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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The practice of social work has as an essential component the act of decision making. In fact, the process of social work can be conceptualized as a continuous series of observations, assessments and decisions which occur whether the setting is a public welfare department, mental health center, hospital or any of the variety of human services agencies in which social workers practice. Of utmost importance in the understanding of social work decision making is the fact that most judgments are made in less than certain circumstances. Removing a child from the home of an allegedly abusive or neglectful parent, hospitalizing a mental health emergency or selecting a treatment modality for a particular client problem all require judgments based on information which is frequently equivocal and confusing. It is essential to realize that in the face of this uncertainty, social workers make decisions regularly, many of which have dramatic, immediate and long-term effects on the people who are their targets.

Despite the extensiveness of decision-making in practice and the potential impact of their decisions on many people, it is proposed here that social workers have a minimal understanding about how decisions are made; that is, the judgment process. Briar (1963) was prophetic when he observed that social workers "seem to regard the judgments and decisions they make in their practice as somehow less momentous than, say, those made by physicians in medical
practice" (p. 16). In the same article, Briar also noted that very little is known "about how social workers in all fields of practice form their clinical judgments and treatment decisions" (p. 16). Social work research attention to decision processes, especially at the cognitive level, has been uneven and, within the last decade, almost nonexistent.

The purpose of this descriptive study is to examine and apply to a practice problem a specific decision analysis approach which appears to have practical utility for research done on judgment and decision processes in social work. Identified as "policy capturing" (Slovic, Fishoff and Lichtenstein, 1977) or "judgment modeling" (Behling, 1978), the method is based on the cognitive psychological theory developed by Egon Brunswick (1952; Hammond, 1955). The approach, which uses a multiple linear regression analytic framework, is concerned with the "processes and strategies that humans employ in order to integrate discrete items of information into a decision" (Slovic and Lichtenstein, 1971, p. 653). Judgment modeling has been used with success in a variety of applied settings (Slovic, et al., 1977).

The cognitive level of inquiry is a primary reason why judgment modeling has heuristic value for research done in social work decision making. Historically, social workers have tended to view certain components of their practice as not amenable to investigation or understanding. One of these components is clinical judgment, which can be conceptualized as the process, primarily cognitive, through which a practitioner is confronted with an array of information, considers and weighs the information and, finally, makes a decision based on those considerations. This process has often been elevated to near
mystical levels and is frequently referred to as practice wisdom, the "art" of social work (Eaton, 1958). Unfortunately, the persistent belief that clinical judgment cannot be empirically understood has precluded a well-defined and communicated practice theory base. Judgment modeling provides a technology to begin systematic inquiry into an area thought to be resistant to understanding, and will thus assist in a clearer exposition of practice skills.

In this study, judgment modeling is used to examine the decisions made by child welfare practitioners to separate children from their parents for placement in alternative care settings. This social work practice problem was selected primarily because of the position of a number of child welfare researchers and theorists that the understanding of the judgment process leading to placement in alternative care settings is woefully inadequate (Gambriel and Wiltse, 1974a, 1974b; Stein, 1974; Stein, Gambriel and Wiltse, 1978; Wiltse, 1976). The successful application of judgment modeling to this problem will have a positive impact on both understanding separation decisions and, on a broader level, on the definition of child welfare practice and policy.

The overall objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To define and discuss the components of a decision analysis technique called judgment modeling;
2. To apply judgment modeling in the analysis of the decision behavior of child welfare practitioners as they confront a potential separation situation;
3. To examine and interpret this decision behavior on both an individual and small group basis;
4. To link results to practice and policy in the child welfare area;
5. To discuss the implications of judgment modeling for social work research done in the area of decision making and decision analysis.

Clarification of Terms

The literature on "decision making," "choice behavior" and "clinical judgment" does not provide clear guidelines about qualitative differences between these terms. Some decision theorists have attempted to define differences between judgment and decision making based on values. Bieri, et al. (1966), for example, state that "judgment may be said to occur when an individual assigns one set of stimuli to one of two or more response categories" (p. 4). They note, however, that "when the assignment of a stimulus to a category involves a consideration by the judge of a value preference or outcome of each response alternative, the judgment task assumes more of the character of decision making" (p. 5).

Other decision theorists, however, have been less inclined to attempt definitional differences between the terms. Morris (1977) suggests that "by a decision we mean a conceptualization of a choice situation, whether in the form of a mental image or an explicit model" (p. 4). Tripodi and Miller (1966) note that "judgments imply decision making or a selection between two or more alternatives" (p. 63). Finally, Slovic and Lichtenstein (1971) state that "the distinction between judgments and decisions is a tenuous one" and use the two terms interchangeably (p. 652).

This inconsistent usage creates difficulties in the reporting of research on decision making. Various theorists who write about decision making, choice and
judgment from within specific disciplines such as business, political science and psychology use the term or terms that have meaning to consumers of their research. Because this study uses components derived from these disciplines in the formulation of the research issue and in the methodology used to examine it, it is necessary to use the terms interchangeably. Not only is this consistent with usage in the literature (Slovic and Lichtenstein, 1971), it also reduces the need for awkward clarifications in the text.

Decision Making in Social Work Practice

Reinsel (1976) has observed that the concept of judgment is crucial to social work practice (p. 2). Matters of choice consistently confront a practitioner in assessment, treatment or intervention, and termination no matter what the practice method. Despite the range and variability in the content of these judgments across practitioners, a degree of consistency and similarity of form can be identified. In most situations, the practitioner is confronted with an array of information about the problem or situation to be changed. The task of the practitioner is to consider, weigh or value, and select components of information and to base subsequent action on that data. This process is repeated at various points in the intervention or treatment sequence. In an early study, Briar (1961), in fact, views the casework process as a series of judgments.

First, the worker forms diagnostic judgments about the practice situation that confronts him. Next, he plans a course of action, and this step involves another set of judgments. The social caseworker, for example, repeats this sequence many times in the course of a single interview. That is, in a matter of seconds, the client makes a statement, the worker attributes meaning to the client's remarks, and
then selects his response from a number of possible alternatives. Some clinical judgments are made slowly, consciously and deliberately; many occur automatically without awareness" (p. 91).

The notion that professional judgment is a crucial practice skill is widely supported. For example, an N.A.S.W. committee studying competence identified a "component of responsible, self-regulated practice as the ability to dependably exercise critical judgment in making wise decisions" (from Bartlett, 1970, p. 140). Bartlett (1970), in her comprehensive effort to articulate a common base of social work practice, identifies professional judgment as the point at which a profession's "values and knowledge in the form of principles and generalizations" are actually applied in a specific practice situation. She states that

...such judgment is a key operation in any profession. The practitioner must be able to select the relevant principles from his profession's body of knowledge and values and apply them appropriately in assessing the situation before him" (p. 140).

The primacy of professional judgment in the dispatch of responsibility is, according to Bartlett, the reason that focus on its form and content should be viewed as an essential component of a common base for practice.

Reinsel (1976) has noted that the models of a number of prominent casework theorists can be viewed within a decision making or judgment framework. Hamilton, Perlman, Hollis, and Briar and Miller all stress the importance of judgment as a practice skill. More recent practice theorists such as Pincus and Minahan (1974) and Fischer (1978) in the articulation of general practice frameworks and Mech (1970) and Stein (1981) and Wiltse (1978) in child welfare services also stress decision making as an essential practice component.
Unfortunately, the understanding of judgment in social work practice has not kept pace with arguments that it is an essential practice skill. Practice theorists view professional judgment as primarily a cognitive task. Referring to professional judgment in assessment, Bartlett (1970) observes that "in its general outlines, professional assessment is a form of logical analysis that would be carried through by any person with a trained mind" (p. 143). The cognitive nature of professional judgment is precisely why research attention to this topic has been difficult to sustain in social work. Understanding the complicated and hard-to-access thought and cognitive actions of practitioners requires a rigorous methodology and a firm commitment to the notion that this understanding is possible and important. Although the technology exists, social work has been equivocal in its commitment to research in judgment and decision making.

**Frameworks for Conceptualizing Decision Making in Social Work**

Basically, efforts to understand judgment and decision making in social work have been approached within two perspectives. In the first perspective, judgment is viewed as an intuitive, private process undergirded primarily by an accumulation of practitioner knowledge and skill. This view suggests that over time, practitioners gain a "practice wisdom" which is used to organize information search and to form the basis for weighing and considering that information in practice decision making. Theorists using this perspective contend that understanding individual decision behavior is extremely difficult because much of the information processing and choice behavior of an individual practitioner is inaccessible.
The second perspective assumes a different position. In this view, attempts are made to define judgment tasks clearly and carefully and to prescribe ways to collect and process information in such a way that optimal choices are made. Theorists approaching judgment tasks from within this perspective argue that decision behavior is not entirely intuitive and hidden. Rather, through systematic attention and well-designed plans, judgment tasks can be understood and analyzed.

Historically, the intuitive perspective has dominated consideration of judgment in social work practice. According to Morris (1977) the following are properties of intuitive decisions:

1. A "feeling of rightness"
2. Not explained very well
3. Product of subconscious, preconscious or perlogical thought
4. Private, implicit and undelegated (p. 15)

Intuitive decision makers often have difficulty specifying the processes and contents used in reaching a conclusion or making a judgment. The intuitive thinker is "unable to report what aspects of the situation his perceptual processes have selected, or the inferential methods that lead him from these inputs to a decision" (Morris, 1977, p. 15-16).

The general tone of this view in social work is most accurately conveyed by the use of the term "art" as a descriptor of much of the practice process including professional judgment. The use of this term to describe the complicated and not-well-understood set of actions and methods employed by social workers first came from Mary Richmond in her classic, Social Diagnosis. She wrote
We now turn to the details of social casework method. It will be necessary to remember that in any art, the description of its processes is necessarily far more clumsy than are the processes themselves (p. 103).

Eaton (1958) notes that in social practice

When there is an emphasis on "art," it implies a conviction that decisions are based on the basis of an intuitive and inspirational rationale. They are derived from personal discoveries or from the ideas avowed by model practitioners, the "great" teachers, the unusual clinicians, the gifted consultants (p. 3).

The persistence of this view in the development of modern practice theory is notable. Turner (1974), for example, posed the question in his discussion of the role of theory in practice, "might it be that the complete therapist is not the theoritician but the artist whose theory is his intuition and skills his natural endowment" (p. 13). Zastrow (1981), while addressing the issue of values and choice, states unequivocally that "social work is an art, not a science" (p. 25). Thus, some modern practice theorists hold to the notion that a complete understanding of the process through which social workers move while providing service, including the ever-present and critical judgment tasks, is beyond reach. They conclude that what practitioners do is, in large measure, an intuitive process, one that is resistant to elaboration or definition.

Although the intuitive perspective has continued to be supported by various practice theorists, it has its critics. The intuitionist's position that much of social work practice is the application of an artistic creation developed by a knowledgeable and experienced practitioner has been met with opposition by
those who contend that such a position highlights what is wrong with practice theory. Eaton (1958) levied the earliest attack on the intuitive perspective when he stated that:

An air of awe and mysticism surrounds such "practice wisdom" and it is psychologically tempting to become enamored of these art (or clinical) aspects of practice (p. 3).

Eaton (1958) goes on to identify a substantial difficulty associated with the intuitive perspective. The entire basis of social work hinges on the notion that a defined and communicable practice theory can be developed and refined. Practice theory is a framework for action and, as such, must include a level of detail which is as precise as possible and defined in such a way that social workers-in-training and clients can understand what is being done and how. The position that social work practice is intuitive or, in the extreme, unknowable, precludes the development of such a practice theory. Eaton states that:

The artistic approach to practice--and every practitioner has such supreme moments of insight--is important because many new discoveries are made that way, but unless these personal inventions are translated into ideas that can be shared, they are useless to others. They must be described and generalized to be communicated to novices and less-endowed practitioners (p. 5-6).

In addition to the problem of generalizing practice theory, a second difficulty can be associated with the intuitive approach. Practice activities and judgment processes which are guided by practitioner intuition place above inquiry any understanding about their validity and reliability. There is an implicit assumption in the intuitionists' argument that practice decisions are "correct" decisions because they are the product of a well-trained professional mind. This
position assumes that practitioners are capable of rendering critical judgments which are consistently valid and reliable without being affected by other extraneous factors. Fanshel (1962) takes exception to this assumption and, while discussing the role of practice theory in child welfare, noted

By and large, child welfare workers are often guilty of a rank empiricism in the way they work with children, and much of their effort is guided by a kind of "seat-of-the-pants" intuitiveness. They resemble the pilot who would prefer flying through a storm, guided by his own bodily sensations rather than by modern instruments" (p. 488).

It can be said, then, that the intuitionists' position that what social workers do and how they make judgments is resistant to understanding holds serious consequences for practice theory. Foremost are the problems of generating a theory base which can be tested, revised and communicated to concerned audiences. Secondly, social workers who rely on the intuitive, artistic perspective, in effect, fly blindly. By minimizing efforts to quantify practice and decision components, these practitioners do not address the issue of determining how valid and reliable much of their practice, including essential professional judgment, actually is.

Within the last decade, a group of practice theorists have moved away from the intuitionists' views and have labored under the assumption that various tasks and stages in social work can be identified and defined. These theorists generally eschew the intuitionists' position that practice is largely an artistic endeavor and have created practice models which elaborate various critical tasks and procedures that seem to be generalizable across both problem areas and settings (Fischer, 1978; Pincus and Minahan, 1973).
The important role of decision making and judgment as a practice skill has guided much of the conceptual work of these theorists. Mech (1970), for example, notes that practitioners in foster care "cannot escape the role of decision maker, yet schools of social work and social agencies fail to provide practitioners with tools necessary for successful decision making" (p. 26). Mech goes on to suggest that practice theory should contain decision guidelines and identifies four decision questions with respect to the placement of children in foster care he contends should guide practice: 1) Is placement necessary?; 2) Where to place; 3) What to do during placement and where; and 4) How to terminate placement (p. 33).

Pincus and Minahan (1973) identify decision making as a task necessary in each of the stages of their planned change approach to practice. They state "throughout the assessment process, as in the entire planned change effort, the worker is called on to exercise his judgment in making decisions" (pp. 114-115). Pincus and Minahan stress the importance of understanding that practitioners' decisions have a number of sources of bias about which a well-trained social worker should be aware.

More recently, Fischer (1978) and Stein (1981) have added considerable sophistication to the definition of judgment tasks in practice. Fisher's (1978) presentation is concerned with a general framework for casework practice. His conceptualization is unique because it uses a flow diagram to pictorially convey the practice process. Explicitly defined in this diagram are choice points which require the judgment skills of the practitioner. For example, in Figure 1 a segment of Fischer's practice process is presented. Each block represents an
Figure 1. A Segment of Fischer's Practice Framework (p. 240-241).
activity which Fischer discusses in some detail in the text. Decisions are implicit in each activity and are explicitly identified as the "decision to proceed" box.

Stein (1981) also conceptualizes practice as a series of choice points and uses a modified form of flow chart to explain and clarify the process. In Figure 2, various decision tasks are identified within the assessment phase of the practice process. Although relatively simple because it represents decisions as binary choices, the model does capture the essential nature of decision making in the flow of practitioner effort.

Stein (1981) attends to another decision component which is now beginning to be discussed in the social work practice literature. Stein is concerned with the use of specific information in the judgment tasks of child welfare practitioners. He discusses the need for standards, criteria and some form of weighting policy, all of which facilitate decision making. Stein (1981) suggests that decision making involves three steps: developing criteria, using criteria for gathering evidence during assessment, and evaluating the information that is gathered by applying criteria to evidence in order to reach a decision (p. 136). This level of specificity in information gathering and processing in a decision task has not been attempted by many practice theorists and suggests continued refinement in social workers' attention to these details.

In perhaps the most sophisticated attempt to discuss decision making in practice, Bloom (1975) reviews a variety of potentially helpful approaches. Bloom's focus is on the decision a helping professional has to make when connecting a theory and its derived strategic action to a client problem. This
Figure 2. Stein's Assessment Flow Chart, Second Phase (p. 185).
"deciding what to do" is a difficult and complicated choice for most practitioners. Bloom derives a number of "decision aid" strategies from the seminal work of Sarbin, Taft and Bailey (1960) and Hammond (1965) in the formulation of a deductive decision model, an inductive decision model and, finally, a model based on the more traditional subjective probability, Bayesean approach.

Bloom's discussion is notable because of its focus on information use and decision processes on a level not attended to by other social work practice theorists—the cognitive level. His attention is on how a practitioner uses information, logic and probabilistic inference in the choice process.

The Research Issue

The level of detail and specificity of the more recent practice models developed by Pincus and Minahan (1973), Fischer (1978) and Stein (1981), to name a few, have been helpful for social workers both conceptually and practically. The identification of essential practice skills and judgment demands by these models has moved social work intervention out of the "art" stage and into a stage where critical examination of practice theory can be made and taught to new social workers. These new frameworks have also defined areas for social work research.

One area of substantial research importance is concerned with the fact that although theorists have been able to define judgment tasks with considerable clarity, little is known about the actual decision behavior of social work practitioners. Although they haven't identified the process as such, practice
theorists have been devising decision models which are prescriptive, that is, they suggest how a practice judgment should be made. For example, Fischer (1978), discusses at length the choice point, "deciding to proceed." This decision has a number of potential outcomes including actual proceeding, referral to another service or, in rare instances, termination. Each course of action is accompanied by guidelines for action, specifications of information needs Fischer suggests are necessary for decision making. For example, in making a referral

...the caseworker should judge the client's capacity and motivation to follow up on a referral; the worker may judge that the client need only to be told whom to call, or that the client should be rehearsed in application procedures, or possibly that the client should be escorted to the other agency (p. 244).

