013c).

The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign was developed by identifying the individual level issues of a single mother who may be dependent on a relationship involving a non-biological male and not realize her children’s risk for maltreatment. In this type of situation the possible risk and protective factors that influence child maltreatment include the developmental history of each adult in the relationship, single and teen parenthood, exposure to intimate partner violence, unrealistic expectations of children, a lack parenting skills, lack of knowledge about normal child development and lack of knowledge of behavioral management of children (Margolin & Craft, 1989; Guterman & Lee, 2005; Daro & McCurdy, 1994; Guterman & Lee, 2005; Azar & Rohrbeck, 1986; Starling, Holden, & Jenny, 1995; Radhakriskna, Bou-Saada, Hunter, Catellier, & Kotch, 200; Magdol et. al., 1997). It is at this level, we seek to understand the relationship of a protective mother to the threat of non-biologically related male perpetrated child maltreatment. The messaging of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign seeks to educate and raise the awareness of the mother in an effort to interrupt
child maltreatment. Child care and availability of social services are protective factors for
the mother at the individual level, as well as the relationship and community levels.

A woman may not have a wide network of supportive relationships upon whom
she can rely for financial support and child care. As a result, she may need to depend on
any individual in her life that can remain at home to care for her children. The woman
may not have the information or knowledge to consider or determine whether the
individual can be trusted with her children. If she is a victim of intimate partner violence
she may not be able to protect her children due to dependency or subordination
(Salisbury, Henning, & Holdford, 2009). Relationship level factors that affect non-
biological male perpetrated child maltreatment include dysfunctional interaction patterns,
relationship conflict, and intimate partner violence (Margolin, 1992; Rosenberg &
Reppucci, 1985; Klein, 2011). The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign intervenes
at the relationship level through referral to child care and social services.

At the community level, the general public may accept and legitimate childcare
by a mother’s boyfriend. The community may lack in support systems for the mother
such as affordable childcare, and employment options. At the organizational and societal
level, the erosion of economic supports for women such as Temporary Assistance for
Needy Families (TANF) limits choices and options for women needing childcare. Single
mothers trying to maintain the dual role of nurturer and provider are the primary
recipients of TANF (Lens, 2002) which means that affordability, availability, and quality
of childcare may be insurmountable barriers to a mother’s employability (Kisker & Ross,
1997). Community and societal factors that affect non-biological male perpetration
include lack of childcare, poverty, unemployment, isolation from support systems, and multiple and unresolved sources of stress (Rosenberg & Reppucci, 1985; Magdol, et al., 1997; Klein, 2011; Coulton, et al., 2007; Coulton, Korbin, & Su, 1999; Garbarino and Sherman, 1980).

Each of these levels in the social-ecological model has implications for evaluating the effectiveness of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign. An evaluation of state and county level data can provide information on program effectiveness which can determine resource allocation for the program. A program evaluation can tell us if the program is meeting the identified goals, whether or not the campaign should be promoted for use in current and non-participating counties, if changes in resource allocation should be made, if the campaign is appropriately staffed, and if the target populations should be expanded or more narrowly focused. The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign message can have an impact at the community level through the message by promoting public will towards the problem of non-biologically related male perpetrated child maltreatment and the scarcity of resources to support women and children. The community level factors of poverty, child care, and social services were included in the study so that the risk and protective factors could be considered for alternative explanations to the prevention campaign.

The Health Belief Model

The public health approach to health promotion has shaped the development of child maltreatment prevention programming. The public health approach to child
maltreatment seeks to provide services to a large number of people in order to have an
effect on the entire population through a four step approach. The first step in the public
health approach is to define the problem of child maltreatment by exploring the data in
order to understand all of the demographics associated with the problem (CDC, 2013b).
The second step is to identify the risk and protective factors associated with child
maltreatment. Understanding these factors helps to identify where to focus prevention
efforts to stop child maltreatment. The third step integrates the knowledge of the problem
and the risk and protective factors towards the development and testing of prevention
strategies for child maltreatment. The fourth and final step is to advocate for the
prevention programs that have been proven effective to be adopted on a wide spread
basis.

Prevention is targeted at different groups to achieve proactive and reactive
generated goals. Primary prevention is the effort to educate the general public; secondary
prevention is directed towards an at-risk group; and tertiary prevention is the effort to
prevent further maltreatment and to intervene in a group where maltreatment has already
occurred (Crosson-Tower, 2010). A public health approach informs selection of the
primary target audience and the level of prevention activity that is undertaken. The
Choose Your Partner Carefully program is a primary prevention approach directed
towards the at-risk group of single mothers who may entrust the care of their children to a
non-related male; however, a secondary prevention effect occurs through exposure of the
program to the general public.
Public health promotion theories of individual change inform the way in which messages are designed for a prevention program. There are several theories of individual change used to promote public health that are applicable to social marketing campaigns. The theory of individual change used in the Choose Your Partner Carefully prevention campaign is the Health Belief Model. The Health Belief Model is based in the notion that a person will change their behavior when there is a perceived threat, a benefit to be gained, and self-efficacy is present in the targeted individual (Horsfall, Bromfield, & McDonald, 2010; Noar, S. M., 2006; World Health Organization, 2006: DHHS, 2005) (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health Promotion Theory</th>
<th>Primary Level of Change</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Health Belief Model           | Individual              | Perceived threat of a health problem and change in behavior for preventing or managing problem | • Perceived Threat  
• Perceived  
• Severity  
• Perceived benefits to change  
• Self-Efficacy |

Table 2. The Health Belief Approach to Change

The Choose Your Partner Carefully program, based in the Health Belief Model, addresses the belief that a mother can predict who is likely to put her children at risk and can choose to not entrust that person with the care and supervision of her children. The major proposition of the Health Belief Model is that if an individual believes a perceived
threat is present, their behavior will serve to avoid the threat. The campaign message states that your child’s life depends on the choice you make about who to entrust with their care. The message provides risk factors that will enable one to predict whether or not their child will be safe with a caregiver, thus allowing one to behave in a protective fashion for their children. In this model the perceived threat is made up of two components: the perceived susceptibility or risk for the threat, and the perceived severity of the threat. The model purports that an individual is most likely to take action when they believe both the perceived susceptibility and severity are high.

It is further suggested by the Health Belief model that perceived benefits and barriers factor into the decision to act. Demographic factors such as age, gender, and race are also seen as influential factors. Another factor is environmental stimuli such as cues to action. The message of the prevention campaign acts as the cue to action for the primary target audience (Noar, 2006). A prevention program based in the Health Belief model and designed to promote bicycle safety through the use of social marketing techniques was evaluated for effectiveness. The program used social marketing to provide a threat message with a safety solution. The evaluation of the bicycle safety helmet usage program showed the message or cue to action contributed to an increased perception of threat. It further showed that perceived threat messages were most likely to change attitudes, intentions, and behaviors (Witte, Stokols, Ituarte, & Schneider, 1993).

The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign uses a cue to action message: “Choose Your Partner Carefully, your child’s life depends on it.” The prevention message further explains the risk factors to look in a partner when determining if that
partner can safely care for your children. These risk factors provide the threat that can motivate a woman to make the choice to protect her children. The prevention messaging then provides social service information on options for child care and personal support.

**Exposure Theory**

The Health Belief model suggests an individual’s perceived threat of a health problem results in a change in behavior towards preventing or managing problem. The message of the prevention campaign acts as the threat and gives guidance towards change. Exposing the target audience and the general public to the message seems to be a necessary but not sufficient condition for program success. Social marketing is a way to expose the public to a message that identifies a threat and gives guidance to change.

Exposure theory provides guidance for message development and the length and strength of messaging to be used in social marketing campaigns. This theory identifies five mechanisms of change required for the receiver to transfer the message provided into action. Hornik (2002) explains the five mechanisms of exposure theory and the role of exposure in social marketing in the following way. The first mechanism is learning. The message must be available for the individual to learn the nature of the message and repeated exposure to the message may be needed for learning to occur. Second, a person must also experience readiness to hear the message so repeat messaging can “prime” a person to believe the message and learn it. Thirdly, repeated exposure from multiple sources may contribute to social norm pressure. This repeat messaging from multiple sources may communicate social expectations that lead to the development of social
norms. Social norming can prompt the general public to observe and intervene by expressing disapproval towards unsafe child care and reporting of child maltreatment. The fourth mechanism of exposure is the generation of a social network and social discussion that helps to diffuse the message and increase belief in the message. The fifth mechanism of exposure takes the message to policy makers from multiple sources to enforce the message as a social norm so that policy makers may be influenced to respond by changes in relevant policies. Policy changes can further enhance the message that was intended for the targeted audience and expose that message to the general public.

Exposure of the general public to prevention programming raises awareness about the identification of child maltreatment and the path towards action such as reporting or seeking support services. This exposure can impact the beliefs and the action taking behaviors of the bystander of an abused child (Mudde, et al., 2006). A bystander can be defined as anyone with knowledge of the child’s maltreatment and ranges from parents to strangers. Prevention efforts that identify individuals and families at high risk of abuse and provide them with education and tools to prevent and change at-risk behaviors combine a health belief model and prevention approach. Deliberate approaches to prevention that target children and their families can effect change at the individual and relationship levels, and can also raise awareness and diminish stigma associated with the problem at the community and societal levels (Daro & Donnelly, 2002).

A child maltreatment prevention program can focus on change at the individual and family levels with partnerships that aid in change at the community and societal levels. Rather than focusing on a narrow set of behaviors and situations that contribute to
child abuse, expanding the focus results in a larger “prevention program basket” (p. 734) therefore increasing the audience that can be reached. Building coalitions across service systems for the prevention of child abuse not only considers the complex etiology of child abuse but also addresses the many challenges families face and how these factors interact (Daro & Donnelly, 2002, pp. 734-735). Therefore a system of social services that can support the change process and the family’s needs should be in place to support and increase the effectiveness of a public awareness campaign. A prevention program needs to include information and referral to social services that are accessible and available while meeting the needs of the family that are greater than the targeted behavior of the prevention program.

Prevention campaigns play a frequent and valuable role in the prevention of child maltreatment prevention by raising awareness of child maltreatment and identifying ways to intervene such as reporting of child maltreatment or seeking support services for the child and family. Most prevention public awareness campaigns provide information in the hopes that the receiver of the information will voluntarily change their behavior – maltreatment of children – in favor of the target behavior – protection of children. Typically, two types of prevention public awareness campaigns are utilized. One is to create public will about an issue and the other is directed towards changing an individual’s behavior and fostering pro-social behavior in families (Wrisley, 2005; Horsfall, Bromfield, & McDonald, 2010).

Financial resources for social marketing campaigns that provide adequate exposure time of the message are important and necessary. Social networking can
provide ways to get the program message out when agencies have insufficient resources for social marketing (Hornik, 2002). In the case of the Choose Your Partner campaign, the Public Children Services Association of Ohio, and Nationwide Children’s Hospital combined resources to bring the program to fruition. The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign is a behavioral change prevention and public awareness campaign with public awareness as an additional potential effect.

The Choose Your Partner Carefully Study

The Choose Your Partner Carefully study examines the effectiveness of the Choose Your Partner Carefully prevention and public awareness campaign. The study will explore the relationship between the public awareness campaign and the incidence of maltreatment by non-biological males. The study’s primary objectives are to identify the incidence of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment before and after the implementation of the prevention intervention. Evaluation of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign characteristics of strength and length will be included to determine if the adjustment of the campaign is a factor. Additionally, the study will evaluate the covariate relationships of poverty, childcare burden, and availability of social services and childcare to the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign and non-biologically related male perpetrated child maltreatment for alternative explanations.