An implicit assumption of prescriptive theories is that the decision maker is able to operate in a rational and unconstrained manner when making a judgment. The notion in question here is that guidelines for information gathering and processing, when followed, will result in a desired decision or course of action. This notion is both intuitively naive and contraindicated by evidence which suggests that choice behavior is dramatically affected by the limitations of humans in information processing capacities (Simon and Newell, 1971), style differences in choice behavior (Driver and Mock, 1975), organizational and contextual factors affecting choice tasks (Reitz, 1981) and stress and social psychological factors (Janis and Mann, 1977).

A more fruitful approach to understanding decision making in social work, given the problems with prescriptive models, is to examine decision behavior "in reality." This approach to decision making is called descriptive research and "is
concerned with understanding and measuring how people make decisions and process information." It is concerned with issues such as how much information is used in a decision, rather than whether the decision is good or bad" (Driver and Mock, 1975, p. 493).

Descriptive research in social work decision making would add substantially to the prescriptive work done in model development. It is of fundamental importance that social workers attempt to examine their judgment behavior on a molar level, that is, as a cognitive process. This information would refine prescriptive models by detailing how, in fact, practitioners actually use various suggested data in the formation of a judgment. Returning to Fischer's (1978) model and the "decision to proceed" step, descriptive research would be a method for more precisely determining, say, how the capacity and motivation to follow up information links to the actual decision on the part of the practitioner to refer the client to another service. It is not enough to say that this information should be used in such a decision—an effort must be made to determine how this information is used.

Focus of the Study

The focus of this study is on descriptive research in social work decision making. Drawing from the work of Mech (1970), Wiltse (1978), Stein, et. al. (1978) and Stein (1981) in child welfare, and Hammond, et. al. (1975) in decision theory, an effort is made to describe the decision behavior of child welfare workers as they consider the potential separation of a child from his/her parents for placement in an alternative care setting. Models of practice in public child
welfare all include the choice point of "decision to separate" in their practice conceptualization. Mech (1970), for example, suggests that in foster care the essential decision task to determine whether placement is necessary follows information gathering during an initial assessment period. He notes

practice theory emphasizes the principle that decisions to place or not to place be derived from information collected on referral. One of the recurring problems is to identify what and how information should be utilized" (p. 35).

It is the intention of this study to identify what individual practitioners in child welfare use as information to formulate the separation problem and to examine how this information is weighed and utilized in the actual decision by the practitioner. The decision analysis technique of judgment modeling is particularly appropriate for examining this type of problem. Theorists working to define judgment modeling have sought to maintain the perspective of what Brunswick (1952) identified as "representative design." The basic principle of this perspective is that the "organism (decision maker) should be studied in realistic settings, in experiments that are representative of its usual ecology" (Slovic and Lichtenstein, 1971, p. 657). Further, the use of multiple regression statistical techniques yield regression and multiple correlation coefficients which have direct interpretability concerning the judgment task being analyzed. Judgment modeling is a powerful decision analysis technique which assists in the understanding of judgment behavior in relevant, real-world tasks.
Contribution to Social Work

This study will contribute to social work knowledge in two basic areas: 1) in the formulation of practice models and 2) in child welfare practice and policy.

Formulation of Practice Models

A criticism of a number of current practice models is that they have moved from an intuitive position to one of prescribing what practitioners ought to do without the benefit of a clear, descriptive understanding of how practitioners practice. A distinctive component of these prescriptive models is concerned with the judgments practitioners have to make at various points along the interventive process. This study is intended to address the gap in the descriptive understanding of practitioner judgment. The successful application of the decision analysis technique of judgment modeling will provide evidence that its application in the examination of a broad range of judgment problems in social work is feasible. An understanding of these judgment problems will facilitate the elaboration of more precisely defined prescriptive practice models.

Child Welfare Practice and Policy

Each year an estimated 450,000 children in the United States receive care in foster families, group homes and various types of residential children's institutions which together make up a system known as foster care (Wiltse, 1976). Two criticisms have been levied against the foster care system in this country. First, Stein, Gambrill and Wiltse (Gambrill and Wiltse, 1974a, 1974b; Stein, 1974; Wiltse, 1976) assert that an understanding of the judgment process used by practitioners which leads to the placement of children in foster care is inadequate. For example, Stein's (1974) analysis of the verbal content of intake
interviews revealed that the factors considered by a caseworker in the decision to accept a child into foster care are not clear. Gambrill and Wiltse (1974b) conclude that deficiencies such as these are the rule rather than the exception.

The second criticism contends that children who enter the foster care system tend to drift; that is, remain in the system without planning (Maas and Engle, 1959; Rein, 1970; Downs and Taylor, 1980). Rein (1970) notes

...the fate of the child seems to be determined by drift rather than by the decision that long term, permanent care is necessary or desirable. It would appear that foster care is a difficult system to get into, but even more difficult to get out of (pp. 120-121).

In light of these criticisms about the quality of decision making in the foster care field, this study is timely and relevant. The decision of whether or not to separate a child from his/her parents is literally the gateway to the foster care system. The potential costs of this decision are many—from the actual dollar amounts needed to support the system to the emotional costs experienced by the child and the family. The examination of information use by practitioners as they are confronted with a potential separation situation addresses an area of critical importance in the development of responsive child welfare policy and practice procedures.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, literature pertinent to this study is reviewed in two areas: 1) judgment and decision making in social work, and 2) the theory and application of judgment modeling. In the final section, the research questions addressed by the study are identified.

Studies of Judgment and Decision Making in Social Work

Prior to 1960, research attention to decision processes and behavior in social work was not well defined. In the behavioral sciences, in general, however, considerable activity in decision theory research was occurring. In psychology, for example, Meehl (1954) was examining how the use of actuarial or predictive methods improved clinical judgment over the more traditional method of clinician influence. Simon's (1957) work in human problem solving, human information processing and the use of artificial intelligence was opening new vistas in the understanding of the dimension and structure of choice processes. The field of decision theory was broadening at this time to include a variety of disciplines and professions.

Original interest in decision making in social work was stimulated in a conference sponsored by the National Association of Social Workers on the use of practitioner judgments as data in social work research (Shyne, 1959). The intention of this conference was to bring together a number of social and
behavioral scientists who were interested in clinical judgment, to discuss various issues related to the use of judgments in the design and analysis of social work research. As noted in a number of conference references, the pioneering work done by Simon (1957) was a stimulus for this initial interest in the topic.

One of the conference papers (Hunt, 1959) was particularly provocative and highlighted issues that influenced much of the subsequent research done in decision making in social work. Hunt identified categories or types of fallability in clinical judgment which he claimed were the result of the tendency of decision makers to be human. These categories were:

1. The bias in the sampling of client behavior coming from the clinicians' situation. This bias results from the roles that the help-seeker and help-giver take and from the purposes of the help-seeker.

2. The bias from the clinician's conceptions, beliefs and standards.

3. The bias from the clinician's influence over the client. This bias forms from the tendency of the clinician to be responsive to a class of client behavior through a set of theoretical beliefs and to seek information based on those beliefs.

4. The evaluative interaction. This distortion is derived from the first three sources of fallability. It is a failure of the judgments from various clinicians to show high inter-correlation, and it appears to concern particularly evaluative items.

5. The limits of the human being as a processor of information. These limits are reached fairly soon. This limit is shown in the span of apprehension or the number of different items of information that an individual can take in at one glimpse or listen to and repeat without error. The number is from five to seven and very occasionally eight (Hunt, 1959, pp. 39-43).
Hunt's identification and elaboration of these sources of potential biases and confounding effects in clinical judgment led a number of researchers to examine the impact of these issues on the practice of social workers. In general, three, somewhat overlapping, frameworks emerged which set the stage for much of the research done on decision making and judgment in social work for the next twenty years. These frameworks dealt with: 1) client and worker characteristics which influence practitioner judgment, 2) psychophysical and information theory approaches to research in decision making, and 3) research in decision making in the child welfare area.

**Client and Worker Characteristics Which Influence Judgment**

Fischer and Miller (1973) suggest that during the 1960's, a "general ideological climate" within the country attuned human-service professionals to the notion that certain client variables could be and, it was later asserted, often were responsible for biasing the judgment of a clinician. Two particular client characteristics, social class and race, had received some prior research attention, but the exact nature of how these and other characteristics operated to bias judgment was ambiguous. The need to understand the process and form of these potential biasing factors was keen, and, after being highlighted by Hunt (1959), these issues were examined by various researchers.

Initial work in this area in social work was reported by Briar (1961). In this study, Briar sought to determine how client social class affected the judgments of social workers. Building on substantial evidence that social class was shown to affect the decisions of practitioners in mental health and welfare systems, Briar
focused on the examination of this hypothesized relationship using social workers as the group under study. First-year social work students were asked to rate a series of profiles which represented hypothetical clients. These profiles were controlled on all dimensions except social class. Briar's data indicated that respondents did, in fact, differentially rate clients on a number of assessment and outcome dimensions. The evidence indicated that client social class tended to operate as a negative biasing influence on social workers' judgments.

Vail (1970) was concerned with this same general issue except in her study she increased the number of characteristics hypothesized to affect judgment to include the socio-economic class of the client, the race of the client and, importantly, the level of experience of the practitioner. The inclusion of this worker characteristic highlighted the notion that not all bias in judgment is related only to client characteristics. Vail hypothesized that the socio-economic class and race of the client and the level of experience of the practitioner would be sources of biasing influence on "the assessments of potential for treatment, and the proposed treatment strategy of social casework students and experienced caseworkers" (p. 236). She found that only socio-economic class was a biasing influence in the judgments of her respondents. Specifically, social workers "viewed lower-class clients as having less potential for casework treatment than the middle-class client. They tended to see the lower-class client as having less of the desired or positive characteristics for utilization of casework" (pp. 243-244). The race of the client and the level of experience of the practitioner, however, were not found to be influencing factors in the judgment process.
Fischer and Miller (1973) continued an examination of this theme. They studied the impact of the client characteristic of social class, race and degree of pathology on the judgments of 360 professional social workers in California. The study employed a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design in which case profiles were varied according to race (black-white), class (lower-upper) and pathology (mild-severe). Various profiles were rated on dependent measures which were designed to be "reasonably representative of the kinds of decisions made—implicitly or explicitly—in actual practice" (p. 102). Fischer and Miller determined that all three independent variables affected the clinical judgment of their respondents. Social class, for example, had a considerably stronger impact on decisions where lower-class clients had more negative ratings than upper class on all the dependent measures. Black clients, however, were judged more positively on various outcome dimensions than white clients. Finally, those clients diagnosed as having severe pathology were rated more negatively than those diagnosed as mildly pathological on all dependent measures.

Reinsel (1977) conducted a study which utilized the research method and material employed by Fischer (1970) and Fischer and Miller (1973). Reinsel's study focused on the socio-economic status of the client and the theoretical orientation and change orientation of the practitioner as sources of possible biasing influence in judgment. Reinsel's effort was a movement toward the elaboration of the types of characteristics practitioners bring to the interaction with a client and how these characteristics help to frame diagnostic impressions and clinical judgments. Reinsel determined that client socio-economic status was a source of considerable bias in judgment. His findings supported previous
evidence that lower-class clients are viewed more negatively in most crucial areas. The theoretical and change orientations of practitioners, however, were only minimally related to Reinsel's dependent measures and were thus discounted as sources of biasing influence.

In a multi-disciplinary study, Rabb (1981) examined the effects of client race and social class on the decision behavior of various professionals relative to reporting child maltreatment. Rabb was concerned that these professional groups would tend to differentially report suspected child maltreatment on the basis of those client characteristics rather than on more "objective" indicators of maltreatment. He found that when severe maltreatment was portrayed, class and race were not in operation as biases. However, as less severe maltreatment was portrayed, both the class and race of clients did operate as a biasing influence. Specifically, professionals were more willing to report less severe maltreatment where the client was black and from a lower social class.

Thus, as indicated by these studies, considerable research attention has been given to how various client and practitioner characteristics influence the choice behavior of social workers. The evidence strongly suggests that social class continues to evoke differential treatment from practitioners. Race, on the other hand, is less clearly supported although both Fischer and Miller (1973) and Rabb (1981) indicate substantial support for its potential biasing effect.

The major shortcoming of this body of research is that only a few important but narrow characteristics of clients and practitioners have been examined. The primary characteristics of clients which have been explored—class, race and degree of disturbance—are fairly easy to portray in a manner which facilitates
measurement and analysis. Also, the worker characteristics examined in these studies have been of the nature where their representation is straightforward. It is the opinion of this writer that this research needs to examine other types of information about clients and workers that may be biasing influences in decision making.

Psychophysical and Information Theory Approaches

Probably the most intensive effort to examine the judgment behavior of social workers was reported by Bieri, et al. (1966). Actually, this reference summarizes a group of studies conducted at the Research Center of the Columbia University School of Social Work from 1961 through 1967. According to Tripodi and Miller (1966), these studies "were conceived within the spirit of inter-disciplinary cooperation and, utilizing the experimental method, attempted to explicate the judgment process through a series of closely allied laboratory studies" (p. 66).

The primary emphasis of the Columbia group was concerned with factors which could affect the cognitive performance of a clinical decision maker. From a general perspective, the research addressed five areas which held promise for understanding this cognitive domain: 1) the application of information theory in understanding judgment, 2) the use of psychophysical theory in studying anchoring effects, 3) an examination of how the cognitive structure of a clinician affects judgment, 4) the impact of situational factors on choice behavior, and 5) how structure and affect impact on judgment. According to Bieri, et al. (1966), the fundamental issue was to understand
the process by which the clinician translates the raw "stimuli" he receives from a client into one of many different kinds of responses, which we can call a clinical judgment, a judgment about what the clinician perceives that in some way explicates or describes or identifies the nature of the stimulus that confronted him (p. 49).

The conceptual framework of the judgment process employed by Bieri, et al. (1966) included three basic components (p. 49).

![Diagram of judgment process]

The entire purview of this research was to understand how the mediating structure in the above system, that is, the clinician, operated to transform information about a case (input) into a clinical judgment (output). Bieri, et al. (1966) proceeded to examine this mediating structure and were guided in this investigation by the proposition that

if we can describe in some systematic fashion the nature of the input, as well as the output, we can examine the transformation which occurs from the former to the latter and we can infer from this transformation something about the nature of the mediating process itself (p. 50).

The work done by the Columbia group was seminal not only in the social work field but in the decision theory field as well. Bieri, et al. (1966) contended
that an intensive examination of the "black box" of a clinical judge would be possible through the application of techniques developed in psychophysics and information theory. Their basic research approach was highly sophisticated and had as its purpose the mathematical representation of how the input stimuli presented to a clinician was transformed into the output of a judgment.

An example of a study using an information analysis approach in the examination of clinical judges in social work was reported by Miller and Tripodi (1967). In this study, the reliability of the clinical judgment of 126 practicing social workers was examined. The essential question was: "If a clinician were to be presented with an array of client behaviors that are combined to represent increasing amounts of stimulus information, to what extent does the clinician make reliable discriminations as the information is increased?" In order to answer this question, respondents were asked to categorize portrayed clients into eight diagnostic categories (output) based on clinical information provided about three client dimensions (input). The information in the input stage was increased by known amounts, and this independent variable was examined against the dependent variable of the amount of agreement respondents had relative to client categorization on the output diagnostic dimensions.

The results from this experiment were modest but tended to indicate that increased information about clients resulted in more reliable discrimination in the diagnostic categorization of clients. Further, the respondents were able to use approximately two to three categories reliably. It is interesting to note that the findings of this study stand in contradiction to judgment research which
shows that increased amounts of information are not used by clinicians to improve either the reliability or validity of their judgments (Miller and Tripodi, 1967, p. 68).

Orcutt (1964) employed concepts and methods used in psychophysical judgment to examine the phenomena of anchoring as it manifested itself in the judgments of clinicians. An anchor is defined as "a standard or a force that influences perception of other stimuli" (Orcutt, 1964, p. 408). Basically, Orcutt hypothesized that judgments by clinicians about moderately disturbed behavior would be influenced by whether it was judged in the context of the high anchor of extremely disturbed behavior or the low anchor of mildly disturbed behavior. She was interested in the direction of influence of these anchoring stimuli and, further, in the dissipation of these effects on judgment over time.

Using written vignettes, Orcutt presented 176 first-year social work students with various configurations of diagnostic statements about the pathology and context of hypothetical clients. Her results clearly indicated that anchors operated on the judgments of clinicians. She found that judgments about moderately pathological behavior tended to be drawn toward either the low or the high anchor. She also found that the anchor used in the choice situation seemed to be a function of idiosyncratic characteristics of the respondent as he/she considered the context and information of the specific profiles. Finally, she determined that the influence of anchors on decision behavior tended to persist over the rating of a number of profiles, suggesting that it is in operation in most judgment situations.
Orcutt's study provided evidence that objectively derived judgments on the part of clinicians are difficult to achieve. She states

the present study suggests that subjects' judgments of pathology of "cases" represent comparisons in their experiences. That is, the behavioral stimuli were judged with reference to other related behaviors, events, interests, both past and present, that converge in experience to form a pathological dimension" (p. 415).

Her findings clearly hold negative implications for proponents of nosological systems employed for the purposes of assigning clients or patients to diagnostic categories.

In addition to this fundamental work using information theory and psychophysics, the complexities of the operation of the mediating structure, as well as other factors, were thought to be important areas of inquiry for the Columbia group. For example, R igney, Bieri and Tripodi (1964) examined how the cognitive complexity of a judge affects that judge's capacity to perceive a number of different dimensions of social behavior. This area was thought to be important from the standpoint that social workers and other human services practitioners often must deal with large and complex diagnostic and assessment data. Bieri, et al. (1966) also discussed the impact of situational factors in judgment (Ch. 8) and structure and affect in judgment (Ch. 9). The importance of these issues are noted, but no empirical support for their assertions are included in their discussion. However, a number of issues of considerable heuristic value are presented and documented.

The material and research reported by Bieri, and his colleagues represents an important step in understanding both cognitive and structural processes in the
judgments of social workers. Although the psychophysics framework they employed did not become a continued theme in decision theory research, this group made an important contribution through their focus on the mediating structure of the clinician in the decision process. Their research began to challenge the notion held by many practitioners and researchers in social work that cognitive processes were resistant to empirical examination and understanding.

**Judgment and Decision Making in Child Welfare**

Stein, et al. (1978) note that "since the late 1950's, the suggestion has been made that research in child welfare should focus on the decision making process" (p. 8). Both Wolins (1959) and Fanshel (1962) were responsible for exhorting colleagues to devise means and methods to understand decision tasks confronting child welfare workers in a variety of areas. Fanshel (1962) suggests there are a number of well-defined decision tasks facing child welfare workers (e.g., the question of separating children from their parents, the selection of foster parents, the selection of adoptive parents) that can be studied from a number of standpoints (e.g., reliability of decisions, outcome of decisions). These choice points in child welfare practice are often less available in other fields of social work, such as family counseling, child guidance, etc.

The literature which discusses desired research in child welfare indicates that Fanshel's articulation of potential topics was heeded. Through the 1960's a number of studies which examined various facets of child welfare decision tasks were published.
In a well-conceived study on the selection of foster parents, Wolins (1963) generated two important findings. First, he was able to identify with considerable accuracy the items around which social workers built their selection of foster parents decisions. He determined that knowledge of the family's goals, the performance of its roles, the extent of its permeability and its acceptance of strangers were all predictors of the type of foster family a family could be. There was substantial agreement between workers about what constituted a "good" family based on these measures (p. 143).

The second conclusion of Wolins (1963) dealt with the ability of his respondents to cognitively manage case material. Relative to the agreement found between workers, he determined this level of agreement varied according to the "amount and kind of material" each respondent examined. Inter-rater reliability increased as a function of decreasing amounts of case material. Wolins was able to approach near perfect reliability when "selective" case material was presented to respondents. Difficulty with volume was indicated by both well-trained and untrained workers. This finding stands in contradiction to evidence indicated by Miller and Bieri (1966) that reliability of judgment in their task increased as a function of increasing amounts of information.

Some of these early studies of considerable relevance to this study were concerned with the placement of children in alternative care settings. Briar (1963), for example, examined the issue of whether the choice to place a child in a foster family or in an institution was a function of diagnostic criteria about the child. Specifically, Briar hypothesized that the level of disturbance—mild or serious—of a child would affect the rating of that child on nine dependent
measures, one of which was choice of preferred placement. Briar concluded that emotional disturbance and placement recommendations were related, but the nature of the relationship was ambiguous because of an interaction effect.

Boehm (1962; 1967) engaged in a two-stage research process in her examination of the type of information caseworkers use in making the decision to separate a child from his family. In the first stage, a number of caseworkers were asked to "analyze placement cases they were currently carrying and to formulate in their own words the "reasons" which had led to the placement decision" (Boehm, 1962, p. 11). Although a "model" family image tended to emerge as the primary standard against which cases were compared, it was determined that this "model" family did not relate to the separation decision. This finding was based on the fact that both placement and non-placement families tended to deviate from the ideal model.

In the second stage, Boehm studied 200 neglect cases, 100 in which children were placed and 100 in which children were being provided services in their own home. These cases were examined for commonalities and, through a reducing process, 140 items were finally identified as common characteristics. Caseworkers then rated these 140 items as being like or unlike the "model" family, and these ratings were factor analyzed to determine if an underlying structure existed. Twelve factors were identified and included, for example, the behavior of the father, maternal care, family behavior and household management. Boehm's conclusion was that of the twelve identified factors, maternal care weighed most heavily in the separation decision.
Phillips, Shyne, Sherman and Harvey (1971) conducted a study which attempted to identify factors associated with placement decisions in child welfare. Three public child placement agencies provided information about intake cases and decisions relative to the placement of children in those cases. This information was analyzed to determine if any specific client data were related to the placement of children in alternative care settings. No single item or group of items correlated strongly with placement decisions. Stein, et al. (1978) note the suggestion by Phillips, et al. (1971) that in two-parent families, father traits appeared to be most heavily weighed in the placement judgment contradicts the evidence of Boehm (1967), which concluded that maternal care was the most important in the separation decision.

In another type of information analysis, Stein (1974) did a content analysis of interviews conducted by direct service workers in foster care. He was interested in the relationship between the information gathered by these workers and placement decisions. On the basis of his analysis, Stein concluded that between "59 and 78 percent of the information gathered during intake interviews was not related to the objective of reaching a placement decision" (Stein, et al., 1978, p. 11). This finding was further supported in an examination by Gambrill and Wiltse (1978) of entry into foster care.

In a paper aimed primarily at conceptual issues, Mech (1970) again restated the need for decision analysis in child welfare; specifically, in foster care practice. In this paper, Mech pointed out that child placement was plagued with inconsistencies relative to what was known about the information used in these decisions and the process employed to reach them. Indeed, the above literature
review suggests that the findings of various inquiries in this area were either inconclusive or contradictory. The importance of Mech's contribution is that he identified and discussed a number of decision analysis approaches employed in decision research in other behavioral sciences which could have utility in the social work field (e.g., static models, subjective probability models, stochastic models and dynamic models). Further, he elaborated four decision points to which the decision analysis techniques could be applied (see Ch. 1, p. 12). Besides the Bieri, et al. (1966) Columbia group and Bloom (1975), Mech is the only other social work theorist to suggest the rigorous application of decision analysis models in social work.

The interest in decision making in child welfare in the 1970's has been promulgated primarily by Stein (1981), Stein, Gambrill and Wiltse (1978) and Wiltse (1978). Focusing on foster care, these theorists contend that "the provision of foster care to children in this country is a decision-making system" (Wiltse, 1978, p. 53). However, Stein (1981) has also reaffirmed the historical perspective that decision behavior and process remain an ill-defined area of understanding.

In summary, systematic attention to research in social work decision making has not been sustained. The bulk of the work done in this area occurred during a relatively short period of time in the early 1960's. Although various important studies have occurred since that period, and given the potential range and importance of the topic, the accumulated empirical findings about social worker judgment seem minimal. Further, it does not appear that much of the work done in decision research in social work has had an impact on practice or policy making.
Two reasons for this state of affairs can be posited. First, decision research is methodologically a difficult task, especially as it moves toward the cognitive arena. For example, the work done by Bieri, et al. (1966) at Columbia was highly sophisticated and difficult to do. Further, the findings of the group were sufficiently removed from daily practice that it was unlikely they would have an impact. The relative obscurity of the work of the Columbia group is evidenced by the fact that only one subsequent study in social work (Golan, 1969) attempted to use some of their methodology to examine how selected applicant factors influenced admission decisions. In the decision theory field, however, the work of this group has been recognized (Slovic & Lichtenstein, 1971).

A second problem can be traced to the results of the decision analysis research which has been done. Modest conclusions and inconsistent results have not caught the attention of practitioners or researchers. For example, after an exhaustive review of the types of information associated with placement decisions, Phillips et al. (1971) framed their inconclusive results with the following statement:

The reader may well have concluded by now that we have worried these data to death without very useful results for the agency or caseworker who is faced with a decision of whether to place a child. We have documented the complexity of placement decisions and made some progress in delineating the combination of elements that point to placement, although we have no illusion that a simple rating scale can be derived that will result in automatic decisions without the exercise of judgment in weighing and balancing factors in the situation (p. 89).
To summarize research which is designed to be germane with a conclusion that is both obvious and not helpful guarantees that the link between research and practice will not be made.

There is a persistent interest in decision making in social work, however. Mech's (1970) suggestion of the need for more intensive work in the area of decision making in foster care was a restatement of the similar suggestion made earlier by Fanshel (1962). Decision tasks are becoming an integral part of practice conceptualizations, and their importance is stressed to new practitioners (Stein, 1981).

This research is thus both timely and relevant. The need to understand decision behavior on all levels is critical. This study follows Mech's (1970) suggestion to consider models from decision theory which provide a means for a detailed examination of the decision behavior of social workers.

Judgment Modeling and the Linear Model

Efforts to understand the process and form of decision making have proliferated in the behavioral sciences. Slovic, Fishoff and Lichtenstein (1977), for example, reviewed 319 studies concerning behavioral decision theory published between 1971 and 1975 and suggested these studies represented only a small proportion of the research done regarding decision, choice and judgment topics. The field is expansive and increasing at an exponential rate.

According to Slovic, et al. (1977), research in decision making has proceeded essentially along the lines of its two interrelated components: the normative and the descriptive. They state:
the normative theory is concerned with prescribing courses of action that conform most closely to the decision maker's beliefs and values. Describing those beliefs and values and the manner in which individuals incorporate them into their decisions is the aim of descriptive decision theorists (p. 1).

Normative research historically has utilized a framework in which the decision maker bases his choice on his perception of the utilities or payoffs of alternatives and, also, on his assignment of personal probabilities to the various outcomes implied in the choice situation. Using Bayes theorem, a mathematical equation which permits the evaluation of changing probabilities given the input of new information into the judgment problem, a decision researcher can generate a distribution of probabilities over a set of states of the world confronting the decision maker. This distribution is used to formulate decision rules which, when used in conjunction with information about payoffs, can serve to prescribe the choice alternative which maximizes the expected utility of the decision maker (Slovic and Lichtenstein, 1971).

The decision analysis approach employed in this study, judgment modeling (or policy capturing), on the other hand, is a descriptive approach. It is one of the methods developed within the linear regression framework and has been used to understand how a person organizes and uses information in the process of making a judgment. Within this perspective, little attention is given to the utilities and probabilities employed by normative, Bayesian approaches. Rather, attention is on the actual dimensions of information a decision maker makes use of in a choice situation—how it is weighed, configured and used to make a judgment.
Goldberg (1968) suggests that the serious introduction of linear models in decision research was a result of a shift in research interest in clinical judgment. The early focus of research was centered on the accuracy of judgments and not the judgment process. Discouraging findings in the validity of judgments such as 1) the amount of training and experience of a judge did not relate to his accuracy and 2) the amount of information available to the judge did not relate to the accuracy of his resulting inferences (Goldberg, 1968, p. 484) gave rise to the questions of reliability, that is, how consistent judgmental accuracy was across time, judges or information sources. Subsequent studies on reliability suggested that judges were also not consistent in their decisions either as individual judges or when comparing judgments by separate clinicians using the same data source (Goldberg, 1968, p. 485). As a consequence of these unhappy findings, the research focus turned from validity studies to the investigation of the process of clinical inference, the aim of which was to "represent" (or "simulate" or "model") the hidden cognitive processes of the clinician as he makes his judgmental decision (Hoffman, 1960; Goldberg, 1968).

Attention to the linear approach in this research appears to have been inspired, in part, by Meehl (1954). In his work on clinical versus statistical prediction, Meehl was primarily concerned with a comparison of the relative adequacy of the statistical method of clinical prediction, presumably based upon some mathematical regularity such as actuarial tables or multiple regression equations and of clinical methods, based upon the judgments of clinicians.
Meehl crystallized interest in a more statistical approach to the clinical judgment, a direction initiated by Sarbin some years earlier. Next, he brought out vividly to the reader the relative paucity of conceptualization concerning the nature of clinical judgment. This point seems to have been overlooked as to whether a frequency table can predict more accurately than a living, breathing clinician. Except for extended comments about the nature of intuition and of the clinical judgment process, Meehl is relatively silent about the nature of cognitive processes in clinical judgment. However, he has emphasized the possibility that the configural weighting of cues may prove to be an important aspect of the cognitive activity (Bieri, et al., 1966, pp. 2-3).

The controversy explicated by Meehl regarding the notion that a mathematical model of a decision process could, in fact, perform in a more consistent and accurate way than a clinician drew battle lines and created factions which sought to explore and answer fundamental judgment questions. Interest in linear models as a way to mathematically represent a decision process was thus sparked.

The use of multiple regression as a model representing human use of information was first proposed by Brunswick (1940). Brunswick conceptualized a "lens" interpretation of human information processing based on the premise that the environment confronting a decision maker is characterized as diverse and uncertain:

the organism in its normal intercourse with its environment must cope with numerous interdependent, multiformal relations among variables which are partly relevant and partly irrelevant to its purpose, which carry only a limited amount of dependability, and which are organized in a variety of ways (Hammond, et al., 1975, p. 272).

The task of the organism is to organize this information in such a way that inferences can be made about the current state of the environment and that
judgments can be made which assure optimal interaction with that environment. This process invariably requires a cognitive activity of appraisal and selection, the organization of which can only be understood by the analysis of both the cues which provide the environmental information and the judgments based upon the cues.

Brunswick's "lens" model is based on the principal of parallel concepts and symmetry. As indicated in Figure 3, each concept on one side is paralleled by a concept on the opposite side ($r_e-r_s$). The left side of the model represents the environment from which the various cues ($x_1, x_2, ..., x_i$) make themselves available to the decision maker. The right side of the model represents the perceptual process of the decision maker as he examines cues and relates them to the particular judgment to be made.

As proposed by this model, symmetry (or fit) between the two dimensions is upset by the problem of variation. The cues on the task (environmental) side vary in ecological validity, that is, in their relationship with the criterion or judgment. On the judgment side, there is variation in cue utilization by the decision maker. It is how these two dimensions merge to form a judgment which concerns decision researchers; that is, to what extent ecological validities are matched by cue utilization and to what extent ecological function forms are matched by subjective function forms (Hammond, et al., 1975). The use of linear regression statistics provides a technology to examine the cognitive processes of a judge as he utilizes various cue variables to reach a decision.
Figure 3. Brunswick's Lens Model
Applications of the Linear Model Approach to Decision Analysis

The use of linear models to examine and understand the behavior of decision makers is accepted and increasing. As indicated by Slovic, Fishoff and Lichtenstein (1977) linear models have been used with success to analyze complex real-world judgments involving business managers, graduate admissions committees, auditors, accountants, loan officers, military officers, literary critics and trout hatchery employees (p. 12). The adaptability of this approach in understanding decision tasks in diverse settings has facilitated its considerable use.

A second reason for the popularity of linear model techniques relates to the accuracy and interpretability of the information they produce in the analysis of the cognitive behavior of a decision maker. Slovic, et al. (1977) suggest that linear equations have accounted for most of the predicted variance in these complex judgments. The coefficients of these equations have provided useful descriptions of the judge's cue-rating policies and have pinpointed the sources of inter-judge disagreement and non-optimal cue use (p. 12).

Given the rather extensive use of linear model techniques across diverse settings, the review of literature will present selected studies which have relevance for those problems, issues and decisions which confront social workers.

An early study reported by Hoffman, Slovic and Rorer (1968) examined the diagnostic decision behavior of nine radiologists. The task in this study was to have these radiologists review a series of medical profiles, each of which presented seven signs of an ulcerative condition. Based on this set of signs
(cues), the respondents were to rate whether a particular profile condition was benign or malignant on a seven-point scale.

Given the serious nature of the implications of these diagnoses, the results of the study were startling. First, there was low agreement between these radiologists about how the profiles should be diagnosed. The median inter-rater correlation was a modest .38. Second, respondents revealed considerable variation in the consistency of their judgment of the entire task. Consistency here refers to the reliability of intra-judge ratings based on a comparison of how each judge rated selected cases twice. Computed reliabilities ranged from .60 to .92, indicating that some of the judges were able to maintain better cognitive control over the task than others. Finally, the seven clinical signs used in the diagnosis were considered and weighed differentially across radiologists. This finding suggests that different models were employed by these physicians in this diagnostic task.

Building on the work of Meehl (1959), Goldberg (1970) studied the clinical judgment of 29 psychologists. The "judgmental problem used for this study was that of differentiating psychotic from neurotic patients on the basis of their MMPI profiles" (Goldberg, 1970, p. 425). In contrast to Hoffman, Slovic and Rorer (1968), Goldberg's focus was on an assessment of how well mathematical models based on human decision performance could actually improve on this performance. In order to examine this issue, Goldberg used the ratings of his respondents on 861 psychotic patients to obtain a mathematical model in the form of a linear regression equation for each respondent. Then, through a series of cross-validation techniques, he was able to compare the actual diagnostic
performance of the psychologists to the performance of their devised models. Also, because the cases used in the study were real and had already been diagnosed, a criterion for judgmental accuracy existed.

Goldberg's (1970) findings were supportive of those who contend that mathematical models of decision makers generally are more consistent performers than the decision makers themselves. He states

Within the generality restrictions obviously imposed by any one study, it has been demonstrated that linear regression models of clinical judges can be more accurate diagnostic predictors than are the humans who are modeled. Moreover, even when the model of the judge was constructed on a relatively small subset of cases, and then the clinician and his model competed on the remaining (larger) set of additional cases, this same effect occurred (p. 430).