This study begins by considering the effects of the Choose Your Partner Carefully prevention campaign on the incidences of non-related male perpetrated child maltreatment. This program focuses on developing protective factors, such as enhancing
assessment competency and identifying risk factors in order to prevent child maltreatment. The campaign educates mothers about the characteristics of relationships that could lead to child abuse, therefore providing her with the skills to evaluate future relationship partners and prevent the development of relationships that could lead to child maltreatment. The campaign also provides contact information for community social services that offer support and aid, including child care and social services.

As the literature was examined, the following research questions were established:

1. Does county participation in a child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign change the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

2. Does the strength and length of the county child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign and county factors such as poverty, childcare and social service availability impact the child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign effect on the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

The Choose Your Partner Carefully Logic Model explains the pathway of prevention. The following logic model chart only includes the inputs, outputs, and outcomes components which describe the activities and targeted outcomes of the program. The components provide guidance on the evaluation of the program and outcome. This dissertation study will measure the first outcome of the logic model. (See Table 3).
Choose Your Partner Carefully - Primary Child Abuse Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources required: Money and Staff Time from county Public Children Services Association of Ohio</td>
<td>Indicators of effect:</td>
<td>Change:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Activities: Public awareness materials and mechanisms (postcards, new releases, community interest media stories, public speaking, television and radio public service announcements, advertising, billboards, posters, flyers, magnets, social media, and inclusion in parenting courses used to disseminate the campaign.</td>
<td>(a) Women will have increased awareness of the risk their children face when a non-biological male is entrusted with their care;</td>
<td>(a) Incidence of child maltreatment by boyfriends/paramours/non-biological males in the counties providing the public awareness campaign will decrease;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Public awareness campaign is disseminated to the public with the campaign goals of:</td>
<td>(b) Women will have tools to better evaluate the likelihood that their paramour/non-biological male could become a perpetrator of abuse;</td>
<td>(b) Incidence of child fatalities by boyfriends/paramours/non-biological males in the Ohio counties providing the public awareness campaign will decrease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) increase awareness among women of the risk their children face when a non-biological male is entrusted with their care;</td>
<td>(c) Women will recognize potential signs of maltreatment of their children;</td>
<td>(c) Incidence of mother reported abuse by boyfriends/paramours/non-biological males in the Ohio counties providing the public awareness campaign will increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) provide tools to help women better evaluate the likelihood that their paramour could become a perpetrator of abuse;</td>
<td>(d) Women will be aware of potential community resources for childcare (other than boyfriend/paramour/non-biological male) and other social services; and</td>
<td>(d) Counties providing the public awareness campaign will have greater community awareness of the problem of boyfriends/paramours/non-biological male perpetrated child abuse and its overall impact on the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) educate women to help them recognize potential signs of maltreatment to their children;</td>
<td>(e) The community will be more aware of the problem of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment and its overall impact on the community.</td>
<td>(Developed with information from Public Children Service Association of Ohio Toolkit, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) educate women about potential community resources for childcare (other than non-biological male); and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) increase community awareness of the problem and its overall impact on the community (Public Children Service Association of Ohio, 2009).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Choose Your Partner Carefully Campaign Logic Model (Inputs, Outputs, and Outcomes)
Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Goals

This evaluative study examines the effect of a public awareness prevention campaign on the incidence rates of non-biological male perpetrated abuse. Since poverty, childcare and social service support availability are important factors associated with child maltreatment and the prevention of child maltreatment these covariates will be included in the study to examine alternative explanations. This research explores the hypothesis that a public awareness program creates substantive decreased change in the incidence rates of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment over time. Over time as the message penetrates the target audience, the knowledge and awareness levels of the mother will enable her to better protect her children from child maltreatment and the outcome will be a decrease in the incidence rate of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment. Counties with the program will have a greater decrease in incidence rates of maltreatment than counties without the program. Counties with greater program length and strength and more protective confounding variable effect along with less risk confounding variable effect will have an even greater decrease in incidence rates of maltreatment.
This study will address the following research questions:

1. Does county participation in a child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign change the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

2. Does the strength and length of the county child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign and county factors such as poverty, childcare and social service availability impact the child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign effect on the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

**Research Design**

This dissertation study utilizes a comparison group pretest posttest design in the analysis of secondary and survey data. Since this study is retrospective, no random assignment can be used but comparison groups, non-equivalent control groups, are used to provide counterfactual information about what would happen without the predictor variable. Nonprobability sampling is convenient.

The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign was implemented without an evaluation plan. As a result, the study was ex-post facto which means the research question was formulated after the implementation of the program and the data collection was dependent on publically available data sets that measured the variables of interest over time. The feasibility of the study was dependent on publically available data because the outcome was not measured or evaluated prior to or following the intervention.
Since this study was designed retrospectively, the gold standard of intervention evaluation- the randomized control trial- could not be accomplished. Considering these limitations, the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organization of Care Group (2003) endorses the following three methods for population intervention evaluation: the non-RCT trial, the controlled before and after study, and the interrupted time series/longitudinal design. Designs are often chosen to address precision, potential for bias, and the feasibility of the study (Cook & Ware, 1983). The use of non-equivalent groups will introduce the principle of unlikely successive coincidence (Bloom, Fischer, Orme, 2003). If changes repeatedly occurred only subsequent to the intervention, then it makes it less likely that these changes are occurring by chance alone and provides the opportunity for a plausible argument for the intervention effectiveness.

The application process with the National Child Maltreatment Data System (NCANDS) Child File, FFY 2000-2011 required licensing of the data and an agreement to secure protection of the data on a university computer with encryption and secure access. In the case of the survey, coercion was minimized through consent and freedom to refuse survey participation. The Ohio State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved this study on March 3, 2013 and again on April 8, 2013 following survey revisions. The IRB approval for expedited review and a revision for survey script changes are available in Appendix H.
Measures

The analyses proposed in this dissertation study will be drawn from the following data sources: 1) the National Child Maltreatment Data System (NCANDS) Child File, FFY 2000-2011, 2) The Choose Your Partner Carefully Survey, 3) the Ohio Poverty Report, 4) the Ohio Department of Development, 5) Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Selected Age Groups by Sex: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2011: 2011 Population Estimates and 6) the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services County Profile data. Each data collection method and study variable will be described in the following section. See Table 4 for the data collection methods and study variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Study Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Child Maltreatment Data System (NCANDS) Child Files, FFY 2000-2011</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Choose Your Partner Carefully County Program Survey</td>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio Poverty Report-Ohio Department of Development-Ohio Census</td>
<td>Covariate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Department of Development’s Statistical Area Categories</td>
<td>Covariate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Burden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Department of Job and Family Services County Profile</td>
<td>Public Funds for Child Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Data Collection Methods and Study Variables
National Child Maltreatment Data System (NCANDS) Child Files, FFY 2000-2011

In response to the requirements of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1988 (Public Law 93-247), The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children’s Bureau: National Child Maltreatment Data System (NCANDS) Child File was created as a federally sponsored and publically available data set. The Principal Investigators are the Children’s Bureau and Administration on Children, Youth and Families. The funding agencies are Children’s Bureau, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Administration for Children and Families, and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The data set is housed in the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect at Cornell University. The key findings are published in the Child Welfare Outcomes Reports to Congress and annual Child Maltreatment reports. The data are used to examine trends in child abuse and neglect across the country (DHHS, 2011).

Data are submitted in a common record format after going through a process in which the state’s administrative system is mapped to the NCANDS data structure. Data are submitted voluntarily by State Child Protective Services (CPS) agencies to the Federal Government. The sample for each state must be greater than 1000 to be included in the data set. The data set is de-identified and provided upon request at no cost to the researcher. NCANDS is an automated data set provided in SPSS, Stata and SAS format (DHHS, 2011).
The NCANDS data used in this dissertation study measured the dependent variable: incidence rates of substantiated, non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment cases by county in the state of Ohio annually. The level of measurement is ratio. Case level data from the NCANDS Child Files 2001-2007 and 2011 were used as the basis for analysis. Only cases of substantiated non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment were included in the analysis. Twenty-six of the Ohio counties reporting to NCANDS will be included in the study out of the thirty Ohio counties reporting within the NCANDS data set. Four counties who did not report data on the NCANDS dependent variable will not be used in the study.

The NCANDS Child Files 2000-2011 represent a census of all child protective services investigations or assessments conducted in the states that participated in the NCANDS and include investigations that reached a disposition between January 1, 2000 and December 31, 2011. The NCANDS case-level data is reported at the child level from child protective services investigation events. The NCANDS data set consists of two components: Summary Data and Detailed Case Level Data. The Summary component is a collection of key aggregate child maltreatment statistics from all states that include information on investigations, victims, and perpetrators. The Detailed Case component consists of case-level information on children who are part of an alleged maltreatment report that has reached disposition and include type of maltreatment, case disposition, support services provided to the child’s family, and information on the child, caretaker, family, and perpetrator (Connell, Bergeron, Katz, Saunders, & Tebes, 2007).
Individuals were placed into perpetrator status by CPS employees. Perpetrator status is defined specifically in the data set. Any inconsistencies in the reporting would be the result of individual interpretation of the perpetrator definitions. The NCAND’s subcategories of the perpetrator relationship increased in number beginning in 2004. In 2000-2003, the primary role of the perpetrator with the child victim of maltreatment was step-parent, adoptive parent, or unmarried partner of parent. In 2004 the primary role of perpetrator was expanded to included step-parent, adoptive parent, unmarried partner of parent, and other parent, not biological.

The NCANDS Child Files 2000-2011 were requested for this dissertation study. No data were recorded for Ohio in 2000 and again in 2008-2010. As a result of the missing data, these years were eliminated from the study. The missing data will be discussed further in the Limitation of the Study section of Chapter 5. Approximately 120 peer reviewed journal articles and Child Welfare Outcome Reports have been written using the NCANDS data (National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect, 2013).

The Choose Your Partner Carefully County Program Survey

The Choose Your Partner Carefully County Program Survey of Ohio Children Services county public information officers and executive directors was developed to gather information on the presence, length, and strength of the Choose Your Partner Carefully program. The survey was developed by the study author and administered with Lime Survey software by email to each public children services county public information officer and public children services county executive director. Lime Survey
is a free and open source on-line survey program. Lime Survey was purchased and installed to The Ohio State University’s College of Social Work server and is managed by users from a web based interface. Lime Survey was used for data collection and storage of survey responses in this dissertation study.

The information collected is descriptive in nature. The information included whether the counties have ever had a campaign, if the county had a campaign, the date the campaign began, the length in years of the campaign, and the strength of the campaign in the number of social marketing techniques. The Choose Your Partner Carefully County Program Survey is in Appendix I.

NCANDS and Survey data must be matched by county for complete data measurement. The Choose Your Partner intervention is present in some counties and not in others, begins in different years and is minimized, enhanced, or withdrawn in some counties. Counties without the prevention program intervention provide the control groups. The data will cover a seven year series of observations from 2001 to 2007 preceding the introduction of the prevention program intervention and one year of observations in 2011 following the staggered introduction of the prevention program intervention. Four years of observations, the years 2000 and 2008 to 2010, are missing entirely from the NCANDS data set. Three counties interventions were withdrawn after one year of implementation.

The Ohio counties without the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign are assumed to have maximum pre-intervention similarity to the counties with the program. This comparison can provide the opportunity to examine threats to external validity and
to triangulate toward a narrower field of explanations on predictor variable effect (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002).