Goldberg's findings hold particular relevance for the continuing debate about the use of actuarial models by various diagnosticians and clinical judges. His findings verified previous research which indicated that models outperform man. Goldberg (1970), in fact, suggests that in certain instances "in situations when clinicians' time is at a premium, it might be well to model either the judge" (p. 431) or to use a composite model based on a number of judges to complete the diagnostic task. This recommendation has certain cost benefits and, given the performance records of models and the problems of performance by human decision makers (e.g., Hoffman, Slovic and Rorer, 1968), could actually improve clinical judgment and decision making.

In the single study found in social work which employed the regression approach to judgment analysis, Whittington, Digman and Digman (1974) examined
how information influenced the decision to help made by a single practitioner working in a state hospital. Following a format prescribed by Goldberg (1970), these researchers determined how various diagnostic impressions and client characteristics related to the practitioner decision to provide help to a client.

The results of this study indicated that seven variables accounted for 75% of the practitioner's decision behavior. These seven items were: 1) the client is seeking the services of the social worker; 2) the social worker believes the problem is workable; 3) the client makes a good initial impression on the social worker; 4) the client is young rather than old; 5) the client is physically appropriately active; 6) the social worker listens to the client; 7) the social worker believes that she can have a meaningful relationship with the client" (Whittington, et al., 1974, p. 88). The authors point out these data are consistent with previous research which suggests that preferred clients are often young, verbal, appropriate, well-behaved and dressed, friendly, and, overall, indicate an easy case.

Whittington, et al. (1974) make suggestions about how social workers can improve decision making. They suggest the use of a "helping equation" in which the variables represent salient client characteristics and diagnostic information. The dependent variable in the equation is expressed as the need for help by that particular client. The weights used in the formula are statements of how important a particular characteristic is on the need for help. Whittington, et al. (1974) suggest that by establishing the importance of cues and by letting these cues predict a decision through a mathematical equation, the likelihood of
providing help to those who need it the most will be enhanced. They argue, in effect, for the use of an actuarial model in the decision process and point to evidence which supports the need for such an approach.

**Research Questions**

The principle data obtained in judgment modeling is in the form of a linear regression equation. This linear model can be expressed in raw score form as

\[ Y_{ij} = b_{ik}X_{jk} + C_i + e_{ij} \]

where \( Y_{ij} \) is the judgment of the individual \( i \) for choice \( j \), \( k \) are the cues upon which the judgement is based, \( b_{ik} \) is the raw score regression weight for individual \( i \) on cue \( k \), \( X_{jk} \) is the value of cue \( k \) on profile \( j \), \( C_i \) is the constant term for individual \( i \), and \( e_{ij} \) is the residual error from the model of individual \( i \) for profile \( j \) (Hammond, et al., 1975, p. 278). When these data are generated over a decision task, the resultant model is said to be that respondent's judgment policy relative to that task.

This model permits an extensive analysis of the cognitive system of a decision maker. Referring to Figure 3 (p. 44), an achievement index \( r_{a} \) can be expressed which essentially indicates how consistent the decision maker is in using cues to make judgments. The relative importance of each cue is represented on the right side of Figure 3 by the \( r_s \), 1..\( r_s \), n coefficients. However, because these cues are more often than not correlated in the real world, these coefficients are expressed as the regression weights \( b_{ik} \)'s in the above equation. The weights can be interpreted directly as indicators of the importance of that cue to the decision task.
In addition to those basic issues, these data can be utilized to examine other areas of interest. For example, an analysis of the subjective impressions of the decision maker relative to his/her behavior in the decision task is possible. In order to conduct this analysis, the decision maker must rate the importance of each cue subjectively using a weighting scale. These weights can then be used to generate predicted decision scores which can be compared and examined against the actual decisions the person made.

Using an equation formulated by Tucker (1964) derived from Brunswick's Lens model, it is also possible to compare the policies of two judges who have completed the same decision tasks. When two or more judges used the same cues to generate a series of judgments, it is often of interest to examine the extent to which they agree or disagree about how these cues should be utilized.

Based on these issues of interest, the following are the primary research questions addressed by this study:

1. What information do child welfare workers use in their decision to separate children?
2. How consistent are these workers in the application of this information in the separation decision task?
3. Is there divergence in the form of the judgment models of child welfare workers?
4. Do child welfare workers use information the way they think they do in the separation decision task?
5. Is there organizational support for practitioners who are confronted with the separation decision task?
CHAPTER III
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

Overview

This study was designed to be both exploratory and descriptive (Babbie, 1979, pp.85-86). The descriptive component focused on an intensive effort to understand how social work practitioners in a child welfare setting select, organize and use information in an important decision task. Specifically, nine child welfare workers were interviewed to determine what information they used in making a decision to separate a child from his/her parents. This information was then employed to construct a set of case profiles which represented potential separation situations. The responses of these nine practitioners to these case profiles was intended to determine how they used information in making separation decisions. Finally, the practitioners were asked to rate how they thought they used various types of information when considering the removal of a child.

The exploratory aspect of the study was concerned with the larger issue of determining how the decision analysis technique of judgment modeling can be utilized in the effort to refine an understanding of professional judgment in social work. The successful application of this technology in this study would support the argument that it is possible to describe the choice behavior of practitioners and to use this description in the development of policy and practice models.
Respondents

The respondents in the study were child welfare practitioners employed by a public children's services agency. This agency is mandated by law to provide protective services to the children of Franklin County, the purposes of which are to

discharge community responsibility for safeguarding the rights and protecting the welfare of children whose parents are unable to do so; and to see that abused or neglected children are protected against further experiences and conditions detrimental to healthy growth and development and that children receive the kind of care that will provide the essentials for their well-being and development at home or in appropriate substitute care (Agency Protective Service Profile Proc., 1981, p. 1).

The selection of respondents proceeded along guidelines which were important relative to questions posed by the research topic. First, respondents were selected from a single child welfare agency as a means to control for potential organizational effects which might account for differences in decision-making process and style. If actual differences between the decision making models of the respondents were detected, it was important to minimize interorganizational factors as possible explanations.

A second guideline for selection was concerned with the need to examine decision making on two organizational levels. Although direct service workers are usually responsible for initiating the separation process in a particular case, the supervisor of that worker clearly has a role in assessing case information and recommending support for the direct care worker's decision. This study was interested in determining if there were differences between the decision models
of a direct care worker and his/her supervisor. In order to permit examination of these potential differences, three protective service unit supervisors and two direct care workers from each of these units were asked to participate.

As a final guideline, respondents were required to have responsibility for separation decisions as a part of their job duties. Fanshel (1962) criticized the use of artificial case material as a means to understand the behavior of practitioners because of problems of psychological distance and the low risk associated with indicating action based on presented information. However, it has been argued (Rossi, 1979; Hammond, et al., 1975) that case material in the form of vignettes or profiles is an efficient and effective way to approach decision analysis. In this study, an effort was made to assure that the decision task, to separate or not separate a child, was an experience with which each respondent had familiarity.

**Research Design.**

To meet the primary objectives of this research, it was necessary to follow a rigorous set of procedures suggested by decision theorists as necessary if the description of an individual's decision behavior is to be as complete and accurate as possible (Christal, 1968; Hammond, et al., 1975; Wiggins and Cohen, 1971). In a direct way, this set of procedures formed the basis of the research design used in this study. Since the study results were not intended to generalize to a larger population of child welfare workers, certain components of the inferential process such as random selection of subjects and statistical hypothesis testing were not employed.
Research design in this study, then, is used in the general sense suggested by Babbie (1979); "research design...addresses the planning of scientific inquiry—designing a strategy for finding out something" (p. 83). It was not felt that the results of the study would be compromised by a failure to use the more traditional techniques to examine the research issue. On the contrary, the goal of this research to describe individual decision behavior required that an approach be used which would generate the type of data needed to address the research issue. Suchman (1977) addresses this point when he states:

> It seems to us futile to agree whether or not a design is "scientific." The design is a plan of a study and as such, is present in all studies uncontrolled as well as controlled, and subjective as well as objective. It is not a case of scientific or not scientific but rather one of good or less good design (p. 40).

The procedures employed in this study are considered to be "good" relative to the task of decision analysis.

The research format employed was based on that formulated and reported by Hammond, et al., (1975). This approach identifies three component sets of activities through which an analysis of an individual's cognitive decision system can be accomplished: 1) the identification of the judgment problem, 2) the analysis of the judgment problem, and 3) the exercising of the judgment (Hammond, et al., 1975, p. 277). The following discussion details methodological procedures employed to operationalize the Hammond, et al. (1975) format.
Formulation of the Judgment Task

In order to understand the decision behavior of an individual as he/she confronts a particular choice task, it is necessary to identify how, in fact, that decision maker conceptualizes the problem. In this study, the initial search was for the information framework respondents suggested they used to make the decision about recommending separation. The information sought at this point had an integral role in the research in two ways. First, the identification of the various information dimensions used by the respondents was an important research finding in and of itself. Considerable effort has been expended trying to identify what information child welfare workers use in their decision making (e.g., Boehm, 1962, 1967; Phillips, et al., 1971; Stein, 1974). Second, the items identified as important in the separation decision process were to become the primary independent variables in the study. (Another term used by decision theorists for these independent variables is "cue variables.") In order to empirically understand how these cue variables actually were employed by respondents, they were used in the construction of the case profiles employed in the next research stage.

To obtain this data, a series of interviews was held with study respondents. Hammond, et al. (1975) suggest that data collected during this step of the decision analysis "can involve extensive data gathering and multivariate analysis or a simple guided interview designed to elicit cue variables from the individual might suffice" (p. 277). Due to the familiarity of the task to the respondents and limited resources, a guided interview approach was employed.
The interviews were organized by unit. In two instances, the supervisor and the two designated direct service workers were interviewed together. The third unit supervisor, however, was reluctant to have two workers involved in this session due to pressing time commitments, so she was interviewed by herself. The interviews were semi-structured and were designed to elicit the various types of information used when these practitioners were confronted with a potential separation situation. The respondents were encouraged to discuss and consider just what this information included. Detailed notes of the meeting's process and substance were recorded and subsequently analyzed to generate the cue variable framework used in the second stage of the decision analysis.

Table 1 contains the fourteen cue variables identified by the respondents as essential in any separation decision. The first six of these cue variables are socio-legal categories which typify the condition of the child. It was noted by the respondents that any situation which might require a separation judgment will include, to some degree, the presence of one or more of these conditions.

Three general characteristics of the child were reported to be important factors in the decision task: the age of the child, the ability to function and his/her view of separation. The ability to function variable was meant to be a general appraisal relative to a child's skill in handling both rules and independence in an age-appropriate manner. View of separation referred to the way the child anticipated possible separation and possible manifestations of this anticipation.
Table 1. Information Dimensions and Measurement Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cue Variable</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Physical Abuse</td>
<td>0-Not; 1-At Risk; 2-Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>0-Not; 1-At Risk; 2-Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical Neglect</td>
<td>0-Not; 1-At Risk; 2-Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emotionally Maltreated</td>
<td>0-Not; 1-At Risk; 2-Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dependent</td>
<td>0-Not; 1-At Risk; 2-Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unruly</td>
<td>0-Not; 1-At Risk; 2-Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Age of Child</td>
<td>01 - 17 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prior Agency Contact</td>
<td>0 - 3 Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Resource Availability</td>
<td>1-Not Available; 2-Limited; 3-Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parental Functioning</td>
<td>1-Severely Limited; 2-Moderately Limited; 3-Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Parental Willingness</td>
<td>1-Willing and Open; 2-Somewhat Willing; 3-Openly Hostile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Parent/Child Relationship</td>
<td>1-Satisfactory, Accepting, 2-Supportive, But Conflictual; 3-Strained and Rejecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Child Functioning</td>
<td>1-Severely Limited; 2-Moderately Limited; 3-Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Child View of Separation</td>
<td>1-Acceptance; 2-Willingness, But Concern; 3-Anxiety and Resistance; 4-Open Hostility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three general characteristics of parents were identified by the respondents: prior agency contact, parental functioning ability and parental willingness to change. Prior agency contact was a measure of the chronicity of a particular situation. The respondents suggested that a number of families require attention more than once although not always regarding the same problem. The parental functioning ability variable was an overall assessment of the parents' ability to care for and provide for a child. The willingness to change measure was intended to indicate a degree of cooperation on the part of the parents to change a problem situation.

Resource availability was mentioned by most respondents as an essential factor in the separation decision task. This variable was meant to assess the general availability of resources or lack thereof in a specific situation.

Finally, the relationship between the parent and child was indicated to be important when separating a child. The parent/child relationship cue variable was included to add this dimension to the separation decision.

**Measurement**

The measurement of these items was also addressed during the interview sessions. Measurement here refers to the discussion by Hammond, et al. (1975, p. 227) of the need to discover the formal properties of the set of cue variables in the decision task. The scales used (shown in Table 1) were derived from a two-level process. Initial scales were constructed by the researcher based on information obtained in interviews about how to best portray the scale for each cue variable. After these scales were defined, they were resubmitted to selected
respondents for review and revision. This second activity was necessary because it can be considered as an assessment of the face validity of the cue variables and their corresponding measurement scales. In decision analysis, measures must be "believable" to the respondent so that accurate representations of "real world" situations can be portrayed. This review and revision process resulted in changes of various scales which the respondents suggested made them more meaningful.

A second measurement issue was concerned with representation of the primary dependent variable in the study—the actual decision to be made. Two options were available in the framing of this response scale. The first option was to employ a simple dichotomous choice of either yes or no to the question "Would you recommend separation of this child based on the above information?" The second option was to use a continuous scale with anchor concepts providing its meaning. This latter alternative provided more latitude statistically, but the meaningfulness of the scale to respondents was essential.

The scale used was constructed using Whittington, Digman and Digman's (1974) approach. The scale expresses choice as a likelihood of action on the part of the decision maker based on the information portrayed in a profile. In this study, the scale asks the respondent to indicate how likely he or she would be to recommend the separation of a child using the anchors of "no recommendation" at one end of the scale and "certain recommendation to separate" at the other. The scale values of 0 to 1.0 were intended to be expressions of the probability or likelihood of action further defining the scale in terms familiar to respondents. (see Figure 4).
Instrument Construction

The data collected in the formulation stage were intended for use in the construction of a series of profiles, each of which was to present to the respondent a situation which could require a separation recommendation. The success of these profiles as representative examples of "real world" situations and as useful in statistical analysis hinged on adequate attention to two issues: 1) each profile had to be conceivable to the respondent and 2) scale values needed to be ascribed in such a way that reasonable variance was assured. Tying these notions theoretically to Brunswick, Hammond, et al. (1975) note

The formal properties of the judgment task (for example, distributions and interrelations) should correspond to the properties of the environment that gave rise to the problem (p. 278).

Because of the variability in the way separation situations were perceived both on a unit and individual level, it was necessary to devise a format which presented the properties of the judgment task in a manner which was conceivable across respondents. The validation of the measurement scales used was a first step in the accomplishment of this task. However, the way that information was put together in a profile required further validation.
An examination of studies using judgment modeling suggests that the types of formats used to present information is as variable as the imagination of the researcher. Roose and Doherty (1978) confronted this issue by developing profiles using alternative formats and consulting with respondents to determine a final form (p. 204). It was decided to follow Roose and Doherty's (1978) suggestion to have respondents indicate a preference for the final format form. This process also assured the face validity of profiles as representative of actual situations.

Because social work practitioners tend to use a written process to summarize practice situations and their professional activities, it was decided to construct profile formats using short paragraphs with information dimensions included as a logical and appropriate component. An alternative would have been to simply list the fourteen dimensions and note the corresponding scale value. Follow-up contact with respondents indicated the paragraph approach was far superior and was consistent with the way case information was generally formatted. Figure 5 is an example of the format used in the study. The full set of profiles is found in Appendix A.

The actual construction of the profiles followed suggestions made by Rossi (1979) and Hammond, et al. (1975). No attempt was made to present to respondents all of the possible combinations implied by the fourteen independent variables. Rather, Rossi (1979) suggests that "the strategy is to present each respondent with a fair sample of that universe of all possible combinations (p. 179). In order to "sample" this universe, profiles were constructed by a process of randomly assigning levels of each independent variable to each profile. The
Profile No. ________

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this _______ old child is ___________________________.
The family has had ______ contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are __________________________.
The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is _________________________________. The parents have demonstrated they are __________________________ to such change.
The relationship between the parents and the child is _______________________.
The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is ______________________________. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with _________________________________.

Your Decision:

0.0  0.1  0.2  0.3  0.4  0.5  0.6  0.7  0.8  0.9  1.0

No Separation  Certain Recommendation to Separate

Figure 5. Format of Separation Profiles

only restriction on this random assignment was that some combinations of information were rejected as "not credible" for a respondent, a violation of the validity assumption of the study. It was also expected that the random assignment would serve to keep to a minimum the intercorrelations of the independent variables, thus controlling for problems relating to multicollinearity in the multiple regression procedure.

Another issue was concerned with the number of profiles to be presented to each respondent. From a statistical standpoint, it has been suggested that the stability of regression coefficients is severely compromised by a low number-of-cases-to-respondent variable ratio (Cohen and Cohen, 1975). The minimum noted
by Cohen and Cohen (1975) is a ten-to-one, and other statistical theorists have suggested even greater ratios. The selection of the number of cases used in this study (a ten-to-one ratio would have required each respondent to rate 140 profiles) needed to be tempered by the task demands of rating a large number of profiles. Confronting a series of profiles containing fourteen pieces of information was thought to be both taxing and time consuming for the respondents. A number of 120 was reached and represented a compromise between a possible fatigue effect and an acceptable 8.5 to 1 ratio of profiles to independent variables. Finally, since regression coefficient stability is more of an issue when these coefficients are used as parameter estimates and since the study was intended to be descriptive, the compromise was reasonable.

As one of the purposes of the study was to analyze the subjective opinion of a practitioner about his/her own choice behavior, a means to collect this data was required. Cook and Stewart (1975) discuss seven methods for obtaining the subjective description of a respondent's decision behavior and evaluated their comparative effectiveness. They conclude that the differences between these methods are minimal and that selection of a method can be based on the research need. The method selected for use in this study used a 100-point scale to express the relative importance of a particular cue variable compared to the others. The respondents were simply requested to assign a number from one to 100 to each cue variable indicating that variable's importance. It was not a forced ranking process where values could be used only once. Instead, the same value could be used on more than one variable as an indication of the equal footing of those measures (see Figure 6).
As a final task in this section, would you please do the following: The items listed below have been suggested as important considerations in the process of deciding to separate a child from his/her parents. For each item, assign a number from 1-100, which indicates how important it is in your separation decision-making. One hundred would indicate most important and one would indicate least important.

__________ Condition of Physical Abuse
__________ Condition of Sexual Abuse
__________ Condition of Physical Neglect
__________ Condition of Emotional Maltreatment
__________ Condition of Dependency
__________ Condition of Unruliness
__________ Age of Child
__________ Prior Family Contacts with F.C.C.S.
__________ Availability of Resources to Work with the Situation
__________ Parental Ability to Function
__________ Parental Willingness to Change
__________ Parent/Child Relationship
__________ Child Ability to Function
__________ Child View of Separation

Figure 6. Format for Rating the Importance of Information Dimensions Used in the Separation Decision.
A final section of the questionnaire collected information about various factors which describe organizational support for decision making. The questions asked in this questionnaire are displayed in Figure 7. Questions one through three are measures of the extent to which the respondents use information provided by the agency as guidelines in the separation process and if they perceive that information as helpful. Questions four and five were intended to be indicators of the separation decisions as source of job stress and, if so, how that stress is handled.

1. Have you reviewed the agency document, "Administrative and Program Staff Report on Planned Placement?"

2. If you have reviewed that document, have the guidelines it details assisted you in making the recommendation to separate a child from his/her parents?

3. Do you use other specific guidelines to assist in the decision to separate? If so, please indicate their names and sources.

4. Would you say that the decision to separate a child contributes to the job stress of either a child welfare direct service worker or supervisor?

5. If the answer to Item 4 is yes, how is this stress handled or minimized in your agency?

Figure 7. General Questions About Organizational Support for Decision Making

Reliability and Validity

Reliability. In decision analysis applications, the issue of reliability is addressed primarily from within two frameworks: 1) intrajudge reliability and 2) interjudge reliability. Intrajudge reliability is concerned with the consistency of a single judge in the use of information in a judgment task (Hammond, et al.,
Interjudge reliability, on the other hand, is concerned with the extent to which two or more judges agree in their responses to a judgment task.

Hammond, et al. (1975) suggest that intrajudge reliability can be estimated from the multiple correlation coefficient (R) obtained in a simultaneous regression analysis of an individual judge using all the independent variables under study. This coefficient is a measure of association between the dependent variable and an optimally weighted combination of the independent variables. A high multiple R, which indicates a strong relationship between the dependent and independent variables, also suggests that the judge demonstrated consistency in the use of information in the judgment task. Inconsistent or unreliable information use would tend to reduce the value of the multiple R.

The multiple correlation coefficient is also useful in the estimation of the reliability of the measurement scales used to represent the judgment task. This issue of measurement reliability deals with the extent to which scales which represent the information dimensions consistently present a consistent picture of the task. Measurement reliability can be inferred from the multiple R derived in the simultaneous regression analysis of a judge. A high multiple R not only indicates that the judge is consistent in information use, it also suggests that the scales used to represent the task are reliable. The less reliable the judge, the more likely it is that measurement error contributes to the lack of consistency.

A measure of interjudge reliability is obtained through a comparison of the models of two judges. This comparison can be made by either simply correlating the responses of pairs of judges on an identical rating task or by using an equation developed by Tucker (1964; see page 105 in this study for discussion).
which permits a more precise examination of the relationship between two models. The coefficient obtained in this analysis, either a Pearson's r or Tucker's r_a, can be viewed as a measure of the consistency or reliability demonstrated between two respondents as they rate or perform the same judgment task.

Hoffman, et al. (1968) point out an important connection between intrajudge and interjudge reliability estimates. In their study, it was determined that judges (nine radiologists rating a series of x-rays) were fairly reliable individually in the use of information on the judgment task. The multiple R's for these judges ranged from .60 to .92. Interjudge reliability, on the other hand, tended to be low, ranging from .83 to -.11 with a median of .38. The relevance of this finding is that the high intrajudge reliabilities enabled the researchers to conclude that the low reliability between respondents were due to real differences in approach to the judgment task and were not due solely to individual inconsistency or unreliability. Hoffman et al. assert that establishing a good fit between the independent and dependent variables in the models of individual judges permits more sensitive detection of differences between models.

In this study, estimates of both intrajudge and interjudge reliabilities were obtained. Intrajudge estimates were derived from the simultaneous regression analysis done on each of the nine respondents. Interjudge estimates were calculated using Tucker's (1964) lens model equation. Finally, a comparison of these reliabilities was completed within the framework suggested by Hoffman, et al. (1968). The results of these analyses are reported in Chapters IV and V.

**Validity.** Kerlinger (1979) suggests that "validity is often defined by asking the question: are you measuring what you think you are measuring? If so, your
measure is valid; if not, it is not valid" (p. 138). In decision analysis, measurement validity is concerned with the accuracy of the representation of the judgment task. In this research, for example, it was necessary to assure the validity of the measurement scales used to represent the information dimensions (see Table 1) and of the dependent variable scale (see Figure 4).

Measurement scales in decision analysis are often argued to be face valid. This is especially true in judgment modeling where the information dimension scales and the scale which represents the decision to be made are defined by the respondents themselves. Sellitz, et al. (1976) assert that two major questions must be considered when the face validity of measurement is assumed: 1) whether the instrument is measuring the kind of behavior the investigator assumes it is, and 2) whether it provides an adequate sample of that behavior (p. 178).

In response to the first question in this study a concerted effort was made to assure face validity of the measurement scales by actively including respondents in the definition and elaboration of the judgment task. This task definition was a highly interactive process which included structured interviews, follow-up contact for revision and a use of agency documents. The actual scales used to represent the independent and dependent variables were the product of this process and can be thought of as a representation of "expert opinion" in this judgment task.

The second area, the adequacy of the sample of the behavior, was addressed primarily through the following activity. The format used to present the configuration of information which represented a separation situation needed to
be a valid format. Not only did the measurement scales need to be valid, the way they were presented together as a representation of a real world situation was an important consideration. The respondents indicated a preference for a short, narrative paragraph format which is shown in Figure 5. In their opinion, the profile format presented the information about a separation situation in a way which closely mirrored the way information was found in their actual practice.

Data Collection

The initial interviews with respondents were started in March, 1981, and were completed by April 30, 1981. Subsequent contact with various respondents during questionnaire development was necessary as questions arose about scale validity and format preferences.

The questionnaire data were collected over a six-week period from May 20, 1981 to June 30, 1981. The questionnaires were hand delivered with the instruction that the respondent try to complete the task within six weeks. This time frame was permitted because the questionnaire was lengthy and, further, because the respondents were participating on agency time and all carried heavy caseloads. All questionnaires were completed and returned by June 30, 1981.

Data Analysis

Returned questionnaires were coded using the instructions listed in Appendix B. The data were analyzed using The Ohio State University computing system and, where necessary, by hand calculation. The Statistical Analysis System
(1979) was employed as the computer package and Hartwig and Dearing (1979) and Cohen and Cohen (1975) guided the formatting and interpretation of results.

Data analysis was dictated by the essential research questions. As a preliminary, description of various characteristics of the respondents was obtained. Further, a rather extensive univariate description of the primary dependent variable was completed. Hartwig and Dearing (1979) advocate the careful description of variables of special interest in research and, following suggestions by Tukey (1977), list special techniques which can be used to facilitate an understanding of data. Two such techniques, the stem and leaf and boxplot, were used to examine responses to presented profiles.

In the multivariate analysis of the data, multiple linear regression and correlation procedures were performed. The data obtained through this analysis had a direct interpretation within the judgment modeling framework. Simultaneous regression was used to: 1) generate a statistic which indicates how much of the variance in the dependent variable—the separation decision—can be accounted for by the cue variables; 2) evaluate the unique contribution of each cue variable to this explained variance; and 3) construct an hierarchical analysis of sets of cue variables and their unique contributions of explained variance. A regression/correlation technique was employed to compare the respondents' subjective opinion about their use of information to the empirical results indicating how they used the information. Finally, a specific equation developed by Tucker (1964) was used to compare various practitioner decision models.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results section is divided into eight major parts. Section one provides a brief description of respondent characteristics. Sections two and three are concerned with the statistical description of the independent and dependent variables, respectively, used in the study. Section four begins the analysis of the full decision models of the respondents. In section four a simultaneous regression approach is employed to examine the model of each of the respondents. Further analysis of models using an hierarchical approach to regression is described in section five. Section six examines a comparison of the judgments of respondents using a special equation, the lens model equation, adapted for this purpose. Section seven focuses on the analysis of the subjective opinions of respondents about how they judged the presented profiles. Finally, section eight briefly examines responses to questions about organizational support of decision making.

Description of Respondents

At the time of the study, all of the respondents were employed by Franklin County Children's Services, Columbus, Ohio. The nine respondents were selected to participate by the research director of F.C.C.S. and all signed Human Subject Consent forms agreeing that participation was voluntary. A supervisor
and two direct service workers from three separate units responsible for child placement were represented. Two units were designated as protective service units while the third was responsible for unruly children.

All of the participants were experienced children's services workers (see Table 2). The average total number of years employed in children's services for the group was 7.3. Further, respondents had been employed in their present position from one to eight years with the average being 3.9. Finally, the respondents were well educated. Seven of nine respondents held an M.S.W. degree while one respondent had a B.S.W. and one had a two-year Associate Degree in the mental health area.

Table 2. Descriptive Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Years in Present Position</th>
<th>Years Total in Child Welfare</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B.S.W.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} = 3.9 \quad \bar{x} = 7.3 \]
Analysis of the Decision to Separate

The Independent Variables

The independent variables under examination in this study have been identified as the information dimensions which were used by the respondents in the separation decision. The identification of these information dimensions was accomplished through a series of interviews with respondents.

Table 1 presents these information dimensions as well as the measurement scale employed to represent the dimensions in the case profiles. Although these data were discussed in detail in Chapter III (see Formulation of the Judgment Task section), a brief summary will be provided here. The first six dimensions in Table 1 (p. 57) represent socio-legal categories which describe the condition of the child. Age, child functioning and child view of separation represents general characteristics of the child. Parental characteristics are measured by the prior agency contact, parental functioning and parental willingness to change dimensions. Resource availability and parent/child relationship deal with factors which might be used to keep the family intact and the quality of the relationship between the child and his parents, respectively.

Table 3 presents a statistical description of the independent variables as they were used in the data analysis. Note that for variables with the same scale, both the mean and the standard deviation are either identical or very similar. The reason for this similarity is that these data are actually artifacts of the research design employed in the study. In the development of the profiles, the scale values of each independent variable were assigned by a random method.
Table 3. Description of the Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>8.9417</td>
<td>4.9862</td>
<td>1-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.5976</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.5976</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Neglect</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.5976</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Maltreatment</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.5976</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.5976</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.5976</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Contact</td>
<td>1.4083</td>
<td>1.1559</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>1.9833</td>
<td>.8299</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Functioning</td>
<td>1.9917</td>
<td>.8147</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Willingness to Change</td>
<td>2.0417</td>
<td>.8033</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Child Relationship</td>
<td>2.2667</td>
<td>.7303</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Functioning</td>
<td>1.9417</td>
<td>.8023</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child View of Separation</td>
<td>2.5167</td>
<td>1.0767</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the objective in mind that each value would be represented an equal number of times. These descriptive characteristics reflect the "artificial" nature of the data and suggest that a balance was achieved.

Table 4 contains zero order correlations among the independent variables. It is of interest to note that the correlations are low, ranging from .00 to .42 with a median of .075. These low correlations are consistent with Rossi's (1978) prediction that where profiles are created by a random procedure, the correlations among the independent variables are "often much lower than are those in the real world, and they are often zero" (p. 179).

Having minimally correlated independent variables is desirable for two reasons. First, low intercorrelations between independent variables permits a more sensitive detection of the relationship of a single independent variable to the dependent variable with all the other variables included in the model. A second, related reason is that high correlations between independent variables create the undesirable condition of multicollinearity. Cohen and Cohen (1975) note that regression coefficients obtained under the condition of multicollinearity may be misleading as measures of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables (p. 100).

The Dependent Variable

This section is concerned with a detailed examination of the responses of study participants to the 120 case profiles. These responses, measures of the decision of whether or not to recommend the separation of a child are presented
Table 4. Independent Variable Zero-order Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy. Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy. Negl.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emot. Mal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Avail.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Func.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Will.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-C Relation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.14</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>Child Func.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></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>Child View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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and analyzed within the framework of exploratory data analysis suggested by Tukey (1977) and Hartwig and Dearing (1979).

Exploratory data analysis is a relatively new approach to the examination of research findings. The intent of this family of methods is to use graphic and transformation techniques to both describe and examine research results. Tukey (1977) notes that "a basic problem about any body of data is to make it more easily and effectively handleable by minds..." (p. v) and proposes a number of techniques and methods which help to make data more understandable.

From among the many techniques available to explore research results, two have been utilized in this study to examine the dependent variable; the stem and leaf display and boxplot. Both of these techniques are used in the examination of one variable. They combine the use of rank ordering, histograms and order statistics to capture and present the form and distribution of a variable.

Tables 5, 6 and 7 present the responses of the study participants to the case profiles. The examination of these responses is straightforward. On the very left side of the stem and leaf, the response scale of the dependent variable is ranked from 0 on the bottom to 1.0 on the top. Recall that the anchor points are no recommendation (0) and certain to recommend separation (1.0). The 0's which follow to the right of scale values each represent an actual response to a particular profile using that scale value. The frequency of response for each value is indicated in the column under the # symbol. The stem and leaf display is both a rank ordering and a histogram. Its primary value is when it is used to define the shape of a distribution. In the examination of the nine stem and leaf displays presented in Table 5, 6, and 7, different shapes can be discerned.
Table 5. Stem and Leaf Displays and Boxplots for Unit 1

**Supervisor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>0.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Min = .1  Q1 = .3  Median = .4  Q3 = .6  Max = .9

**Worker 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>0.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Min = 0.0  Q1 = .3  Median = .6  Q3 = .8  Max = 1.0

**Worker 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>0.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Min = 0.0  Q1 = .2  Median = .4  Q3 = .7  Max = 1.0
Table 6. Stem and Leaf Displays and Boxplots for Unit 2

**Supervisor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Leaf</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Min = 0.0, Q1 = 0, Median = 0.2, Q3 = 0.6, Max = 1.0

**Worker 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Leaf</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Min = 0.0, Q1 = 0.5, Median = 0.6, Q3 = 0.8, Max = 1.0

**Worker 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Leaf</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Min = 0.0, Q1 = 0.4, Median = 0.7, Q3 = 0.9, Max = 1.0
Table 7. Stem and Leaf Displays and Boxplots for Unit 3

**Supervisor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Leaf</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Min = 0.0  Q1 = .1  Median = .2  Q3 = .7  Max = 1.0

**Worker 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Leaf</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Min = 0.0  Q1 = 0  Median = .1  Q3 = .4  Max = 1.0

**Worker 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Leaf</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Min = 0.0  Q1 = .1  Median = .5  Q3 = .9  Max = 1.0
The shape of each participant's distribution of responses is also graphically presented by the boxplot. The components of the boxplot are defined by the order statistics (Q1, median, Q3, minimum, maximum) listed for each respondent. Viewing the box vertically, the bottom horizontal line represents the first quartile (Q1) and the top of the box represents the third quartile (Q3). The line contained in the box is the median value for the distribution. The box part of the boxplot, then, represents the middle 50 percent of the responses to the dependent variable. The lines which extend from the top and/or bottom of the box are known as whiskers and represent the upper and lower 25 percent of the responses to the dependent variable.

If the stem and leaf and boxplots are visualized with the dependent scale as the reference, a picture of the form of each participant's responses to the case profiles emerges. In Table 5, for example, the supervisor did not use the extreme values of the scale. Her responses anchored at .4 (median value) and clustered around the middle of the scale. The restricted range used by the Unit #1 supervisor is represented by a comparatively small boxplot with shortened whiskers.

Worker 1 in Table 5 presents a different picture, however. This respondent used the entire scale. Her responses anchored higher on the scale than did the supervisors and also displayed more variation across the scale. The larger boxplot and its whiskers graphically illustrate this scale use.

An examination of the stem and leaf and boxplot displays for each participant indicates that these participants tended to have different opinions about the case profile information. The pattern of differences is indicated in the
above comparison between the supervisor and worker 1 of unit 1. These differences are also suggested in unit 2 (see Table 6). Further, note the response pattern of the supervisor of unit 2. The bulk of these responses are located at the low end of the scale (median = 2) with 50 percent falling between .6 and 0. An interpretation of this response set is that this supervisor approaches placement decisions conservatively and appears to be reluctant to recommend separation. When comparing the supervisor to workers 1 and 2 of unit 2, considerable differences are evident. In both instances, the worker scales are anchored above .5 (.6 and .7, respectively) and the boxplots suggest these workers are more inclined to recommend separation than their supervisor.