The independent variable of the study is the Choose Your Partner Carefully prevention and public awareness campaign. The Choose Your Partner Carefully County Program Survey defines the independent variable and its levels. The independent variable is measured by the Choose Your Partner Carefully Survey in three ways: 1. presence of the program or no program, 2. the length of the program in years, and 3. the strength of the program in number of social marketing techniques. The level of measurement for presence or no presence of the program is nominal. The length of the program is measured in years as a ratio level variable. The strength of the program is measured in number of social marketing tools used by each county as a ratio level variable. The strength intervention variable is dummy coded to 0 = no intervention, 1 = one social marketing intervention through 14 = fourteen social marketing interventions. Eighteen of the twenty six counties reported the presence of Choose Your Partner Carefully.

County administrators and public information officers answered the survey questions and responded at a rate of 100%. The survey questions are primarily factual so by asking two or more sources for the information increases the completeness of data (Locascio & Atri, 2011). Information on program implementation was gathered at the annual level only. The measurement questions were clearly stated in generally accepted measurement levels such as presence, years, and number of social marketing techniques. The survey responses were complete by all counties surveyed. Any inaccuracies in
reporting would not be identifiable because the campaign has not been evaluated and
comparison data is not available.

Ohio Poverty Report

The definition of poverty originated in the Social Security Administration in
1964. It has been modified by Federal interagency committees since then, with the Office
of Management and the Budget now prescribing it as the standard to be used by Federal
agencies for statistical purposes. The U.S. Bureau of the Census notes:

“At the core of this definition was the 1961 economy food plan, the least
costly of four nutritionally adequate food plans designed by the Department of
Agriculture. It was determined from the Agriculture Department’s 1955 survey of
food consumption that families of three or more persons spend approximately
one-third of their income on food; hence, the poverty level for these families [i.e.,
the minimum income required to avoid malnutrition] was set at three times the
cost of the economy food plan. For smaller families and persons living alone, the
cost of the economy food plan was multiplied by factors that were slightly higher
to compensate for the relatively larger fixed expenses for these smaller
households” (1992a: B-27). A family consists of a householder and one or more
other persons related by birth, marriage, or adoption living in the same housing
unit. Families (and all of the persons in them) with less than the minimum income
required for the economy food plan are below the poverty threshold and are poor.
Families (and all of the persons in them) at or above the minimum are not poor.
The amounts of money needed to stay out of poverty vary by size and, for families of the same size, the number of related children under 18 years old (Ohio Department of Development, 2013, pg. 36).”

The poverty information is derived from The Ohio Poverty Report. Statistics used in this report come from the U.S. Census Bureau – specifically the decennial censuses, the annual Current Population Surveys, and the American Community Survey (Ohio Department of Development, 2013). U.S. Census data is mandated by the United States Constitution to be performed decennially. The first census was taken in 1790 just after the American Revolution ordered by Thomas Jefferson, the Secretary of State at the time. Aggregate data is released immediately with individual level data available after 72 years. Census data is achieved through robust research methodology and data collection and considered to be a solid source of reliable and valid measurement. The US Census is committed to supplying accurate, reliable, and valid data achieved through individual query rather than sampling (U.S. Census, 2013).

The poverty level information is prepared in report form by the Ohio Development Services Agency, a research office which is a state affiliate of the U.S. Census Bureau. The information is publically available. A family of four is defined as living in poverty if their income is at or below $16,895 annually (Ohio Department of Development, 2013). Poverty is measured as the percentage of the county population that lives at or below the poverty level. The percentage of people at poverty level by county will act as the covariate-poverty. The level of measurement is ratio.
Ohio Metropolitan, Micropolitan, and Statistical Areas Categories

The Ohio Development Services Agency’s Office of Research provides data and analysis on the economic, industrial, demographic, and program trends of the state of Ohio, its businesses, and its people. Descriptive data on the economic activities of Ohio as well as the population trends of cities, villages, townships, and counties in the forms of reports, maps, and databases can be found on the website. Consistent definitions of counties through the delineation of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas makes it possible to have comparable areas across the U.S. for preparing and disseminating Federal statistics. The Research Office acts as the state government liaison to the U.S. Bureau of the Census and the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. The Ohio Department of Development’s Statistical Area Categories is considered public information and can be accessed on the Ohio Development Services Agency website, formerly the Ohio Department of Development’s website. (Ohio Department of Development, 2010).

Metropolitan Statistical Areas have at least one urbanized area with a population of 50,000 or more, plus adjacent territory that has a high degree of social and economic integration with the core as measured by commuting ties. Micropolitan Statistical Areas are a new set of statistical areas and have at least one urban cluster with a population of at least 10,000 but less than 50,000, plus adjacent territory that has a high degree of social and economic integration with the core as measured by commuting ties. These categories do not equate to urban or rural areas, rather they may contain both. In the state of Ohio, Micropolitan areas tend to be rural. Statistical areas are often used by federal agencies as geographic boundaries for program eligibility and funding priorities (Ohio Department of
Development, 2010). The federal funding by statistical areas is related to the amount of funding for social services and therefore the availability of social services.

Ohio Department of Development Data will provide information on county size which will act as a proxy variable for availability of social services. A proxy variable is a substitute variable for the theoretical variable named in the study (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Identification of all available social services for thirty counties was not a realistic goal for this study therefore this rough estimate of availability was chosen. Counties differ in size and are categorized into Metropolitan and Micropolitan statistical areas by the Ohio Development Services Agency. This author contends that using the county statistical area as a substitute variable for availability of social services will provide a theoretical representation of social service availability. This variable is a proxy for social services by relating the size of the county to the availability of social services. The level of measurement for this variable is nominal.


The data source for child care burden is the Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Selected Age Groups by Sex: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2011: 2011 Population Estimates. This information is gathered and stored by the United States Census Bureau and managed by the United States Department of Commerce. The U.S. Census provided publically available information for each Ohio County on the ages and gender of the residents (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2011). Specifically the U.S.
Census provided the total number of adults over the age of eighteen in each Ohio County and the number of children under the age of fourteen in each Ohio County.

Target audience options for childcare can impact access of non-biological males to children. The Choose Your Partner Carefully program targets women who place their children in the care of a boyfriend. Child care burden is defined as the need for child care and is operationally defined as the ratio of adults 18 years of age and older available to provide care to the number of children 14 years of age and younger in a specified Ohio county. Child care burden, a child care availability variable, is measured as ratio level data.

Ohio Department of Job and Family Services County Profile

The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services provide an annual County Profile of statistical and demographic data. Each county profile includes data compiled from multiple federal and state sources in the areas of population, food security, poverty, childcare, funding, income maintenance, child and adult services, elder care facilities, and more. The County Profile provides childcare data, for each Ohio county, that includes the number of children using publicly funded childcare, public funds used for childcare expenditures, an annual average expenditure per child and the number of licensed childcare providers. The childcare providers include licensed full time, part-time, Head Start, school based, and combination centers with seven or more children. Each Ohio county provides childcare services and learning opportunities for the goal of family success at work and in education. Families whose income is at or below 150% of the
federal poverty guidelines can receive partial or full payment of their monthly childcare expenses while parents work or attend employment training. These expenses are funded through both the state and federal governments. Families remain eligible until their income exceeds more than 200% of the federal poverty guidelines (Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, 2011). Public funds used for childcare expenditures and the number of licensed child care providers will be the proxy variables used for childcare availability.

Child care availability and affordability are factors in the choice of caretakers. Women who have safe, quality, and affordable child care are less likely to be depending on and to leave their child in the care of a boyfriend. Childcare funding and the number of child care providers will determine the availability of child care to address child care burden.

In addition to the child care availability measure of child care burden, childcare availability is measured in two more ways: 1. the number of childcare providers in a county, and 2. the amount of Ohio Department of Job and Family Service dollars allotted to a county for child care. Both are measured as ratio level data.

Data Analysis Plan

The dissertation study sample consists of annual data reported by twenty six counties over an eight year time frame. In that period 787 total cases of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment were reported. Eighteen of the twenty six counties adopted the Choose Your Partner Carefully program. Seven years before the intervention
is the pretest and one year post-intervention is the posttest. Covariate data on each county is included in the study.

Research Question 1. Does county participation in a child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign change the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

For research question 1, descriptive and inferential analyses were performed. Descriptive statistics are used to summarize and describe county participation in the intervention. The attributes of the perpetrators, the victims, and the types of abuse were examined. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the statistical significance of the differences among mean scores of counties with the Choose Your Partner intervention and counties without the intervention.

Research Question 2. Does the strength and length of the county child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign and county factors such as poverty, childcare and social service availability impact the child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign effect on the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

For research question 2, descriptive and inferential statistics were also performed. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and describe the number of years the counties provided the intervention, the strength of the intervention by social media techniques, the poverty rates of counties, and the availability of child care and social services by county. A negative binomial regression is used to predict the maximum
likelihood of change in non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment to be expected by chance when controlling for differences in the program intervention by county and differences in the county covariate attributes.

Descriptive statistics provide an overview of the various characteristics of the study variables and provide the information necessary to understand the attributes of the data distributions. The dependent variable of this study, child maltreatment perpetrated by non-related males, is the number of incidences reported by county. Although some researchers may treat this type of data as continuous, assumption violations for ordinary least squares regression models tend to occur with count data. Because count data tends to be discrete, does not have values less than zero, and has distributions that are highly skewed, a Poisson regression model addresses the data most effectively (Allison, 2009).

A Poisson regression method is used to predict rare events given a set of predictors and works well in the presence of multiple covariates. The main assumptions of this method are first, that the observed counts are generated from a Poisson distribution which is characterized by the expected number of events to occur with a probability mass function. The logarithm of the incidence rate changes linearly with equal increases in the intervention variable. Second, the distribution variance is equal to the mean. Third, the distribution is multiplicative in the incidence changes from the effects of the intervention variable and other covariates. Last, the observations are independent (Hilbe, 2007).

Knowledge of the distribution of the dependent variable, maltreatment, is important in understanding whether the assumption of normally distributed data can be
met, qualifying the data for specific statistical analyses. The variance is particularly important in evaluating overdispersion. Diagnostics for overdispersion, which is greater variation than expected, were performed to ensure assumptions were met. The Poisson distribution is a limiting distribution of a binomial distribution. Once the data were analyzed and reviewed, the data did not meet the assumptions of a generalized linear model (GLM)/Poisson distribution. The data were not normally distributed; specifically the mean and variance did not equal each other. Overdispersion occurred, so a negative binomial distribution, a generalization of the Poisson distribution, was selected. This approach can assess the change in the dependent variable over time while addressing covariance in the observations (Locascio & Atri, 2011). In the negative binomial approach, overdispersion or extra correlation can be accommodated by way of an additional parameter (Coelho-Barros, Achcar, Mazucheli, 2010; Yang, Kang, Mao, & Zhang, 2007; Allison, 2009; Coxe, West, & Aiken, 2009; Hilbe, 2007).

A regression model was built to control for covariates of the Choose Your Partner Carefully Campaign. The variables used in the study include the strength of campaign implementation (number of social marketing strategies used), length (years) of implementation, poverty, the availability of county social services, child care burden, and the availability of childcare on the incidence rates of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment.

An examination of the variables with backward stepwise elimination of variables not significant to the model was the initial approach. Model building indicated significant multicollinearity. Coefficient modeling is often used with data that do not meet the GLM
assumptions and can be used for more robust modeling with the elimination of extra correlation. This analysis can determine the individual county differences in change over time. In order to utilize this analysis, the following conditions must be present: a categorical predictor of change/program presence, residuals must be correlated and heterogeneous, more than three observations, reliable variables, and a dynamic model or framework of change (Ployhart & Ward, 2011). The final model was built informed by a coefficient matrix.
Chapter 4: Results

The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign was specifically designed as a primary child abuse prevention program to educate mothers on how to evaluate the behavior of the person they place in charge of their children. This prevention program attempts to interrupt the causal process that leads to child maltreatment and notifies the public of the problem of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment which can modify community expectations of child caregivers. Counties differed in length of and strength of campaign implementation. The implementation of the program is not standardized. Each county is free to implement the program in a variety of ways and has different staffing and budget levels available for the implementation. Public awareness of the problem creates the opportunity for dialogue to develop within the community and support for the development of societal systems to support the safety of children such as mothers’ isolation from support systems, childcare needs, and family financial needs. County factors such as poverty, childcare, and social service availability are strongly correlated with child maltreatment. Consequently these are being considered with the child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign effect on the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males.

This chapter will describe the analysis used to investigate the dissertation study research questions. First descriptive statistics will be presented to gain a better...
understanding of the variable attributes. Research question 1 will be answered using an analysis of variance. Finally Research question 2 will be answered using a negative binomial regression model.

Descriptive Statistics

Each county has a combination of factors that can impact the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign and the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males. These county level factors are poverty, availability of social services, and availability of child care. Poverty of a county is measured as the percentage of persons at or below the poverty level in a county. The poverty level in the United States is 14.3% and in the state of Ohio the poverty level is just slightly higher at 14.8% (Ohio Department of Development, 2013). The overall average poverty rate for all counties in the study was slightly lower than the national and state average at 12.7%. The average poverty rate for counties with the campaign (13.8%) is higher than counties without the campaign (12.1%). (Figure 3 and Table 5)
The proxy variable for Availability of Social Services is measured as the county statistical category of Metropolitan and Micropolitan. Metropolitan counties are presumed to have greater availability of social services than Micropolitan counties. Twenty one of the twenty six study counties are Metropolitan (81%) counties and five of the study counties are Micropolitan (19%). Of the counties with the campaign, fifteen of the counties with the campaign are Metropolitan counties (83%) and three of the counties are Micropolitan (17%). Of the counties without the campaign, six of the counties are Metropolitan (75%) and two of the counties are Micropolitan (25%). (Figure 4 and Table 5).

Figure 3. Poverty Rate Comparisons among US, Ohio, and Choose Your Partner Carefully Study Counties with and without campaign
In the state of Ohio 26% of the population has a need for child care. The average need for child care or child care burden for all counties in the study is the same as the Ohio average of 26%. For counties with the campaign, the child care burden is 26% and for counties without the campaign, the child care burden is slightly lower at 21%. Metropolitan counties’ average child care burden was 26% and for Micropolitan counties the average child care burden was just one percent higher at 27% (Table 5).

The public funds available for child care in the state of Ohio are $569,657,458 (ODJFS, 2013). The overall average for public funds available for child care in all counties in the study was $27,860,609. The average for public funds available for child
care in counties with the campaign is $35,420,247 and the average for counties without
the campaign is less at $8,089,250. Metropolitan counties’ average for public funds
available for child care was $31,452,850 and for Micropolitan counties the average was
less at $3,313,634 (ODJFS, 2013) (Table 5).

There are 4114 subsidized child care providers in the state of Ohio. The overall
average number of child care providers in all counties in the study was 175 (Range
=534). The average number of child care providers in counties with the campaign is 212
and in counties without the campaign, the average number is 80. Metropolitan counties’
average number of child care providers was 196 and for Micropolitan counties the
average number was 34 (ODJFS, 2013) (Table 5).
Table 5. County Factors with the Presence of CYPC and Without CYPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Availability of Social Services</th>
<th>Child Care Burden</th>
<th>Child Care Funds</th>
<th>Child Care Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>$3,034,468</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtabula</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>$3,373,576</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>$12,2,634</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>$4,700,005</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>$114,643,933</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>$92,239,326</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>$4,480,119</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>$93,039,273</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>$6,337,429</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>12/6%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>$12,913,266</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>$25,394,246</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>$1,877,573</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>$38,218,533</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>$4,152,318</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>$4,011,331</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>$1,132,705</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>$12,846,754</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>$6,329,073</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>$4,495,310</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>$4,899,006</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licking</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>$6,505,104</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoning</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>$12,756,989</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskingum</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>$3,975,388</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>$24,546,001</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>$2,298,671</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>$2,188,680</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dependent variable, non–biological male perpetrated child maltreatment, is the count of cases. A total of 787 non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment
cases were reported across the 26 study counties from 2001-2007 and in 2011. Of the total reports, 629 reports (80%) were from counties (n=18) with the campaign and 158 reports (20%) were from counties (n=8) without the campaign. The total number of child maltreatment cases reported annually was steady with significant increases in reported incidences in 2006 and again in 2011. Each of those years showed significant increases in reported maltreatment incidences. No data were available during the years 2000 and 2008-2010 (Figure 5). See Appendix J: Child Maltreatment Cases by County and Year. NCANDS data were reported for the year 2000 but no data for non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment was reported. No NCANDS data were reported for the years 2008 through 2010 by the state of Ohio. Reports by county in a year ranged from 0 to 67. The mean number of child maltreatment cases for a county was 8.4 with a median of 4.0 (SD= 11.498; Range= 66).
A description of the child victims, the child maltreatment type and the perpetrators will be described in order to better understand the dependent variable, non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment. Approximately 52% of the child victims were female and 48% were male (n=787) with an average age of 10 years old (\( \bar{x} = 10 \)).

The types of abuse experienced by the child victims were physical (n = 787; 42.2%), neglect (38.5%), sexual (10.4%), and psychological or emotional maltreatment (7.8%) (Figure 6). The perpetrators of the child maltreatment were male (100%) and were primarily stepparent (59%) or adoptive parent (36%).

Figure 5. Non-Biological Male Perpetrated Child Maltreatment Cases by Year

![Child Maltreatment Cases (n=787)](image-url)
The independent variable, The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign, was measured in three ways:

1. Presence= 1 and no Presence =0
2. The numbers of years the campaign was provided (Range 0-4)
3. The strength of the campaign (Range 0-14). The strength is defined by the number of social marketing tools used to distribute the campaign.

First the campaign was measured for Presence. Of the twenty-six study counties, eighteen of the counties had implemented the Choose Your Partner Carefully (CYP C) campaign (69%) and eight (31%) did not implement the campaign. For all the years the
data were reported, the counties with the campaign had 629 (79%) reports of non-
biological perpetrated male child maltreatment and counties without the campaign had
158 (21%) of the reports.

The second measurement of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign was by
the number of years the campaign was provided (See Table 6). The mean number of
years the counties provided the campaign was 2.4 with a median of 3 (Range =0-4). Only
three counties provided the campaign for four years (12%). Five counties provided the
campaign for three years (23%). Four counties provided the campaign for two years
(15%) and five counties provided the campaign for one year (19%). Eight counties did
not provide the campaign (31%).

The third measurement of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign was
strength. Counties provided the program at a strength level ranging from one to fourteen
social marketing strategies used. The numerical level of strength corresponds to the
number of social marketing tools used to distribute the campaign ($\bar{X}$=6; M=3). (Table 6).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties with the CYPC (n=18)</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtabula</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Choose Your Partner Carefully County Campaign Presence, Years of Campaign, and Campaign Strength: Number of Social Marketing Tools
### Social Marketing Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Marketing Tool</th>
<th>Number of Counties Using Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brochures/ Flyers/Postcards</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboards</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Presentation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Education Courses</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookmarks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Number of Counties Using Specific Social Marketing Tools

The most used social marketing tools were brochures, flyers, and postcards used by 12 counties. Billboards were used the second most frequently by 11 counties.

Community presentations, the third most commonly used social marketing tool, was used by 9 counties. See Table 7 for the number of counties using specific social marketing tools.

### Inferential Statistics

**Research Question 1:** Does county participation in a child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign change the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign effect on the level of child maltreatment
perpetrated by non-biological males. ANOVA is used to determine the statistical significance of the relationship between a categorical independent variable and a continuous outcome variable. An *F* ratio statistic is a ratio of the explained variance to the error variance. The results indicated no statistical significance (overall *F* = 1.439; *p* > .10) of the differences among mean scores of counties with presence of the CYPC campaign intervention (M=9.25; SD=13.057) and counties without presence of the intervention (M=6.08; SD=5.230). (Table 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th><em>F</em></th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>189.372</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189.372</td>
<td>1.439</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>12106.596</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>131.593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12295.968</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. ANOVA of Choose Your Partner Carefully Campaign

**Research Question 2:** Does the strength and length of the county child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign and county factors such as poverty, childcare and social service availability impact the child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign effect on the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?
A negative binomial regression analysis was run on the Choose Your Partner Carefully variables and covariates using non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment as the outcome variable. The population of children in each Ohio county under the age of eighteen, derived from the U.S. Census 2011, was used as an offset variable of the regression equation during the analysis.

The initial approach to the data was to run the analysis using a Poisson Regression Analysis. A Poisson Regression is the standard method of analysis to model count response data. Counts are observed data such as the count of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment. The Poisson distribution is discrete so the response variable must be discrete. In order to use a Poisson Regression in this study the following assumptions must be met by this data:

1. The logarithm of the child maltreatment rate must change linearly with equal increment increases in the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign.
2. Changes in the rate of child maltreatment from combined effects of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign length, strength or other covariates in the study will be multiplicative.
3. Data must be equidispersed. Equidespersion is a characteristic of the data’s distribution and occurs when the mean equals the variance.
4. The cases of child maltreatment observations must be independent (Coxe, West, & Aiken, 2009).

An initial evaluation of the data for model fit was necessary. The number of child maltreatment cases by year showed a mean of 8.4 with a variance of 132.215. This
suggests that an assumption for the Poisson distribution has been violated. Specifically
the assumption of equidispersion is not met. The data are overdispersed. A negative
binomial regression analysis is the standard method of analysis used to model an
overdispersed Poisson distribution (Hilbe, 2007).

In addition to distribution exploration using the mean and variance, a goodness of
fit test using a Pearson Chi-square evaluates the data for distributional fit to a Poisson
distribution. The Pearson Chi-Square was 1347.424 and the degrees of freedom were 92.
The Value/df is the ratio of variance. The farther away from 1 the Value/df becomes, the
more overdispersed the data. In this case the value/df is 14.646. (Table 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness of Fit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Value/df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>942.986</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1347.424</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14.646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


These methods used to evaluate the distributional characteristics of the data lead
to the use of a negative binomial regression analysis. A goodness of fit test using a
negative binomial regression analysis was observed. The Pearson Chi-Square was
136.378 and the degrees of freedom were 92. In this case the value/df is 1.482. This value
demonstrates a distributional fit for this method of analysis (Table 10).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness of Fit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Value/df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>100.331</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>136.378</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Evaluation of the data and distribution indicated the presence of high levels of multicollinearity that make it difficult to determine the true relationships of the variables. A high level of multicollinearity exists between multiple independent variables and covariates in this study. Multicollinearity is a term used to describe highly correlated independent variables (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

Theoretically, the covariates are highly correlated. The covariates of the study were selected following a review of the literature that suggested relationships between the covariates and the dependent variable. However, the literature also suggested strong relationships between and among the covariates: poverty, availability of social services, child care burden, availability of child care funds, and availability of child care providers. Primarily there is a strong relationship within the covariates anchored in a scarcity and availability continuum.