In unit 3, (see Table 7) the supervisor also appears to be conservative in recommending separation (median = .2) although not quite as much as the unit 2 supervisor. The response sets for the workers of unit 3 are also disimilar. Worker 1, for example, is even more conservative in recommending placement than the supervisor with an extremely low anchor point (median = .1) and 51 responses of no recommendation. Worker 2's response set shows a bimodal distribution in which this respondent tended to use the extremes of the scale when responding to the case profiles. This use of the scale extremes can be interpreted as an expression of certainty about the decision to recommend separation by the respondent.

In summary, the examination of the responses of each participant to the 120 case profiles indicates differences in approach to the judgment task. For some of the respondents (supervisor of unit 2, worker 1 in unit 3) the task is approached with a genuine reluctance to recommend the separation of a child.
For others (worker 1 in unit 1, workers 1 and 2 in unit 2), there appears to be more of a willingness to make the recommendation.

A second difference is concerned with the certainty with which participants approached the task. The tendency to use the middle of the response scale (supervisor and worker 2 of unit 1, worker 1 of unit 2) indicates an uncertainty about separation based on profile information. On the other hand, the tendency to use scale extremes (worker 2 of unit 3) suggests that the task is approached with more certainty about the separation problem.

Finally, the differences between respondent approaches to this judgment task do not appear systematic, that is, differences existed both within and across unit affiliation.

The **Simultaneous Model**

The results reported in this and the following section are concerned with the relationship between the fourteen independent variables and the separation decision. In this section, the first level of analysis focuses on the zero-order correlations between each information dimension and the decision to recommend separation. A more detailed analysis of this relationship is then discussed within a simultaneous regression framework.

Table 8 contains the zero-order correlations between each information dimension and the decision to recommend separation. The range of these correlations, from .00 to .61 with a median of .19, indicate that the information dimensions were, in general, related to the decision to recommend separation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Dimension</th>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Worker 1</td>
<td>Worker 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Neglect</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Maltreatment</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Contact</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Functioning</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Willingness</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Child Relationship</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Functioning</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Vision of Separation</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the examination of these correlations across respondents, that is, by independent variable, a pattern emerges where various independent variables appear to have consistently higher correlations with the dependent variable. For example, age, physical abuse, sexual abuse, unruly, resource availability, parental functioning, parental willingness to change, the parent/child relationship and child view of separation have moderately correlated relationships with the decision to recommend separation. The remaining independent variables, physical neglect, emotional maltreatment, dependency, prior contact and child functioning tend to be more modestly correlated with the dependent variable. Each of these last information dimensions, however, contain higher correlations with the decision to recommend separation for certain respondents.

Given that the various information dimensions were shown to be correlated with the dependent variable, the next level of analysis was concerned with the examination of these information dimensions as a group and the decision to recommend separation. The statistical technique employed in this analysis, simultaneous multiple linear regression, is appropriate when the relationship between a set of independent variables and a single dependent variable is under examination and where the independent variables are treated simultaneously and on equal footing (Cohen and Cohen, 1975).

The statistical results of simultaneous regression can be interpreted within a decision analysis framework. Regression coefficients are the optimal weights attached to each independent variable (optimal by the principle of least squares).
and can be interpreted as a measure of relationship between that independent variable, given all the other independent variables in the equation, and the dependent variable.

The multiple correlation coefficient, $R$, is the measure of association between a dependent variable and the optimal combination of two or more independent variables (Cohen and Cohen, 1975, p. 78). Within the decision analysis framework, $R$ is considered to be a measure of the control a decision maker has over his judgments. Hammond and Summers (1972) note that control is concerned with how a decision maker executes his knowledge in a judgment task. Perfect control would be indicated by an $R$ value of 1.00 and a total lack of control would produce a value of near .00.

The square of the multiple correlation coefficient, $R^2$, is the proportion of the dependent variable's variance which is shared with the variance of the optimally weighted independent variables (Cohen and Cohen, 1975, p. 78). $R^2$ can be expressed as a proportion of shared or explained variance with a range of 1.00 to .00, or it can also be expressed in percentage terms ranging from 0 to 100 percent.

Within the decision analysis framework, $R^2$ is a measure of how well the independent variables in the equation explain or account for variance in the dependent variable—the judgment made. Perfect explanation, or fit, would be indicated by an $R^2$ value of 1.00. An $R^2$ value of less than 1.00 indicates that important variables which would aid in explanation could have been omitted from the equation or that the relationship between the independent and dependent variables has some form other than linear (Hammond, et al., 1975, pp. 280-281).
Tables 9, 10 and 11 contain the results of the simultaneous regression analysis for the respondents from each unit. Under each respondent, the column contains all the relevant information about that respondent's judgment model. The coefficients which correspond to the fourteen information dimensions are the raw score regression coefficients. At the bottom of each column, four coefficients of interest are displayed. R and R², discussed above, are indicators of how well the respondents used the various information dimensions in the judgment task and, also, how well these information dimensions account for variance in the judgment task. The $\bar{x}$ symbol represents the mean of the dependent variable based on the 120 profiles rated. Finally, because the regression coefficients are expressed in raw score form, the intercept is reported.

The simultaneous models for unit 1 are presented in Table 9. First, an examination of the regression coefficients for each respondent provides a picture of what particular variables appear to influence the decision to recommend separation. Although these coefficients are small it must be kept in mind they are not correlations. Rather, these weights are expressed in raw score form and are indicators of the amount of change in the dependent variable for a unit increase of the associated independent variable controlling for all the other independent variables in the model (Cohen and Cohen, 1975).

The asterisks indicate that a particular coefficient is statistically significant at the .05 level. Statistical significance is used here as a guide to interpretation and the pattern of regression coefficients noted to be significant suggest how respondents used particular information dimensions in the judgement task. For
Table 9. Simultaneous Models for Unit 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.V.</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Worker 1</th>
<th>Worker 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Neglect</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Maltreatment</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruliness</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Contact</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Functioning</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Willingness</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Child Relationship</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Functioning</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child View</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.7856</td>
<td>.7845</td>
<td>.8230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>.6173</td>
<td>.6154</td>
<td>.6773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ë</td>
<td>.4336</td>
<td>.5700</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Simultaneous Models for Unit 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.V.</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Worker 1</th>
<th>Worker 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Neglect</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Maltreatment</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruliness</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Contact</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Functioning</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Willingness</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Child Relationship</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Functioning</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child View</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.8233</td>
<td>.6770</td>
<td>.7916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.6779</td>
<td>.4583</td>
<td>.6267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Simultaneous Models for Unit 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.V.</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Worker 1</th>
<th>Worker 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Neglect</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Maltreatment</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruliness</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Contact</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Functioning</td>
<td>-.05*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Willingness</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Child Relationship</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Functioning</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child View</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.8595</td>
<td>.8086</td>
<td>.8191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.7388</td>
<td>.6538</td>
<td>.6710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
example, in unit 1, age appears to be an important consideration for the supervisor and worker 1 but not for worker 2. There tends to be agreement about the importance of physical and sexual abuse for all three respondents but worker 1 stands alone when considering the importance of emotional maltreatment. Only worker 2 systematically used prior contact information in the judgment task but there tended to be agreement that resource availability, parental functioning and parental willingness to change are important considerations in recommending separation.

Moving to the R and $R^2$ values for each respondent in unit 1, it is apparent that the supervisor and each worker exercised considerable control ($R = .7856$, .7845 and .8230) in making their judgments. Further, the information dimensions included in the models accounted for a substantial portion of explained variance of the dependent variable. Over 60 percent of the variance of the judgment for each respondent can be accounted for by the optimally weighted independent variables ($R^2 = .6173, .6154$ and .6773).

Similar interpretations can be made for unit 2 (see Table 10). An examination of the pattern of significant regression coefficients highlights the similarities and differences of information use by these respondents. The supervisor, for example, focused almost exclusively on the condition of the child information dimensions, resource availability, parental functioning and parental willingness to change. On the other hand, worker 1 appears to have emphasized physical and sexual abuse, emotional maltreatment and parental willingness to change in the judgment task. Worker 2 tended to be in agreement with the
supervisor about the importance of the condition of the child, except for unruliness, and parental willingness to change. However, worker 2, like worker 1, tended to disagree with the supervisor about the importance of resource availability and parental functioning when making the separation judgment.

The R values of .8223, .6770 and .7916 for the supervisor, worker 1 and worker 2, respectively, of unit 2 suggest these respondents were successful in exercising control when making their separation judgments. Further, the R^2 values of .6779, .4583 and .6267 indicate that the information dimensions account for a substantial proportion of explained variance in the dependent variable.

Table 11 presents the data obtained from unit 3. An examination of the pattern of significant regression coefficients for this unit suggests, most obviously, that considerable agreement exists between these respondents about the importance of the condition of the child information dimensions in the judgment task. Age is also considered important by the supervisor and worker 2 but less so for worker 1. The supervisor alone used parental functioning in the judgment task. Worker 2 placed importance on parental willingness to change and the parent/child relationship where the supervisor and worker 1 did not. Finally, only worker 1 considered child functioning as an important information dimension in the separation judgment.

Consistent with the R and R^2 values determined for respondents from other units, these respondents also were found to have impressive coefficient values. The R values of .8595, .8086 and .8191, for example, indicate that members of this unit were quite able in the exercising of control in the judgment task. The R^2 values of .7388, .6538 and .6710 also suggest that the information dimensions
included in the analysis were successful in accounting for a large proportion of explored variance in the judgments of these respondents.

In summary, three conclusions are indicated by the results of the simultaneous regression analysis. First, there is confirmation that the information dimensions which were noted by the respondents as important in their considerations about recommending the separation of a child are, in fact, used consistently by the respondents in the task. Recalling that an R of 1.00 indicates perfect control, the median R value of .8086 obtained in this study suggests that these respondents were impressively able to exercise control over the use of the information dimensions in the separation judgment.

Second, the $R^2$ values for respondents (median = .6538) indicate that the fourteen information dimensions were successful in accounting for a substantial amount of the variance of the dependent variable. An interpretation of this finding is that these information dimensions can be discussed, for these respondents, as primary factors which systematically influence the decision to recommend the separation of a child.

Finally, the examination of statistically significant regression coefficients highlights the fact that respondent models vary in terms of how important each information dimension is in the judgment task. Differing models imply that respondents approach the judgment task of separating children with some disagreement about what information should be weighed more heavily when making the judgment. The dimensions of age, the six variables which indicate the condition of the child, resource availability, parental functioning and parental willingness to change seem to be agreed upon, in general, as the most
important considerations. Other dimensions which are used less consistently but appear to be important are prior agency contact, parent/child relationship, child functioning and child view of separation.

The Hierarchical Model

The results of the hierarchical analysis reported in this section is an extension and elaboration of the simultaneous analysis discussed in the previous section. Hierarchical regression differs from the simultaneous approach primarily in the way the independent variables are entered into the regression equation. In simultaneous regression, all of the independent variables are entered at the same time. In hierarchical regression, however, individual or sets of variables are entered into the regression equation sequentially. With the addition of these variables or variable sets there is an increase in the amount of variance explained in the dependent variable. It is this increase which is the focus of research interest (Cohen and Cohen, 1975, pp. 98-102).

The use of hierarchical regression in this study was guided by the contention of decision theorists that individuals often employ "simplifying rules or strategies" when making complex judgments (Shanteau and Phelps, 1977; Tversky and Kahneman, 1974). The results of the simultaneous analysis indicated that study respondents approached the judgment task of separating children with different notions about the importance of the various information dimensions used to make the judgment. This hierarchical analysis was designed to examine these differing respondent models in more detail and to determine if simplifying strategies were in operation.
The first task in this analysis was to define the variable sets which would form the basis for examination. Guidance for set composition was derived from two sources: the data obtained in the initial respondent interviews, and the guidelines to placement issued to child welfare employees by Franklin County Children's Services (Administrative and Program Staff Report on Planned Placement, 1980). The primary objective of this task was to define larger categories of information which were hypothesized to be categories used as simplifying rules by the respondents.

The sets used in the hierarchical analysis are presented in Table 12. Five sets were identified: 1) child condition, 2) child characteristics, 3) parent characteristics, 4) resource availability, and 5) parent/child relationship. The variables which compose each set are also identified in Table 12. The condition of child set is composed of the various socio-legal categories used to typify the type of problem which brought that family to the attention of the child protection agency. The sets which contain characteristics about the child and parents are composed of information dimensions which can be argued to clearly link to these sets. Finally, resource availability and parent/child relationships are single variable sets which conceptually stand in distinction from the others.

As noted above, hierarchical regression is a strategy used to examine the unique relationship between variable sets and a dependent variable. This technique essentially partitions the explained variance of that dependent variable into portions uniquely accounted for by particular sets. This is accomplished by setting up a series of simultaneous regression equations with each subsequent equation containing an additional variable set of interest. The amount of
Table 12. Sets for Hierarchical Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Condition</td>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Maltreatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unruly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Characteristics</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child View of Separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Characteristics</td>
<td>Parental Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental Willingness to Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior Contact with FCCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Child Relationship</td>
<td>Parent/Child Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
increase in $R^2$ (explained variance) is attributable to the set entered at that point in the analysis (Cohen and Cohen, 1975).

The point at which a variable set is entered in the hierarchical analysis is an important methodological consideration. The regression coefficients produced by multiple linear regression are expressions of the partial relationship between an independent variable and dependent variable, that is, regression coefficients are a measure of relationship controlling for the effects of other independent variables in the equation. The values of these coefficients, therefore, can be dramatically different depending on what other variable sets are in the model.

Cohen and Cohen (1975, pp. 99-102) suggest that decisions about where to enter a variable set in hierarchical analysis be guided by one of three considerations: 1) causal priority, 2) research relevance, and 3) multicolinearity problems. In this study, the entry of sets was based on a ranking of set importance inferred from the information obtained in respondent interviews. For example, the variables which indicate the condition of the child were almost unanimously agreed upon by respondents as a key information dimension. This set was entered first. The next most important information dimensions were various child characteristics. This set was entered second. Parental characteristics were suggested to be next in importance and, finally, resource availability and the parent/child relationship were entered.

Tables 13, 14 and 15 present the results of the hierarchical analysis. Each set is listed in the left column of the tables and the descending order indicates the point at which a particular set was entered in the analysis. The order of entry of the variable sets was the same for all respondents.
Table 13. Hierarchical Analysis for Unit 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Worker 1</th>
<th>Worker 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.1566</td>
<td>.3596</td>
<td>.1391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.2100</td>
<td>.4685</td>
<td>.1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>.0534</td>
<td>.1089</td>
<td>.0467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.4800</td>
<td>.5790</td>
<td>.6228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>.2700</td>
<td>.1105</td>
<td>.4370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Availability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.6060</td>
<td>.6129</td>
<td>.6701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>.1260</td>
<td>.0339</td>
<td>.0473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent/Child Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.6173</td>
<td>.6154</td>
<td>.6773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>.0113</td>
<td>.0025</td>
<td>.0072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Hierarchical Analysis for Unit 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Worker 1</th>
<th>Worker 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1590</td>
<td>.2276</td>
<td>.3035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2023</td>
<td>.3396</td>
<td>.3798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0433</td>
<td>.1120</td>
<td>.0763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.6396</td>
<td>.4356</td>
<td>.5603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4373</td>
<td>.0960</td>
<td>.1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Availability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.6748</td>
<td>.4422</td>
<td>.6244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0352</td>
<td>.0066</td>
<td>.0641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent/Child Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.6779</td>
<td>.4583</td>
<td>.6267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0031</td>
<td>.0161</td>
<td>.0023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. Hierarchical Analysis for Unit 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Worker 1</th>
<th>Worker 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.6354</td>
<td>.5127</td>
<td>.3491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.6844</td>
<td>.6127</td>
<td>.4236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>.0490</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td>.0745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.7100</td>
<td>.6277</td>
<td>.5622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>.0256</td>
<td>.0150</td>
<td>.1386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Availability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.7366</td>
<td>.6536</td>
<td>.6075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>.0266</td>
<td>.0259</td>
<td>.0453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent/Child Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.7388</td>
<td>.6338</td>
<td>.6710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>.0022</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the interpretation of the hierarchical analysis, the most important items upon which to focus are $R^2$ and Increment value indicated by the addition of that set to the regression equation. In Table 13, for example, the first set, child condition, appears to be an important set for those respondents, especially worker 1. This variable set accounts for 16 percent, 36 percent and 14 percent of the explained variance of the judgment task.

The Increment value for each of the subsequent sets indicates how much additional variance in the judgment task is explained by the addition of that set to the model. For example, in unit 1, child characteristics contribute an additional 5 percent, 11 percent and 5 percent to the $R^2$ value of the respondents. These values can be interpreted directly as indications of the strength of the relationship of that set to the judgment task. For unit 1, worker 1 uses child characteristics substantially more than the supervisor or worker 2. In fact, these data suggest that worker 2 takes the child (including condition and characteristics) into account in the separation decision (cumulative $R^2 = .4685$) more than either the supervisor (cumulative $R^2 = .2100$) or worker 2 (cumulative $R^2 = .1858$).

The pattern changes, however, when parent characteristics are entered into the model. The Increment values of .2700, .1105 and .4370 indicate that parent characteristics are also important considerations in the separation decision. However, the relative importance for both the supervisor and worker 2 is substantial. For the supervisor, 27 percent of the variance of the judgment task is accounted for by parent characteristics. For worker 2, nearly 44 percent of explained variance is accounted for by that set. The pattern for this unit
suggests that there worker 1 focuses on the child when making a separation judgment, the supervisor and worker 2 tend to focus on the parent.