Due to multicollinearity, a correlation matrix was used to build the regression model. A correlation matrix was used to evaluate the variables for strength of
relationship. A model of relationship was developed and multiple indicators of the same variable were deleted from the model. Multiple indicators will distort the outcome of regression modeling. High multicollinearity has an adverse effect on the regression coefficients and can be seen when the standard error of the coefficients are examined (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Campaign Years</th>
<th>Campaign Strength</th>
<th>Campaign Presence</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Availability of Social Services</th>
<th>Child Care Burden</th>
<th>Child Care Providers</th>
<th>Child Care Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Strength</td>
<td>.212*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Presence</td>
<td>.730**</td>
<td>.204*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>.438**</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Social Services</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Burden</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Providers</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.588**</td>
<td>.324**</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Funds</td>
<td>.371**</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.533**</td>
<td>.264*</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.968**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 11. Correlations for Independent Variables and Covariates

An inspection of the properties of the correlational matrix among the study independent variables revealed Campaign Strength shared statistically significant
correlations with Campaign Presence and Campaign Years but was not significantly correlated with other covariates. Child Care Burden was only statistically correlated to Poverty but not to any other independent variables and covariates. Campaign Presence and Campaign Years were not entered into the model in an attempt to reduce the effect of a statistically significant correlation among the independent variables. Campaign Strength can only exist when Campaign Presence also exists within the variable. Forward stepwise addition advised by the correlation matrix was used to place covariates into the model.

The final model was chosen when no further statistically insignificant measures were present (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1984). In the final model built through correlation matrix support, the results show as the rate increases for Campaign Strength, an incidence rate ratio multiplicative increase of \( \exp(.292) \) in non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment occurs. The effect size measured by the incidence rate ratio indicates that for every unit increase in Campaign Strength the likelihood of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment increases by 29%. In regards to Child Care Availability, the effect size of Child Care Funds demonstrates an incidence rate ratio multiplicative decrease of \( \exp(-7.378) \) in child maltreatment as the rate of Child Care Funds increases. This means that for every unit increase in Child Care Funds the likelihood of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment decreases by 738%.
Table 12. Negative Binomial Regression Analysis Correlation Model with Campaign Strength and Child Care Funds.

The results of both the bivariate and negative binomial regression analysis will be taken into account for evaluation of the research questions and testing of the hypothesis.

The following summarized results of the study are explained by research question and hypothesis.

Research Question 1: Does county participation in a child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign change the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

A one-way ANOVA showed that there was no significant difference between Campaign Presence (M=9.25; SD=13.057) and No Campaign Presence (M=6.08; SD=5.230) (overall $F = 1.439; p < .05$). The results indicate the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign did not have a statistically significant effect on the incidence rates of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment.

Research Question 2: Does the strength and length of the county child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign and county factors such as poverty, childcare and social service availability impact the child maltreatment public awareness and
prevention campaign effect on the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

The correlation built model demonstrated a maltreatment rate increase associated with Campaign Strength (B = .292, Wald chi2 = 10.707, p = .001) to the incidence rate ratio multiplicative increase of exp. (.292) in non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment. Campaign Strength was statistically significant at the .05 level. This means that for every unit increase in Campaign Strength there is the likelihood of a 29% increase in the incidence rate of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment.

Only Child Care Funds seemed to have a relationship to a decreased incidence of child maltreatment. In the correlation built model, the effect size of Child Care Funds (B = -7.378, Wald chi2 = 5.711, p = .017) demonstrated an incidence rate ratio multiplicative decrease of exp. (-7.378) child maltreatment as the rate of Child Care Funds increased. Child Care Funds was statistically significant at the .05 level. This means there is a likelihood of a 738% increase in the incidence rate of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment for every one unit increase in Child Care Funds.

Poverty, Availability of Social Services, Child Care Providers, and Child Care Burden were not statistically significant in the correlation built model.

Research Hypothesis: The Choose Your Partner Carefully public awareness and prevention campaign creates substantive decreased change in the incidence rates of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment over time.

The Research Hypothesis was not supported as statistically significant.
Null Hypotheses: The Choose Your Partner Carefully public awareness and prevention campaign does not create substantive change in the incidence rates of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment over time. The Null Hypothesis remains the most viable choice.
This dissertation is an evaluation of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign, a prevention program that seeks to interrupt child maltreatment by non-biological males. The evaluation focused on the outcome of the campaign in order to determine the effectiveness of the campaign for the prevention and reduction of child maltreatment by non-related males. Several characteristics of the prevention campaign were included in the evaluation such as years of implementation and strength of implementation on the rates of child maltreatment. Additionally factors strongly correlated to child maltreatment and possible alternative explanations to the incidence rates of child maltreatment were included in the evaluation. These covariates were poverty, child care, and social service availability.

This chapter will be a discussion and synthesis of the findings to enhance the evidence base for specific child maltreatment prevention strategies. The findings will provide information on the effectiveness of a specific prevention strategy and the implications for social work practice, policy, research, and education. The discussion will begin with a summary of the study findings and limitations. Next the discussion will focus on the implications for improved social work practice through the design and implementation of evaluations during interventions, policy discussions on child care needs and funding, academia and practice research collaborations for research in the field
of child maltreatment prevention, and education of social workers able to develop interventions based on evidence gained through evaluation. The implications will be followed by concluding remarks.

Summary of the Study Findings

In this section, a review of the study findings for each research questions will be presented and followed by an interpretation of the results.

Research Question 1

Does county participation in a child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign change the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

In regards to the effectiveness of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign, a relationship between the presence of the program and a decrease in child maltreatment was not found. In both the analysis of variance and the negative binomial regression, no statistically significant relationship was found.

The findings of this study show mixed consistency with other studies. In regards to the findings on the effectiveness of the prevention program utilizing social marketing techniques, the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign did not lead to a decrease in non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment. However, other prevention programs that utilize social marketing techniques have been shown to be effective. In a systematic review of 54 studies that included 22 random control trials that met specific inclusion criteria for the definition of social marketing and research design, the findings showed social marketing effectiveness across a range of behaviors, in a range of target groups,
and through multiple settings. Social marketing was shown to be an “effective framework for behavior change interventions” (Stead, et al., 2007, pp. 126).

Other factors that must be considered when interpreting the findings of no statistical significance for program presence are the threats to internal validity that may have obscured the impact of the program. The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign was not evaluated in a random control trial. Rather, the intervention counties self-selected to implement the intervention and defined the way in which the program would be delivered. The lack of random assignment, fidelity to a standardized intervention model, and purposive outcome data collection make it difficult to compare program effectiveness across counties. Limitations of the data set used to track changes in number of non-related male maltreatment incidences may have also contributed to the statistically non-significant findings. Several years of data were missing from the NCANDS dataset and two years of the eight years showed significant spikes in maltreatment. The large increase in maltreatment cases for those two years could be accurate yet when compared to the other six years, the volatility of change raises questions about the data accuracy.

Research Question 2

Does the strength and length of the county child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign and county factors such as poverty, childcare, and social service availability impact the child maltreatment public awareness and prevention campaign effect on the incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-biological males?

In this study, the findings showed the strength of the program was related to an increase in child maltreatment despite the intention of the program to promote a decrease
in child maltreatment. Specifically, the results showed that higher levels of program strength, as measured by the number of social marketing strategies used, were related to higher levels of child maltreatment. Again, these results can be interpreted as a lack of program effectiveness or as inconclusive due to threats to internal validity.

One possible explanation could be that the counties that had higher rates of child maltreatment could have self-selected to provide the program. No random assignment of programs to counties was undertaken. Counties may have self-selected to provide the program because they were aware of the problem of non-related male child maltreatment in their county, attended the conference where the program was presented, were interested in the program topic and target population, and had the resources and staff to provide the program. Larger counties would have the staff, resources, and ability to travel to conferences and therefore more likely to provide the program.

The findings also revealed that greater availability of child care funds within counties was related to a decrease in non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment. Quality and safe child care is strongly correlated to decreased levels of child maltreatment (Cowen, 1998; Klein, 2010) in other studies. In fact, one study showed that a lack of quality childcare reduced the choices of childcare for single mothers and may have contributed to the utilization of partners for that childcare (Rosenberg & Reppucci, 1985). Having child care choices other than a mother’s partner may be a protective factor for children thus preventing child maltreatment.

The results of this evaluation showed a mixed relationship to the existing evidence from other child welfare research that examined the covariates of poverty,
access to child care, and access to social services. Multiple studies have confirmed that poverty is highly correlated to child maltreatment (CDC, 2013a; Berger, 2005; Ben-Arie, 2010; Coulton, et al., 2007; Coulton, Korbin, & Su, 1999; Garbarino & Sherman, 1980; Deccio, Horner, & Wilson, 1994) yet poverty was not a significant factor in this study. However, child care availability is related to decreased child maltreatment in this research and in other studies (Rosenberg & Reppucci, 1985; Cowen, 1998; Klein, 2010). Finally, several previous studies indicate that the availability of social services is a protective factor for children and is related to lowered rates of child maltreatment (CDC, 2013a; McGuinness & Schneider, 2007; Belanger, Price-Mayo, & Espinosa, 2007).

Availability of social services was not statistically significant in this research.

The increase in non-related male caretaker maltreatment related to the strength of the implementation of the Choose Your Partner Carefully program might also be attributed to an increase in public awareness of the issues and a greater likelihood to report suspected abuse or neglect. It is possible that the reports and substantiation of maltreatment could rise with increased surveillance of children by increasing public awareness of the characteristics of potential abusers.

Limitations of the Study

The intent of this study was to evaluate the Choose Your Partner Carefully program but the lack of evaluation preparation by the state and counties and the gaps in state and county data collection created significant limitations to this study. The Choose Your Partner Carefully program was implemented without a pre-planned evaluation. This
dissertation study evaluated the program using a multiple group pretest posttest design with secondary administrative data sets and data collected by a survey. Reverse engineering of an evaluation limits the accuracy of data collection that one can achieve as compared to data that is collected immediately and concurrently to the implementation of the program and intervention. First hand data provides direct knowledge about how a program is implemented and allows a more comprehensive look at possible outcomes for the program.

If the evaluation was designed and conducted while the program was implemented then a more rigorous research design and accurate data collection methods could have been utilized. Random assignment of the program to counties and a proceduralized implementation campaign strategy would have reduced the likelihood of bias and ensured the intervention was provided as intended. Collection of data on outcome variables such as non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment and fatalities as well as mother reported non-biological male perpetrated maltreatment should have been incorporated as part of the client service and program delivery. State and county administration should manage and maintain data on the interventions they fund.

A survey of the community could also have been implemented to evaluate the public awareness of the program and the problem of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment. Gathering process evaluation data on the program could have provided information on the program length and strength (number of social marketing tools) more accurately than relying on the memory of staff to provide this data.
The major threat to the internal validity of this study is the reliability and validity of the data used in this study. Four years out of the 12 years included in the study did not have data for the frequency of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment. For the years 2000 and 2008-2010, no data were recorded in Ohio. Consequently, these years were eliminated from the study. Although it is possible no occurrences of this type of maltreatment occurred in those years, it is more likely that the data was reported inaccurately or not reported at all. The definition of the perpetrator category was enlarged in 2003 which lead to more opportunities to fit into the category. State reporting to NCANDS is voluntary so there is no external control to ensure reliable reporting. In this case the possible inaccuracies of the NCANDS data collection lead to questions about the data reliability and validity.

An inquiry to the State of Ohio Bureau of Protective Services indicated state reporting staff looked into the years of missing data. They were unable to identify any anomalies in the 2000 and 2008 - 2010 reporting tables that would have impacted perpetrator data. Ohio implemented alternative response practice in 2007, which may have reduced the overall number of individuals identified as alleged perpetrators, but would not have affected availability of perpetrator data through NCANDS (L. McGee, personal communication, August 15, 2013). Contact with the coordinator of technical services at the National Data Archive for Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) confirmed the fact that no data were reported by the state of Ohio for these time periods (M. Dineen, personal communication, August 2, 2013). While it is possible no perpetrator data occurred during these time periods, it is also a possibility that reporting
inaccuracies resulted in no data or the state did not report these data. The data inaccuracies create a threat to the internal validity of the study, therefore the study conclusions should be viewed with caution.

There are also questions about the reliability of The Choose Your Partner Carefully County Program Survey of Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign’s data. Few counties kept written information on the program implementation start and end dates of the program, program budget, and social marketing strategies used. Responding to the survey required the respondents to rely on memory or to ask others who were employed during the program implementation.

Differential selection of evaluation participants, the Choose Your Partner counties, may be a threat to the internal validity. The Choose Your Partner Carefully program was presented to Ohio counties at the 2008 Public Children Services of Ohio Annual Conference. Following the conference, counties began to implement the program voluntarily. Out of the eighty-eight counties in Ohio, twenty-six counties implemented the program over a four year period. The question is how do counties that implemented differ from counties that did not implement? The group comparisons are between the counties with and the counties without the Choose Your Partner Carefully program across time. Counties were not randomly assigned to the program but rather self-selected into the program and are therefore not equivalent. First the public information officer would have to learn of the program from attendance at the Public Children Services Association of Ohio Conference or hear about it from another, then the person who learned of the program would have to see value in using the program and then have the time and
resources to provide the program. The time and resources would more likely exist in a larger metropolitan county. Additionally metropolitan counties have more collateral resources to support the program recipient needs. More stakeholders, such as agencies that serve the same target group, would be present and more likely to have the resources to be involved. Counties were compared by size and social services availability, poverty, child care burden, and child care availability to include the differences into the study. If an evaluation was put into place prior to the program implementation, randomly selected counties could have implemented freeing the study from this threat to validity. However the lack of randomization makes it difficult to generalize to counties of all sizes and counties outside of Ohio.

Treatment diffusion may have been a threat to validity if neighboring counties were also implementing the program. A county without the program could be exposed to the program from a neighboring county or a county with a program might experience greater program strength as a result of the neighboring county exposure. Exposure to the intervention from an adjacent county could have resulted in treatment diffusion. This exposure could obscure county differences that might be attributable to the intervention since non-participating counties may have benefited from the program as well.

The Choose Your Partner Carefully Program was developed with specific messaging, visual materials, and suggested social marketing strategies. All of the counties that implemented the program used the messaging and many of these materials and strategies. However there was no effort made to maintain fidelity or standardize the program to its fullest capacity. Counties reported use of one to several social marketing
tools, reported collaborations with stakeholders, and reported a wide range of resources and staffing to provide the campaign. The survey used in this study was an attempt to capture information on the fidelity of the program and the details that inform the length and strength of the intervention. County staffing and financial resources mainly influenced the level of implementation which is a selection-treatment interaction and threat to external validity. Counties with more resources are at an advantage in providing the program at full social marketing strength. This issue as with many of the threats to validity and generalizability are advantaged by larger metropolitan counties.

Multiple –treatment interference is a likely threat because the target group, mothers involved with men who are not biologically related to their children, is likely involved with other treatment providers where they potentially received the prevention message as well as other types of interventions specifically for the target problem. This factor will only allow generalizability to the specific target group.

In 2007, when the social problem of non-biological male perpetrated child maltreatment was identified, a needs assessment could have determined the “nature, scope, and locale of the problem” and enabled development of a program directed at the problem (Grinnell, Gabor, Unrau, pg. 143, 2012). Following the needs assessment, the implementation of a process evaluation would have informed the summative (outcome) evaluation of the program operations. A process evaluation could have gathered information about the fidelity of the program’s services. This would have been helpful in the evaluation of whether the programs provided by each county matched the original program design. Differences in program delivery could account for differences in county
program outcomes. A plan for program revision based on data outcomes could also have been put in place. Additionally a process evaluation could have contributed to the development of a data collection system. A data collection system that specifically collected the outcome variables at the county level and centrally stored would have ensured an accurate accounting for the changes in the target variable and data availability over time. With an evaluation in place we would have lessons learned.

In this dissertation study the prevention campaign was not found to be statistically significant in reducing child maltreatment by non-biological males. So we must ask ourselves, what are the implications of providing an ineffective program?

Quality social work includes providing quality interventions. To ensure this quality we must engage in evaluations to determine effectiveness. First we evaluate interventions because we want to know whether the intended changes of the intervention are actually occurring. This evidence helps us build knowledge for the target population and problem we are addressing with the intervention. An evaluation has the potential to provide us with a cost benefit analysis of the intervention and enable decision making about the quality and sustainability of the intervention. Information provided can also allow for quality improvement adjustments in the intervention. Finally social workers have an ethical obligation to provide evidence based interventions in order to improve the quality of our client’s lives while we do no harm.
Implications for Social Work Practice

The results of the effectiveness of the Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign on non-biologically related male perpetrated child maltreatment were not statistically significant for an effect on the decreased incidence rates of child maltreatment. It is possible the program is not effective. It is also possible the program was not provided effectively and/or the response variable was not measured sufficiently. This provides an example of the need to provide outcome evaluations during program implementation. Concurrent evaluation provides the opportunity to capture accurate data that can determine the benefit of the intervention. Increased levels of child care funding did show statistical significance to decreased incidence rates of child maltreatment by non-related males. This is congruent with the child care literature suggesting more attention should be given to child care not only as child maltreatment prevention but as a quality of life issue. However, the data inaccuracies demand we limit the implications we attach to the study findings. Since the data are not accurate, the threats to validity do not allow implications to be made that influence a response by practioners or policy makers.

The Choose Your Partner Carefully campaign was provided commensurate with the county resources. Program fidelity was not maintained across counties or years of provision. There is wide variability in the years provided and the strength of the program. But most importantly, no program evaluation was instituted with the initiation of the program. As a result, no outcomes were measured because no monitoring system was put into place. For this evaluation, a large national data set that provided data on the outcome measure, non-biologically related male perpetrated child maltreatment, was used. The
data set presented its own limitations for these purposes. Four year’s data of the study’s years were missing from the data set. Two years presented significant increases in the incidences of child maltreatment, yet no policy changes that redefined the outcome variable or changed the reporting of these variables can explain the volatility of the data. Explanations for these occurrences in data can only be speculative. These are the very reasons the study has implications for social work practice.

Macro practice is the social work practice of interventions designed to bring about change in organizations, communities, and policy. This type of social work practice includes the evaluation of interventions to determine how well the intervention is being implemented and the effectiveness of that intervention. Evaluations clarify the essential components needed for an effective prevention program. If an efficient outcome evaluation had been undertaken from the beginning of the program, we may with confidence know whether the program was effective. It is possible outcome evaluations are not conducted because social workers do not feel confident utilizing a systematic process of data collection. It is also possible organizations are limited in their staffing and resources so that time and evaluation tools may not be within their reach.

Aside from the possible barriers to evaluation, social workers have a responsibility to undertake evaluations to determine the effectiveness of the interventions they are using. Competent social work practice hinges on ethical practice and most certainly the use of evidence based practice. We must make sure we are providing interventions that are effective and are not doing harm to clients. We cannot be certain we
are servicing our clients well if we do not have evidence for our intervention effectiveness.

Child maltreatment is preventable. The Center for Disease Control’s strategy to prevent child maltreatment is organized around four general priorities that include: 1. measuring impact, 2. creating and evaluating new prevention approaches; 3. applying and adapting effective practices; and 4. building community readiness (CDC, 2013). This statement is just one more voice that calls for evaluation to be included in a strategy to prevent child maltreatment.

In an effort to build community readiness to evaluate practice and interventions, one source of information for social work practitioners is the Evaluation Toolkit provided on the FRIENDS: National Resource Center for Community –Based Child Abuse Prevention. The toolkit is divided into four components: 1. Building Your Evaluation Model; 2. Logic Model Builder; 3. Outcomes and Indicators; and 4. Annotated Measurement Tools. The tool was developed to assist program managers and administrators in the evaluation process. FRIENDS collaborated with the National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect Information and the Child Welfare Information Gateway to bring this resource to the public (FRIENDS, 2013). Social worker in the community who need information or support in the development of an evaluation of services related to child maltreatment may use this resource to accomplish intervention evaluation.

Collaborations that support social work practitioners and other professionals involved with prevention programming and evaluation are key to developing evaluation
as everyday practice. University Social Work programs and community agencies need to foster relationships with one another to create a collaborative effort to build research alliances in order to conduct translational research for child maltreatment prevention. These resources can build professional confidence and motivate social work practitioners to participate in child maltreatment prevention evidence building.

In regards to child care, social workers may consider child care options for the clients of their agency. On-site child care for clients of the agency would allow for safe and quality child care as well as foster client engagement.

**Implications for Social Work Policy**

The case for program evaluation is an easy case to present but much harder to put into action. In order for program evaluations to become common practice, policy makers must consider the need worthy of policy mandates at all levels. Providing services that are not effective is not cost efficient to an agency. We also know the cost to care for the victims of child maltreatment over their life time could be substantially reduced with quality prevention programming. Usually grants and other financial awards to agencies for programming require evaluation reports throughout the award fiscal year. This requires accountability for the effectiveness of interventions. Making evaluations of interventions a requirement or norm even when that intervention is supported solely through the agency budget would improve the quality of care and separate effective from ineffective interventions. If this were a norm for the social work practice community,
generating evidence on interventions would develop more rapidly. Research on child maltreatment prevention is an important issue that needs to be included in legislative policy making. Legislative policy requirements are often included in budgets and are a type of financial support that can encourage research. Policy makers may consider requiring evaluation of all interventions provided by policy and legislation.

This study found that child care was related to a decrease in child maltreatment. The literature has shown that availability of quality and affordable child care may reduce the likelihood that a mother will utilize her partner for that child care (Rosenberg & Reppucci, 1985). It is in this way that child care acts to prevent child maltreatment. The research on child care is focused primarily on crisis and respite child care. More research into organic sources of child care is needed, including non-biological males. We need this research to support the need for child care and to determine the need for funding and policy changes for child care. Policy changes to improve quality and availability of child care will require increased funding. Research on the economic cost of child maltreatment to society can serve to inform this shift in policy and funding. Does prevention of child maltreatment through availability of child care make more sense economically than treating the consequences of child maltreatment after the occurrence? Evaluations of child care interventions and the effectiveness to reduce child maltreatment are needed.
Implications for Social Work Research

We must invest in the prevention of child maltreatment so that we can raise healthy children and support a society that promotes community and economic development (Prevent Child Abuse America, 2013). Intervention strategies to address the outcome and consequences of child maltreatment are necessary but are reactive. In order to get ahead of these consequences, we must be proactive and prevent child maltreatment from occurring. It is for this reason that research on the prevention of child maltreatment is so important. Research in the area of child maltreatment prevention determines the most effective interventions to prevent and reduce child maltreatment (Daro & Donnelly, 2002).