Finally, resource availability appears to be an important consideration for the supervisor but not for either of the workers. The parent/child relationships did not appear to be an important consideration for any unit 1 respondent. It is of interest to note that the $R^2$ values associated with the parent/child relationship (.6173, .6154 and .6773) are those repeated for unit 1 respondents in the simultaneous regression analysis. This is because all of the information dimensions used in the study were included in the hierarchical analysis at this point.

Table 14 presents the hierarchical analysis for unit 2. Set 1, child condition, also appears to be an important category of information for the members of this unit with 16 percent, 23 percent and 30 percent, respectively, attributable to it. The set of child characteristics appears less important than child condition but for worker 1 an additional 11 percent of explained variance is added by this set.

As with unit 1, parent characteristics add dramatically to the understanding of the judgment behavior of this unit. Although the addition to explained variance for worker 1 is a modest 10 percent, for worker 2 the increase is 18 percent and for the supervisor the increase is 44 percent. This suggests clearly that for the supervisor, parent characteristics are an essential consideration in the separation decision.

Lastly, resource availability accounts for a modest increase in the explained variance of each respondent in unit 2 (4 percent, 1 percent and 6 percent). Also,
the parent/child relationship adds minimally to each model (less than 1 percent, 2 percent and less than 1 percent).

Table 15 presents the hierarchical analysis for unit 3. Note that the child condition set appears to contain the primary information used by this unit in making a separation judgment. The $R^2$ values of .6354 for the supervisor, .5127 for worker 1 and .3491 for worker 2 indicate that this set carries considerable weight in the judgment task. Because this set accounts for such a high proportion of the variance explained in the dependent variable, subsequent sets appear much more modest in their influence. For example, child characteristics add some to $R^2$, especially for worker 1, and for worker 2 parent characteristics account for an additional 14 percent of explained variance. Consistent with the other units, resource availability and the parent/child relationship add minimally to the $R^2$ value of each respondent.

The results of this hierarchical analysis are useful both in the elaboration of the difference between respondents in how they use information when making a separation judgment and in support of the contention that child welfare workers use simplifying rules when making this judgment. In the elaboration of differences, the varying $R^2$ and increment values for the sets supports and further clarifies the simultaneous regression analysis finding that information is weighed and used differently by respondents in the judgment task.

In the second area, these sets appear to represent larger categories or themes which respondents use to summarize more specific and detailed information. For example, each respondent had a particular set in his model which accounted for, on the average, over 60 percent of the total variance
explained by that model (range 44 percent of 86 percent). If these sets act as simplifying rules, it could be argued that they represent the basic information sought by the respondents as they are confronted with a separation and, further, that this information is most important to their perception of the judgment task.

For six respondents, child condition was the set of major importance. In fact, for the supervisor of unit 3, the separation judgment was over-simplified by use of the information contained in this set. Eighty-six percent of the total variance explained by his model was accounted for by this set, suggesting that child condition was almost entirely the information dimension used to make the separation judgment. For three respondents, parent characteristics was the set which seemed to guide their judgments. Finally, child characteristics, resource availability and parent/child relationship appeared to influence the judgments of the respondents but in a less pronounced way than child condition and parental characteristics.

A Comparison of Judgment Models

Thus far, the results of the exploratory data analysis and both the simultaneous and hierarchical analyses have indicated that study respondents differ in the shape and form of their responses to the separation profiles and in how information is used in the judgment task. A question not addressed in these analyses, however, is concerned with the extent to which respondents agreed that various profiles should have or not have been recommended for separation action. Although the stem-and-leaf and boxplot displays highlighted the fact that
respondents tended to rate the profiles differently, there was no means in those techniques which permitted a statistical comparison of differences.

The basic issue addressed in this section is concerned with the level of agreement of the nine respondents about recommending the separation of children. Hammond, et al. (1975) suggest the most appropriate technique for analyzing the relationship between two judgment models is the "lens model equation" (p. 287). This equation is based on Brunswick's "lens model" of behavior (see Chapter II) and was first proposed by Hurch, Hammond and Hurch (1964). According to Hammond, et al., the formula as modified by Tucker (1964) is the most widely used in judgment modeling analytic strategies and was, therefore, employed in this study.

The Tucker equation is

\[ r_a = GR_1 R_2 + C \sqrt{1 - R_1^2} \sqrt{1 - R_2^2} \]

where \( r_a \) is the correlation coefficient which expresses the relationship between two respondent models; \( G \) is the correlation between the predicted scores generated from each respondent model; \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) are the multiple correlation coefficients for each respective model; and \( C \) is the correlation between the residual scores obtained from each model. The benefit of using this equation instead of the more simple approach of correlating pairs of the dependent variable is that it takes into account critical components of each respondent's model in the calculation (Hammond, et al., 1975).
Table 16 presents the lens model correlations computed for each pair of judgment models. The range of these correlations, from .32 to .75, tends to support the exploratory data analysis finding that the relationship between model pairs is highly variable. Further, using the correlation interpretation scale suggested by Hinkle, Weirsm and Jurs (1979, p. 85) eight relationships (22 percent) are low and twenty-eight relationships (78 percent) are moderate. The median value of these correlations is .55.

A review of the correlation matrix does not reveal any prominently consistent pattern. In general, the relationships within units are moderate with unit 3 having consistently higher agreement than units 1 or 2. The relationship between units tend to be widely variable and are low to moderate in magnitude.

In summary, the data obtained in the "lens model" comparisons indicate that respondents are only in modest agreement about recommending the separation of children. A pattern that could have been expected in the correlation matrix is that the relationships within each unit are substantially higher than between unit comparisons. The within unit pattern did indicate that slightly higher relationships occurred but the pattern was not definitive and pronounced. Further, the recognized need for agreement about the separation of children by these respondents would have indicated that overall higher correlations could be expected. The low to moderate levels of agreement suggest that differences in approach to a separation situation found in previous analyses are substantive and real.
Table 16. Correlations of Judgments Using the Lens Model Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Worker 1</td>
<td>Worker 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker 1</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker 1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker 2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker 1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker 2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Analysis of Subjective Models

The results of analyses discussed in previous sections were obtained through the examination of "computed" or "objective" (Slovic and Lichtenstein, 1971, p. 683) respondent models, that is, the various model components examined were derived from fitting a regression equation of the participants' responses to the separation profiles. Another topic addressed in this study was concerned with the "subjective" nature of these models. This "subjective" dimension focuses on how well a respondent understands the information use policies he/she employs in a judgment task. It was important to include this topic because of evidence which suggests that judges are frequently in error when their subjective models are compared to their actual judgment behavior (Cook and Stewart, 1975; Slovic and Lichtenstein, 1971).

Cook and Stewart (1975) describe and compare seven methods for obtaining and analyzing the subjective descriptions of judgment models. In each of these methods, respondents are requested to attach a value of some form to each of the independent variables included in the model. The purpose of this value is to rank that particular independent variable in relation to the others. The primary differences between these methods are concerned with how the values or weights are attached, the form of value used and the techniques employed to compare the subjective weights to the actual model.

Based on their finding that these methods were essentially comparable, Cook and Stewart (1975) suggest the choice of method be made based on research objectives. In this study, a 100-point scale rating was selected for use. This method has respondents attach a value of 1 to 100 to each independent variable
with lower values indicating less importance. The reason this method was selected is that any value can be used more than once to indicate that particular independent variables are equal in importance. The actual questionnaire item used to obtain the subjective weights from respondents is shown in Figure 6.

Table 17 presents the subjective weights of the study respondents. As suggested above, the various values assigned by respondents are indicators of how important that particular information is thought to be in the recommendation to separate a child. These data were collected immediately after the respondents had rated the separation profiles so that the judgment task was relatively current as respondents defined their subjective models.

The analysis of a subjective model using this method is well defined and proceeds as follows. The weights assigned to each of the information dimensions by a respondent are used as regression coefficients in the formulation of a "subjective" regression equation. Predicted scores are obtained from this regression equation using the information in the separation profiles and are considered to be the separation judgments which would occur if the subjective model of the respondent was actually used. These predicted scores are then correlated with the actual judgments made by the respondent on the separation profiles. Finally, this correlation is interpreted to be the measure of subjective accuracy or insight the respondent has about how information is actually used in a judgment task.

Table 18 contains the correlation coefficients which describe the subjective accuracy of the study respondents. Two points are notable in the examination of these correlations. First, using the interpretation rules of thumb suggested by
### Table 17. Subject Weights for Information Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Dimension</th>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Neglect</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Maltreatment</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Contact</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Functioning</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Willingness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Child Relationship</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Functioning</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Child Vision of Separation | 80 | 15     | 98     | 50 | 80 | 70 | 50 | 1 | 1
Hinkle, Wiersma and Jurs (1975, p. 85) these coefficients indicate low positive correlations between the subjective models and the actual judgments of the respondents. Second, by squaring the correlation coefficient an estimate of shared variance is obtained. The $r^2$ values displayed in Table 18 highlight the fact that the subjective and actual judgment models of the respondents share only a small percentage of their total respective variances (ranging from 12 to 26 percent with a median of 19 percent). These data suggest that the respondents have minimal insight about how they use information to make the recommendation to separate children.

Table 18. Correlations of Predicted Decisions Using Subjective Weights with Actual Decision Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.4941</td>
<td>.2441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker 1</td>
<td>.4812</td>
<td>.2316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker 2</td>
<td>.4084</td>
<td>.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.4692</td>
<td>.2201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker 1</td>
<td>.4315</td>
<td>.1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker 2</td>
<td>.5062</td>
<td>.2562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.3508</td>
<td>.1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker 1</td>
<td>.4085</td>
<td>.1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker 2</td>
<td>.3747</td>
<td>.1404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A part of this error in subjective accuracy can be attributable to Slovic and Lichtenstein's (1971) observation that "judges strongly overestimate the importance they place on minor cues (i.e., their subjective weights greatly exceed the computed weights for these cues) and they underestimate their reliance on a few major variables" (p. 684). A brief comparison of the subjective weights obtained from respondents and the regression coefficients of their model generated in the simultaneous analysis indicates that all of the participants tended to rate certain information dimensions as substantially more important than they were actually weighted in the regression model.

However, the error in subjective accuracy found in this study suggests more than overestimation or underestimation of information importance. Cook and Stewart (1975) reviewed a number of decision studies which included analyses of subjective models. Although they found error in the accuracy of assessing information use, in general, departures from "objective" models in these studies were not as large as those found in this research. While respondents in this study were shown to be consistent in their use of information to make separation recommendations (as indicated by large R values) they appear to have little understanding about this information use.

Organizational Support

Although the primary focus of this study was on the thorough examination and comparison of individual judgment models, one additional issue was included because of its potential influence on respondents' decision behavior. The decision to recommend the separation of a child is made in an organizational context.
Decision and organizational theorists suggest that the context of decision making is an important consideration in the examination of judgment processes, whether on an individual or small group basis (Reitz, 1981).

Two specific topics were addressed in this part of the study. The first was concerned with the extent to which the agency policy provided by Franklin County Children's Services (F.C.C.S.) on the separation process was perceived as useful to the respondents. The importance of this topic relates to the need for an organization to define a framework which provides consistency both in how potential separation situations are assessed and formulated, and in the process which ends with a choice about a future course of action. The problem of separating and placing a child, in particular, needs clear, concise and consistent guidelines for action.

The second issue dealt with the extent to which the separation task was assessed by respondents as a job stressor and, if so, to identify the steps taken by F.C.C.S. to deal with such stress. Attention to this issue was inspired by assertions that decisions in planning for children are difficult to make (Permanent Planning for Children in Foster Care Handbook, 1977), and that difficult or stressful conditions negatively influence both job performance (Reitz, 1981) and decision behavior (Janis and Mann, 1977).

Questions 1, 2 and 3 in Part III of the questionnaire were intended to measure how helpful respondents perceived agency policy to be in the decision to separate a child. As a policy statement, F.C.C.S. provides a procedural guide for the placement of children in alternative care settings (Administrative and Staff
Report on Planned Placement (A.S.R.P.P.), 1980. The placement process defined by this document has five steps or stages:

1. A decision as to whether or not it is necessary to separate the child from his parents.
2. The process of getting to know the child.
3. Selection of the type of placement needed.
4. Preparation of the parent, the child, the foster parents, group home or institutional personnel.

Guidelines and suggestions for practice in each of the placement steps are also discussed in the policy guide. For example, in step one where the decision to place a child is made, it is noted that

While it is not possible to lay down absolute rules, in general, the following factors point toward placement and the conditions must exist before a placement decision is permitted:

1. A child may need to be removed from his home for his own physical protection, e.g., physical abuse or gross neglect, homeless.
2. Serious diagnosed medical, mental or physical illness on the part of the parent sometimes make it impossible for them to give adequate care to the child.
3. The temporary disruption of a family due to illness, desertion or other factors may necessitate temporary placement of a child.
4. Parents may, because of their own emotional problems, be so incapable of handling the child with understanding that their relationship to him is seriously damaging.
5. A physically or mentally handicapped child sometimes has to be placed away from home temporarily in order to receive special training when resources are not available in his own community (A.S.R.P.P., 1980, p. 3).

In the study, respondents were asked if they had reviewed the Administrative and Staff Report on Planned Placement and, if so, to indicate if they thought it was helpful in making the recommendation to separate a child. Even though each of these respondents had been in their present jobs for at least one year or more, three of the nine had not seen the policy statement. For the six who had received the document, all agreed it was of assistance in initiating the planned placement process.

Although generalizations to other child welfare staff are risky to make based on the small number of non-random respondents in this study, a concern can be raised based on responses to the above questions. An agency policy designed to frame and guide the practices of employees must be systematically made available to these employees. The three respondents who were not aware of F.C.C.S. policy were, in fact, from the three units represented in the study, suggesting that the problem is not simply a lack of communication between a particular supervisor and worker. The problem of the non-availability is made more acute by the fact that those respondents who had received the policy thought it was a helpful guide.

Questions 4 and 5 of Part III were concerned with determining whether or not the decision to separate a child was perceived to be stressful and to obtain information about how this stress was handled if it existed. These questions were related to the notion that child welfare decision making is a difficult dilemma in
which choices are often between alternatives, none of which are entirely satisfactory (Downs and Taylor, 1980, p. 13).

All nine of the respondents agreed that the decision to separate a child contributed to the job stress of a child welfare staff person. Further, seven of the nine respondents indicated that stress is managed by the use of a shared decision making team approach. Two respondents thought stress was not handled well due to job pressure, overburdening caseloads and an unresponsive administration.

This use of shared decision making at F.C.C.S. is consistent with methods developed by child welfare theorists which attempt to deal with the inherently difficult nature of child welfare decision tasks. For example, in the Permanent Planning Handbook (1977) the following are reasons why shared decision making is a preferred technique:

1. Collaboration with other knowledgable people provides the best guarantee that the best plan will be made.
2. It shares the responsibility any one decision maker has for the consequences of fateful decisions.
3. It assesses the possibility of bias and error.

By way of summary, the results of the analysis of organizational support for decision making link directly to the findings obtained in the decision analysis. First, despite the openness of the respondents that the administrative policy statement of F.C.C.S. is a helpful decision aid, its intended impact to provide consistency in how separation judgments are made did not appear to be empirically supported. The respondents tended to use different information when
considering the separation of a child, employed different simplifying rules when considering this information use and, finally, demonstrated lack of agreement about when a child should be separated. Although policies are not intended to eliminate all disagreement or to insure perfect consistency, the results of the study indicate this particular policy had minimal impact on how the decision to separate a child is made.

The findings of the decision analysis are also related to the perceptions of the respondents that the decision to separate a child is stressful. This question may seem gratuitous given the well-known dramatic impact such a decision has on the child, the parents and others close to the situation. However, it is asserted here that a part of the perceived stress in the decision task is related to the substantial disagreement about when to separate a child demonstrated between the respondents.

Adelman, et al. (1975) propose that interpersonal conflict is empirically displayed by the judgment modeling technique. They state that "social judgment theory (judgment modeling) asserts that policy quarrels can be described in terms of the cognitive parameters (weights, function forms, organizational principles and consistency) of the participants" (p. 140). From this perspective, the disagreements and potential conflict between respondents about the separation task was highlighted in the exploratory data analysis, in the regression analysis and in the comparisons made using the "lens model equation. The problem of disagreement is likely exacerbated by the fact that respondents have little insight about their own judgment models.
The use of shared decision making as a way to minimize stress and to maximize the likelihood of a best plan for a child has been supported in child welfare literature. However, shared decision making must be used judiciously and with an awareness that small group decisions are not necessarily "better" than one made by an individual. Reitz (1981) suggests that a variety of factors, including disagreements between group members, can negatively influence and disrupt the generation of a decision agreeable to all of the members of that group. In this study, for example, strong disagreement between a supervisor and a worker about the separation of a child could result in decision by fiat. That is, the supervisor, by virtue of position in the organization carries the most weight in the decision process and therefore, can influence the final decision. The use of shared decision models must be accompanied by assurance that group members have equal say and influence over the choice to be made.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

This study was undertaken to examine the decision behavior of child welfare practitioners. The practice problem selected in this examination was concerned with the situation in which a recommendation might be needed to separate a child from his/her parents for placement in an alternative care setting. In this study, nine practicing child welfare social workers rated 120 profiles, each of which presented a potential separation problem. Practitioner responses to these profiles were the focus of the decision analysis.