The research findings of this study did not show statistical significance for the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program in the reduction of child maltreatment. However, child care funding did show a statistical significance in the reduction of child maltreatment but we must be cautious in the interpretation of this finding. Research that builds an evidence base for specific prevention strategies and enhances the effectiveness of existing prevention programs is needed to advance prevention science. Research into the relationship of non-biological men and the mothers of the children they abuse is needed to understand the dynamics of these relationships. From the social-ecological perspective, improving the lives of children and families can make an impact on the prevention of child maltreatment. Research in this area should include exploration of environmental influences such as poverty, child care availability, and availability of social services.
One caution in regards to the focus of child maltreatment prevention research, social workers must be aware of the intersectionality of gender, social privilege, and economic factors. Social privilege is “scientifically encoded into biological privilege through the institution of science; and biological privilege is socially encoded in social privilege through the institutions of public policy and politics” (Subramaniam, 2005, p. 232). In order to challenge traditions of privilege and power, while preventing bias, we must remain aware of how gender contextualizes social work practice, research, education, and policy. In the case of this study, one must be cautious about bias towards mothers. The program message evaluated in this dissertation study focused on mother’s responsibility to choose their partners carefully. In order to avoid mother blaming, we must remember the perpetrator of the abuse is the person responsible for the abuse. Gender biases are common in the child welfare system. “A review of the child welfare literature revealed three things. First, little attention has been given to the quality of fathering as a factor in children’s well-being. Second, mother blaming is as viable as ever, both in clinical journals and its practice. Third, there has been little focus on gender biases in the child welfare literature since *Child Welfare* published a special issue of feminist approaches to child welfare in 1985” (Risley-Curtiss & Heffernan, 2003, pg. 395). Social workers are ethically responsible to be aware of gender bias and victim blaming when involved in social work practice and research. Research into parenting, the relationship dynamics of the child caregivers, and division of labor and child care may shed light on the expectations we have for men and women who are responsible for the
care of children, their needs, and the way in which we develop interventions that address child maltreatment prevention.

Implications for Social Work Education

Most social work students enter social work programs excited to begin direct practice with interest in a specific social problem or population. If you ask most social work students what kind of work they want to do, they will tell you micro practice. Often students will avoid a commitment of time and energy towards courses in macro practice and specifically evaluation. We must find ways to engage social work students in courses that cover research, statistics, and evaluation. Social work education may need to provide additional supportive services and resources to students in these areas in an effort to ease anxiety and create the best possible road to success in these areas of knowledge. If we can engage social workers in macro practice courses and graduate social workers confident in research methods, we improve the likelihood that social workers will undertake projects such as program evaluation more readily. If social workers are more willing to participate in these activities, an increase and improvement in evidence-based practices such as prevention programming is sure to occur. Communicating the importance of prevention approaches and how these approaches fit into social work practice may create greater motivation for the development of prevention and participation in evaluation of prevention.

Social work educators should focus more research into understanding how social work students perceive research and evaluation methods and statistical courses, what
preparatory coursework may improve comfort with these topics, and how to best teach this material.

Conclusions

Child maltreatment is preventable. Research is important in developing a better understanding of how prevention strategies can interrupt child maltreatment. Every year 6 million maltreated children need society to respond. Conversations between practitioners, researchers, and policy makers are necessary to organize the societal responses required to address this problem. Conversations and cooperation among these three important change agents only happens when growing evidence reaches sufficient levels to provide guidance and solutions. It is hoped that this study will motivate social workers to participate in the evaluation of interventions that prevent and reduce child maltreatment. Social workers need to see the value in developing proactive prevention interventions rather than reactive treatment interventions.

Because quality and safe child care is a protective factor for children more research and advocacy are needed in this area. This study supported the relationship of child care to a decrease in child maltreatment. More research is needed in community based child care availability and child maltreatment. If more federal and state funds could be dedicated to child care it is possible that the same monies would be saved because the need to provide treatment for abused children would have been prevented.

The findings of this study are to be taken cautiously because of the gaps in available data and possible data inaccuracies. While the effectiveness of the Choose Your
Partner Carefully program cannot be assessed from this evaluation, the study does confirm the need to evaluate the interventions we provide to our clients. Social workers have an ethical responsibility to provide evidenced based interventions that are likely to improve the client’s well-being.
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Appendix A: Choose Your Partner Carefully Postcard and Brochure
Choose Your Partner Carefully...
...your child's life depends on it.

When you choose a partner for you, you are choosing for your child too.

Your baby is counting on you to make the right decision.

Never leave your child with someone you don't trust with your child's life.

Does your partner:

- Show anger or impatience when your child cries or has a tantrum?
- Call your child BAD NAMES or put him down?
- Think it is funny to SCARE your child?
- Stop you from bringing your child to his family's events?
- Make ALL the decisions for you and your child?
- Tell you that you are a bad parent or that you should not have your kids?
- Pretend that WHEN HE HURTS YOUR CHILD that you are to BLAME or that it's NO BIG DEAL?
- Make your child SCARED by using guns or knives or other weapons?
- Tell you that your child is a nuisance?

If you answered yes to even one of these your child might be at risk!

Never leave your child with someone you don't trust with your child's life.
When you choose a partner for yourself, you are choosing one for your child, as well.

**Does your Partner:**
- Show anger or impatience when your child cries or has a tantrum?
- Call your child BAD NAMES or put him down?
- Think it is funny to SCARE your child?
- Stop you from bringing your child to family events?
- Make ALL the decisions for you and your child?
- Tell you that you are a bad parent or that you should not have your kids?
- Prolong that WHEN HE HURTS YOUR CHILD that you are to blame or that it’s NO BIG DEAL?
- Make your child scared by using guns or knives or other weapons?
- Tell you that your child is a nuisance?

If you answered yes to even one of these questions, your child might be at risk!

Never leave your child alone with someone you don’t trust with your child’s life.

Far too often, a child is abused or even killed when left in the care of a parent’s partner.

In Ohio, data shows that of those children who were killed, the biological parent was responsible in 61% of the reviews. The mother’s partner was cited in 28% of the reviews. (Ohio Department of Health; Child Fatality Eighth Annual Report, September, 2008).

According to data from the Clark County Child Advocacy Center and Family & Children Services, approximately, 28.3% of child abuse and neglect cases involved a parent’s partner as the alleged perpetrator.

Ask yourself these questions:
- Does your partner have a criminal history?
- How he she or she treated their past partners?
- How does he or she treat other children?
- How he or she treat animals?

Remember, this is one choice you can make to save your children from harm or even death.

---

**When signs of risk are identified:**
- Get you and your children to a SAFE place and then
- Contact your local Children Service Board
- Or contact your local Domestic Violence Shelter
- If you cannot get to a SAFE place, contact one of the local agencies for immediate help.

---

Contact Information:

**Family & Children Services of Clark County, Inc.**
1345 Lagonda Ave
Springfield, OH 45503
T: 937-327-1748
W: www.clarkdjs.org
Appendix B: Choose Your Partner Carefully Press Release
Choose Your Partner Carefully SAMPLE NEWS RELEASE

( Agency Letterhead )

Release Date:
Contact Person:

City- With cases of violence against children on the rise, (agency) is launching a new campaign urging parents to consider who they let around their children.

Last year in Ohio, XX children were killed at the hands of their mother’s partner. XX children were abused. (or use the set of statistics that are relevant for your agency).

(Sample Quote) “Women need to realize that who they get involved with directly affects their children.” Says (agency director or spokesperson). “Choose your partners carefully; your child’s life depends on it.”

The following are a few of the questions women should ask themselves about their partner:

- Does he show anger or impatience when your child cries or has a tantrum?
- Does he call your child bad names or put him down?
- Does he think it is funny to scare your child?
- Does he pretend that when he hurts your child that you are to blame or that it’s no big deal?

If you answered yes to even one of these questions, your child might be at risk. Never leave your child with someone you don’t trust with your child’s life.

Women and interested agencies can contact (agency contact) for more information about the campaign and referrals to local resources

###
Appendix C: Choose Your Partner Carefully Talking Points
Some talking points to consider incorporating in your message are:

- Know if he has a criminal history
- How does/did he treat other women in his life?
- How does he treat other children? (Nieces, nephews, friends’ children)
- Does he show extreme frustration for his children over yours?
- Does he get angry when you spend time with your child?
- Does he dictate when your child can visit extended family?
- This is one choice you can make to ensure the safety of your child in our home.
- Every year XX children are abused by their mother’s partner. XX of those children were killed.
- Use other bullet points from post card for additional talking points (Public Children Service Association of Ohio, 2009).
Appendix D: Choose Your Partner Carefully Power Point Presentation
Choose Your Partner Carefully Power Point Presentation Outline

Slide 1  Choose Your Partner Carefully…

Slide 2  Choose Your Partner Carefully
• This power point was developed using the “Choose your partner carefully” campaign tool kit.
• Starting Point Web Site  Job & Family Services Web Site
• Break the Cycle Web Site

  For Technical Assistance contact:
  Kathryn Whittington (440) 998-1811
  Ashtabula County Children Services

Slide 3  Introduction
  Far too often a child is abused or even killed when left in the care of a parent’s partner, usually the mother’s boyfriend (who is typically not the biological fathers)

Slide 4  Objectives

• Increase awareness among women of the risk their children face when a non-related male is entrusted with their care
• Provide tools to help women better evaluate the likelihood that their paramour could become a perpetrator of abuse
• Educate women to help them recognize potential signs of abuse to their children

Slide 5  Objectives  Cont.

• Educate women about potential community resources for child care (other than non-related male)

Increase community awareness of the problem and its overall impact on the community.

Slide 6  Goals

• To prevent Child Abuse and Neglect
• Bring awareness to this issue
• To provide women with the information to make good choices for child/children and themselves
• Provide local resource information
Slide 7  Statistics

• Insert county statistics here
• Using crystal reports for substantiated/indicated abuse or neglect cases
• Insert National statistics here
• Using National Child Abuse & Neglect System (NCANDS) http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/pubs/cm06/chapter5.htm#character

Slide 8  Statistics Cont.

• Data from your local Child Fatality Review Board
• Data from Ohio Department of Health, Child Fatality Review annual report http://www.Ohio Department of Health. ohio.gov

Slide 9  Questions to ask yourself about the person

• Do you know if he has a criminal history?
• How has he treated former girlfriends?
• How does he treat the women in his family?
• How does he treat other children?

Remember this is one choice you can make to ensure the safety of your child/children in your home!

Slide 10  Is my child at Risk?

• Show anger or impatience when your child cries or has a tantrum?
• Call your child BAD NAMES or put him down?
• Think it is funny to SCARE your child?
• Stop you from bringing your child to his family events?

Slide 11  Is your child at Risk?

• Makes ALL the decisions for you and your child?
• Tells you that you are a bad parent or that you should not have your kids?
• Pretends that WHEN HE HURTS YOUR CHILD that you are to BLAME or that it’s NO BIG DEAL?

Slide 12  Is your child at Risk? Cont.

• Makes your child SCARED by using guns or knives or other weapons?
• Tells you your child is a nuisance?

If you have answered yes to even one of these your child might be at risk.
When signs of risk are identified

- Get you and your child/children to a SAFE place and then
- Contact your local Children Service Board
- Or contact your local Domestic Violence Shelter
- If you cannot get to a SAFE place contact one of the local agencies for immediate help

How to find Safe & Appropriate Child Care

- Locating safe and appropriate child care is important. You need to know who you are leaving your child with. Contact your local Job & Family Service Agency and or Starting Point.
- http://gis1.odjfs.state.oh.us/childcare/

How to find Safe & Appropriate Child Care Continued

- Ask questions – Starting point has two forms for In Home Child Care Interviews & Center Based Interviews

Community Resources

- Insert your community resources for:
- Report Child Abuse & Neglect
- Domestic Violence
- Job & Family Services
- Starting Point – Child Care Referral
- Other local agencies that refer for county services
  (Public Children Services Association of Ohio, 2009)
Appendix E: Choose Your Partner Carefully Curriculum Model
The Curriculum Model is as follows:

Lesson Plan

Course Title: Choose Your Partner Carefully

Course Length: 6 weeks

Lesson Length: 9 hours

Learning Objectives: Increase awareness among women of the risk their children face when a non-related male is entrusted with their care, Provide tools to help women better evaluate the likelihood that their paramour could become a perpetrator of abuse, Educate women to help them recognize potential signs of abuse to their children, Educate women about potential community resources for child care (other than non-related male), Increase community awareness of the problem and its overall impact on the community.

Target Audience: Pregnant Teens, Teen Mothers, and Single Adult Mothers

Prerequisite: None

Materials:

Equipment:

Lesson Outline: Introduction

1. Why it is important to choose the right partner
2. Objectives

Awareness
1. Goals
2. Statistics

Communication
1. What questions to ask
2. Is there risk to the child

How to identify abuse
1. What are the signs to look for
2. What to do when signs are identified

Child Care
1. Where & Who are you leaving your child with
2. How to find safe & appropriate daycare

Wrap up & referrals- Community Resources
1. How to contact local agencies
2. Questions

(Public Children Service Association of Ohio, 2009)
Appendix F: Choose Your Partner Carefully Public Service Announcement
### 30 Second Radio Spot

**DATE:**

**START:** START DATE

**STOP:** STOP DATE

**LENGTH:** 30 seconds

**SFX:** IF YOU WANT A SOUND EFFECT

**LIVE Copy (Announcer):** Choose your partner carefully; Your child’s life depends on it. Never leave your child with someone you don’t trust with her life. Many children harmed each year by unrelated adults who just don’t know how to take care of a child. Your baby is counting on you to make the right decision. Contact CHILDREN SERVICES at PHONE for more information or visit WEBSITE.
Appendix G: Choose Your Partner Carefully Billboard
Choose Your Partner Carefully...

...your child’s life depends on it.

440-329-5340

ChildrenServices.org

Choose Your Partner Carefully...

...your child’s life depends on it.

Lorain County Children Services • ChildrenServices.org
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Appendix I: The Choose Your Partner Carefully County Program Survey
Choose Your Partner Carefully County Program Survey

Participation in this survey is voluntary. You can decide not to participate, decline to answer any questions, as well as to stop participating at any time. The information you provide in this survey is encrypted. If you have any additional questions concerning this research or your participation, please feel free to contact:

Linda Helm, MSW, LISW-S, ACSW, Ph.D. Candidate
University Partnership- Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Program Campus Coordinator
The Ohio State University
210 Stillman Hall, College of Social Work
1947 College Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1162
helm26@osu.edu
Office: 614-688-3290
Cell: 937-901-1189

or

Denise E. Bronson, MSW, Ph.D. - Dissertation Supervisor
Associate Dean & Director of MSW Program
The Ohio State University
College of Social Work
bronson.62@osu.edu
614-292-1867

Completion of the survey implies your consent to participate.

"For questions about your rights as a research participant, or to talk to someone who is not a member of the research team, please contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-578-6251."

The information you share with me will be of great value in helping to complete this research project. The results of this research could significantly enhance our understanding of child maltreatment prevention. This online survey will take about 15-20 minutes of your time. Thank you for your consideration regarding this exciting research opportunity. Your individual contribution to this study is invaluable and greatly appreciated.

There are 32 questions in this survey

PCSO County Name
1 [County]

**PCS0 County Name **

Please choose only one of the following:

- [ ] Allen County
- [ ] Ashtabula County
- [ ] Butler County
- [ ] Clark County
- [ ] Clermont County
- [ ] Columbiana County
- [ ] Cuyahoga County
- [ ] Fairfield County
- [ ] Franklin County
- [ ] Greene County
- [ ] Hamilton County
- [ ] Highland County
- [ ] Lake County
- [ ] Lawrence County
- [ ] Licking County
- [ ] Lorain County
- [ ] Lucas County
- [ ] Mahoning County
- [ ] Marion County
- [ ] Montgomery County
- [ ] Muskingum County
- [ ] Portage County
- [ ] Richland County
- [ ] Ross County
- [ ] Seneca County
- [ ] Stark County
- [ ] Summit County
- [ ] Trumbull County
- [ ] Wayne County
- [ ] Wood County
2 [Name] Name of Person Completing Survey
Please write your answer here:

3 [Job Title of Person ]
Job Title of Person Completing Survey
Please choose all that apply and provide a comment:

- [ ] PCSO County Director
- [ ] PCSO County Public Information Officer
- [ ] If other Job Title, write the title in the box to the right

4 [Boiler plate]
Please provide your phone and email in case survey information needs clarification.

5 [Contact Phone]
Phone
Please write your answer here:

6 [Contact Email]
Email
Please write your answer here:
County Program Information

7 [Program] Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?

Please choose only one of the following:

○ Yes
○ No
○ Uncertain

8 [2007 Offer] Did your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program in 2007?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

"Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question '7 [Program]' (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)"

Please choose only one of the following:

○ Yes
○ No
○ Uncertain

9 [Date 2007] What is the date program began?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

"Answer was 'Uncertain' or 'Yes' at question '7 [Program]' (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)"

Please enter a date:


10 [2007 Methods] What methods were used to publicize your 2008 county Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?
Use the boxes on the right to add methods or to note the frequency and population targeted.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

"Answer was 'Uncertain' or 'Yes' at question '8 [2007 Offer]' (Did your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program in 2007?)"

Please choose all that apply and provide a comment:
11 [2008 Offer] Did your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program in 2008?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question 7 [Program] (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)

Please choose only one of the following:

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Uncertain

12 [Date 2008] What is the date program began?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was 'Uncertain' or 'Yes' at question 7 [Program] (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)
Please enter a date:

13 [2008 Methods] What methods were used to publicize your 2008 county Choose Your Partner Carefully Program? Use the boxes on the right to add methods or to note the frequency and population targeted.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
- Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question 7 ([Program]) (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?) and Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question 11 [2008 offer] (Did your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program in 2008?)

Please choose all that apply and provide a comment:

- Mailings
- Flyers
- Magnets
- Billboards
- Television Public Service Announcements
- Radio Public Service Announcements
- Community Presentations
- High School Education
- Parent Education
- Social Media
- Other
- Other
- Other
- Other
- Other

14 [2009 Offer] Did your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program in 2009?
15 [Date 2009] What is the date program began?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was "Yes" or "Uncertain" at question 7 [Program]? (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)

Please enter a date:


16 [2009 Methods] What methods were used to publicize your 2009 county Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?
Use the boxes on the right to add methods or to note the frequency and population targeted.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was "Yes" or "Uncertain" at question 7 [Program]? (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?) and Answer was "Yes" or "Uncertain" at question 14 [2009 Offer] (Did your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program in 2009)?

Please choose all that apply and provide a comment:
17 [2010 Offer] Did your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program in 2010?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was "Yes" or "Uncertain" at question 16 [Program] (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)

Please choose only one of the following:

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

18 [Date 2010] What is the date program began?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was "Uncertain" or "Yes" at question 17 [Program] (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)
19 [2010 Methods] What methods were used to publicize your 2010 county Choose Your Partner Carefully Program? Use the boxes on the right to add methods or to note the frequency and population targeted.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
'Answer was "Yes" or "Uncertain" at question 7 [Program] (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?) and Answer was "Yes" or "Uncertain" at question 17 [2010 Offer] (Did your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program in 2010?)

Please choose all that apply and provide a comment:

- [ ] Mailings
- [ ] Flyers
- [ ] Magnets
- [ ] Billboards
- [ ] Television Public Service Announcements
- [ ] Radio Public Service Announcements
- [ ] Community Presentations
- [ ] High School Education
- [ ] Parent Education
- [ ] Social Media
- [ ] Other
- [ ] Other
- [ ] Other
- [ ] Other
- [ ] Other

20 [2011 Offer] Did your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program in 2011?
21 [Date 2011] What is the date program began?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
"Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question '7 [Program]' (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)

Please enter a date:

22 [2011 Methods] What methods were used to publicize your 2011 county Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?
Use the boxes on the right to add methods or to note the frequency and population targeted.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
"Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question '7 [Program]' (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?) and Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question '20 [2011 Offer]' (Did your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program in 2011?)

Please choose all that apply and provide a comment:
| □ Mailings |
| □ Flyers |
| □ Magnets |
| □ Billboards |
| □ Television Public Service Announcements |
| □ Radio Public Service Announcements |
| □ Community Presentations |
| □ High School Education |
| □ Parent Education |
| □ Social Media |
| □ Other |
| □ Other |
| □ Other |
| □ Other |
| □ Other |

23 [Budget] If known, indicate your county Choose Your Partner Carefully Program budget for each year offered.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question 7 'Program' (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)

Please choose all that apply and provide a comment:

- □ 2007
- □ 2008
- □ 2009
- □ 2010
- □ 2011
24 [Budget] If the annual budget for your county Choose Your Partner Carefully Program is unknown, list the county fiscal contact.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
"Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question 7 [Program] (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)"

Please write your answer here:

---

25 [SpecAdm] Is a specific person designated to administer your Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
"Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question 7 [Program] (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)"

Please choose only one of the following:

☐ Yes
☐ No

---

26 [Hrs] How many work hours are allocated to your Choose Your Partner Carefully Program per month?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
"Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question 7 [Program] (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)"

Please write your answer here:

---

27 [Evaluate] Has your county's Choose Your Partner Carefully Program been evaluated?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
"Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question 7 [Program] (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)"

Please choose only one of the following:

☐ Yes
☐ No

---

28 [Outcomes] What outcomes are you hoping to achieve with your program?
Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was "Yes" or "Uncertain" at question 7 (Program) (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)

Please write your answer here:

29 [Effective] What are the most effective ways you implemented the program?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was "Yes" or "Uncertain" at question 7 (Program) (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)

Please write your answer here:

30 [Strengths] What are the strengths of your program?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was "Yes" or "Uncertain" at question 7 (Program) (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)

Please write your answer here:
31 [Limitations] What are the limitations of your program?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question 7 [Program] (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)

Please write your answer here:

---

32 [Redesign] If you could redesign the program and implementation, how would you do so?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
* Answer was 'Yes' or 'Uncertain' at question 7 [Program] (Does your county offer the Choose Your Partner Carefully Program?)

Please write your answer here:
Thank you for your time and efforts in providing the necessary information for this survey. Your contribution to this study is greatly appreciated.

Linda Helm, MSW, LISW-S, ACSW, Ph.D. Candidate
University Partnership- Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Program Campus Coordinator
The Ohio State University
210 Stillman Hall, College of Social Work
1947 College Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1162
helm.28@osu.edu
Office: 614-688-3290
Cell: 937-901-1189

Denise E. Bronson, MSW, Ph.D. - Dissertation Supervisor
Associate Dean & Director of MSW Program
The Ohio State University
College of Social Work
bronson.6@osu.edu
614-292-1867

12-31-1969 – 10:00

Submit your survey.
Thank you for completing this survey.
Appendix J: Child Maltreatment Cases by County and Year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Maltreatment Cases by County and Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Shaded Areas Indicate Years Choose Your Partner was Provided by County</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtabula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskingum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Cases (n=787)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>