A specific set of decision analysis techniques was employed to complete this research. The primary method used was judgment modeling. This method is theoretically grounded in Brunswick's lens model of behavior and utilizes multiple regression statistics to model the decision behavior of an individual. Within the general framework of judgment modeling, a simultaneous and hierarchical analysis, a statistical comparison of judgment models using the lens model equation and an analysis of subjective models were all used to examine research questions. Further, two techniques from exploratory data analysis theory, the stem-and-leaf and boxplot, provided descriptive insight into the primary dependent variable in the study. Finally, a brief examination of organizational support for decision making was completed.

119
Summary of Findings

Five primary research questions were addressed in the study. A summary of relevant findings follows each of the questions.

Question 1: What information do child welfare workers use in their decision to separate children?

The initial identification of information important to the decision task was accomplished through a series of interviews with respondents. This process generated the fourteen information dimensions shown in Table 1 (p. 57). As previously noted, the first six of these dimensions are socio-legal categories which are used in the child welfare system to classify the type of maltreatment or problem experienced by a child. Age, ability to function and view of separation were noted by respondents to be important characteristics of the child. Essential parental characteristics were said to be ability to function, willingness to change and a measure of the chronicity of family problems as indicated by prior content. Finally, the availability of resources to work with the situation was suggested as an important variable as was the nature of the relationship between the parent and the child.

The data obtained in the study tend to verify that these information dimensions are all used in the separation task. "Used" here means that each of these dimensions contributed to the explained variance of a model for at least one of the respondents. For example, on examination of the simultaneous models shown in Tables 9, 10 and 11 (pp. 88) indicates that the various socio-legal
dimensions are used most frequently in the task. There is variability in the use of the other dimensions but all are employed by at least one respondent.

An overall index of information use is indicated by the $R^2$ values noted for each respondent. This coefficient is a measure of the variance accounted for in the dependent variable by an optimally weighted combination of independent variables. The median $R^2$ of .6538 for these respondents suggests that the fourteen information dimensions they said they employed, in fact, account for a substantial proportion of their decision behavior. Although this information is differentially used by respondents (as discussed below), in general, the dimensions identified were accurate.

**Question 2:** How consistent are those workers in the application of this information in the separation decision task?

While question 1 focused on the identification and verification of information employed by respondents, question 2 was concerned with a more detailed understanding of how this information was used in the decision task. This question was addressed primarily in the simultaneous and hierarchical analyses of respondent judgment models.

Overall, individual respondents were very consistent in the application of information in the separation decision task. An estimate of this consistency can be inferred from the multiple correlation coefficient, $R$, obtained in the simultaneous regression analysis. This coefficient is a measure of the association between a dependent variable and an optimally weighted combination of
independent variables. The median R value of .8086 indicates considerable reliability of information use in the task.

In the hierarchical analysis, evidence was obtained which suggested that respondents tended to use "simplifying rules" in their decision processes. In this analysis, five information "sets" were identified: child condition, child characteristics, parent characteristics, resource availability and the parent/child relationship. Results from the analysis indicated that various sets represented larger categories or themes which defined respondent information use. For example, each respondent had a particular set in his/her model which accounted for, on the average, over 60 percent of the total variance explained by the model.

The existence of simplifying rules accounts for, in part, the high intrajudge reliability of respondents. Intrajudge consistency can be enhanced by a reliance of larger categories or themes which essentially act to focus information search and use. In this study, for example, the set of child condition accounted for 64 percent of the possible 100 percent of one respondent's model. This 64 percent also represented over 86 percent of the total variance explained by his model. An interpretation of this finding is that this respondent tended to recommend the separation of a child whenever that child's condition, either abused, neglected, emotionally maltreated, etc., was confirmed and did not recommend separation if the condition was not confirmed. This respondent represents an extreme in the use of simplifying rules in a judgment task. Although the remaining respondents all demonstrated a reliance on a particular set, other information contributed to their decision as well.
Question 3: Is there divergence in the form of the judgment models of child welfare workers?

The issues addressed in question 2 related primarily to the consistency of the decision behavior of individual respondents. This question, on the other hand, was concerned with the consistency of judgment between respondents.

Initial differences between respondents as they rated the same 120 separation profiles were highlighted by the stem-and-leaf and boxplot techniques. An examination of these results suggested that respondents approached the judgment task with different notions about the separation of children. Data patterns for the nine respondents indicated differences both in the willingness to separate children and in the certainty with which respondents approached the task. Where some respondents were willing to recommend separation, others were extremely reluctant to do so. Similarly, the data indicated that some of the respondents were uncertain about separation while others tended to be more certain in their responses.

More detailed differences between respondents were defined in the simultaneous and hierarchical regression analyses. In the simultaneous analysis, the examination of significant regression coefficients for respondents suggested that differences existed in the use of the identified information dimensions. The statistically significant regression coefficients were interpreted to be those which carried the most weight or influence in the decision task. The dimensions of age, the six variables which define the condition of the child, resource availability, parental functioning and parental willingness to change seemed to be
the information most influential in the separation decision, although agreement on this use between respondents was variable.

Somewhat more agreement between respondents about the use of "simplifying rules" was detected in the hierarchical analysis. For six of the respondents, the child condition set was determined to be the one which framed information examination and use. For the remaining three respondents, the parent characteristics set seemed to guide separation decisions. This finding verifies the existence of two perspectives which guide child welfare decision making, in general; one which focuses on the child's condition in the situation and one which is primarily concerned with the parents or larger context of the family.

Finally, a detailed statistical comparison of the degree to which respondents were in agreement about the rating of the profiles was obtained using Tucker's "lens model" equation. The results of this analysis indicated substantial variability in the extent to which respondents agreed about separation. The range of lens model correlations (shown in Table 16) was from .32 to .75 with a median of .55. An interpretation of these correlations suggests only low to moderate agreement about recommending the separation of children.

Combining the findings of highly consistent information use by respondents and low to moderate agreement between judges about this information use, it was concluded that the difference between respondents reflect real disagreement about what is important to consider when a child is to be separated. Although there was some similarity in what general categories are important in information search and use, disagreement was most apparent when the specific information dimensions were examined.
Question 4: Do child welfare workers use information the way they think they do in the separation decision task?

This question was concerned with an examination of the extent to which respondents were aware of or had insight into their own decision behavior. The question was inspired by decision theory research which suggested that decision makers are often inaccurate in their perception of how they use information in a judgment task.

This analysis was accomplished by having respondents assign subjective weights to each of the fourteen information dimensions. These weights were used to generate a set of predicted scores based on the information in the 120 profiles. These scores were expressions of separation decisions for each respondent if the subjective model was used to make the judgments. These subjective decisions were then correlated with the actual judgments made on the separation profiles. The resulting correlations indicated correspondence between each respondent's subjective insight and actual decision behavior.

The data obtained in this analysis indicated that the nine respondents had little insight into their own decision behavior. The range of the correlations was from .3508 to .5062. The median correlation was .4315. The more meaningful measures of correspondence between the subjective and actual judgment models were the $r^2$ values for each. These coefficients are indicators of the proportion of variance which is shared by the respective models. The low $r^2$ values found in this study, which range from .1231 to .2562, show how inaccurate the perceptions of the respondents were about information use in their decision making.
Question 5: Is there organizational support for practitioners who are confronted with the separation decision task?

Although the primary focus of the study was on individual decision behavior, this question was concerned with two organizational issues which were thought to influence the decision behavior of the respondents. The first issue dealt with the availability, use and helpfulness of agency policy in the separation decision task. The second issue was concerned with child separation and job stress.

It was determined that F.C.C.S. has a policy statement which identifies and addresses various stages in the planned placement of children (Administrative and Staff Report on Planned Placement, 1980). A stage for which practice guidelines were defined in this document specifically addressed the decision to separate a child from his/her parents. Six of the respondents had reviewed the policy and all agreed it was helpful in the separation decision task. Three respondents, one from each of the units represented, had not seen the material.

The assertion by the respondents that this policy was helpful as a decision aid was only partially supported by the decision analysis data. The consistency of individual decision behavior of respondents can possibly be attributed, in part, to agency policy. As an overall guide, however, the policy did not appear to be effective. In the first place, three of the nine respondents had not seen the document. Secondly, its intended impact to provide consistency in separating children was not empirically supported. The differences detected between respondents indicated this policy had minimal impact on how the decision to separate a child is made.
All nine of the respondents agreed that the decision to separate a child contributed to the job stress of a child welfare practitioner. Organizationally, this stress is managed by the use of a shared decision making, team approach. The data obtained in this study identify a component of this job stress, the interpersonal conflict which exists as a result of respondent disagreements about when a child should be separated. Judgment modeling highlights the form of interpersonal disagreement about a judgment task and respondent differences were detected in the exploratory data analysis, in the regression analysis and in the comparisons using the lens model equation.

**Implications**

The above findings have implications for social work theory and practice in four areas. First, the results obtained raise serious challenges to traditional notions about professional judgment in social work. Related to those challenges, the second area is concerned with the relationship between judgment modeling decision analysis techniques and the formulation of social work practice models. Third, this research links directly to child welfare practice and policy. Finally, the study has heuristic value in the definition of further research in judgment and decision making in social work.

**Challenges to Traditional Notions About Professional Judgment in Social Work**

Traditional notions about professional or clinical judgment in social work are those which contend that such judgments are the product of an essentially intuitive process, one that is resistant to elaboration or understanding. From this
perspective, the practitioner is viewed as an "artist" (Turner, 1974) who draws upon expert training and practical experience in the selection of the course of action which best serves the client. Training and accumulated experience form the basis of a "practice wisdom" which guides professional behavior.

This research brings into question these beliefs about professional judgment and the cognitive behavior of social work practitioners. First, challenges can be raised about the inaccessibility of cognitive processes in professional judgment. Hoffman (1960) suggests that the mental processes of a clinician (judge) have been defined from within three perspectives. In the first perspective, the process is a subjective, private experience the understanding of which can only be roughly inferred from observable behavior. A second perspective contends that mental processes can be considered as a bio-chemical event. Detection and understanding of these processes has proceeded slowly through the use of electrophysical and neurophysiological apparatus.

The third view and most relevant to this research is concerned with methods which seek to describe mental processes by means of mathematical models. According to Hoffman, within this framework "mental process refers simply to a functional relationship which accounts for consistencies in response to divergent stimulus (information) patterns" (p. 117). Hoffman further asserts that these functional relationships can be hypothesized and detected best in "controlled situations wherein the input (information) and the output (judgment) are known or capable of quantification" (p. 118) a view which is most consistent with judgment modeling.
It is important to understand that mathematical models constructed to represent decision behavior are not construed as isomorphic to the actual cognitive process which occurs in a choice situation. For example, judgment modeling does not assert that decision makers are actually microprocessors programmed to do multiple linear regression when confronted with a decision problem. Rather, these models are said to be "paramorphic" representations of decision behavior (Hoffman, 1960, p. 125). This term, borrowed from chemistry, implies that mathematical representations help to account for or "explain" what is observed concerning certain properties or characteristics, just as a chemical formula "explains" many, though not all, properties or characteristics of a substance (Hoffman, 1960, p. 125).

A primary goal of this research was to use judgment modeling techniques to "paramorphically" represent the private "policy" of child welfare practitioners. The data obtained suggest this goal was met. The various models derived for participants defined the functional relationships between the information which is important to separation and the decision to separate itself. These models were defined precisely and in enough detail to permit extensive evaluation of information use, weighting policies, and both intra-and interpractitioner consistency. The findings of this study stand in distinct contradiction to assertions that the cognitive processes of a practitioner are resistant to understanding.

A second challenge to traditional belief raised by the research is concerned with the reliance of practitioners on "practice wisdom" to guide their professional judgment. Bartlett (1970) states that "professionals judgment is one of the most important features distinguishing occupations from professions" (p.
Where many occupations have little discretion in the dispatch of various job duties, most professionals enjoy wide latitude in making choices and defining their work. Bartlett (1970) continues

In a profession the complexity and variability of the situations to be dealt with require the exercise of individual judgment by the practitioner in each new situation. Such judgment is a key operation in any profession. The practitioner must be able to select the relevant principles from his profession's body of knowledge and values and apply them appropriately in assessing the situation before him (p. 140).

An assumption of professional judgment is that practitioners are aware of the types of knowledge they bring to a practice situation and that there is a certain amount of agreement between professionals about how this knowledge should be applied. As practitioners gain experience these assumptions become axioms and support the "practice wisdom" myth.

The findings of this study raise serious questions about the reliance on practice wisdom as a guide for professional practice. The respondents involved in the research were well-trained, experienced child welfare veterans. They had considerable familiarity with the decision task and had been intensively involved in structuring the decision analysis. Despite this, while individual consistency was high, these respondents appeared to have very little understanding about their weighting policy. Their awareness of information use was shown to be modest. Further, notions about consistency of agreement on how information should be applied were dispelled. Differences in opinion about when a child should be separated were detected between supervisors and their workers, between the supervisors and between the workers.
It should be noted that credibility for the above challenges is enhanced by research which identified similar problems in psychology (Goldberg, 1970) and medicine (Hoffman, Slovic and Rorer, 1968). These studies suggest that professional judgment is a difficult task about which psychologists and physicians have little insight.

Formulation of Practice Models

A strength of judgment modeling relates not only to its ability to represent functional relationship in the decisions processes of practitioners, but in its value in the formulation and construction of new social work practice models designed to address the problems discussed above. A number of recent practice theorists (Pincus and Minahan, 1973; Fischer, 1978; Stein, 1981) have attempted to capture the flow and process of professional interventive activity in social work, including the various points in the process where critical judgments are required.

These models are examples of prescriptive model building, that is, they attempt to establish logical and consistent practice by specifying what practitioners should do at specific points in the interventive effort. These models also make an attempt to define the types of information needed upon which to process and base practice decisions. A problem with prescriptive models is that they have been unable to identify and describe empirically both information needs and the functional relationship between information and the decision task.

Judgment modeling provides a technology for ascertaining a much more detailed, empirical understanding of information needs and use in prescriptive
model building. The usefulness of such models hinges on a high degree of accuracy in the specification of what information to collect and in the elaboration of how the information relates to the decision to be made. The need for precise assistance in practice is starkly highlighted by Stein's (1974) finding in child welfare that between 59 and 78 percent of information gathered in intake interviews was not related to the objections of making a placement decision (Stein, et al., 1978, p. 11).

A flow chart example of how judgment modeling techniques can be used in the development of practice models is shown in Figure 8. This example is meant to represent a general case where the steps of documentation and processing precede each decision point identified by a practice model. Following the initiation of the interventive process, each decision point requires documentation. Documentation is concerned with what Hammond, et al. (1975) call the formulation of the judgment task. This set of activities, discussed in detail in Chapter III, is concerned with the generation of an exhaustive inventory of information thought to be relevant to the decision task. Information identification can be obtained from practitioners, research results or theory.

The next stage in the process is a processing task where the functional relationship between the information and the decision task is defined. In prescriptive model building, it would be desirable to have this relationship reflect general agreement about information use as this would reflect more normative opinion. The versatility of judgment modeling permits this aggregate approach. In this type of decision analysis, respondents which represent a practitioner group are randomly selected and are asked to rate a set of profiles.
Figure 8. Judgment Modeling in the Development of Practice Models
In this case, regression coefficients are actually parameter estimates and can be tested for statistical significance. Those information dimensions which are found to be statistically significant can be inferred to be a reflection of general agreement by practitioners about the importance of these dimensions in the decision task.

Once the initial task of defining the functional relationship between information and decisions is completed, the prescriptive model becomes a much more accurate and versatile aid to the practitioner. First, it defines the type of information needed and, therefore, makes information search activities more efficient. Second, once information about a situation is obtained, the knowledge of how it functionally relates to a decision is available. An awareness of empirically defined standards weights in a decision task can help the practitioner be more consistent in application and would also minimize the undesirable situation of poor insight into information use. Further, agreement about information importance would facilitate consistency in decision making across practitioners.

A final strength of judgment modeling in prescriptive model building is to actually use the derived regression equation as a decision aid. Decision theorists such as Meehl (1954) and Goldberg (1970) have long advocated the use of such equations. In social work, Whitman, Digman and Digman (1974) discuss what they call a "helping equation" which assists in assigning cases or making judgments according to precise rules.

The use of an equation to predict a decision is straightforward. Once regression weights have been obtained from a decision analysis, the equation can
then be used to determine the assignment or outcome of a decision for future cases. The information values for a situation are entered into the equation and are multiplied by corresponding weights. These products are then summed and the resulting value indicates the decision to be made. This value can be expressed as a point on a continuum, such as in this study, or it can be represented as one of a group of categories. The use of a prediction equation as a decision aid is the optimal utilization of a prescriptive model. To the extent that the equation accounts for variance in the decision task, the predictions obtained by its use will be unencumbered by external forces which might unnecessarily influence the decision.

As a final note, it is important to understand that judgment modeling can be used to construct prescriptive models at any level of aggregation. In the above discussion, model building was viewed in a broad, normative way. However, practice models can be defined and investigated at levels ranging from the most general to the individual practitioner. Generating practice norms and standards will require work at a large group level. However, general models will need to remain responsive to differences in information needs and use implied by various service groups, target populations and practice settings.

Child Welfare Practice and Policy

The results of this study tend to be consistent with both early (Fanshel, 1962; Mech, 1970) and more recent (Gambril and Wiltse, 1974b; Stein, 1981) assertions by child welfare theorists that the process of deciding to separate a child, the gateway to foster care, remains ill-defined and not well understood.
Further, the variability of information use in this decision task found in this research suggests that the lack of professional consensus about factors important in child placement found by both Boehm (1969) and Philips, et al. (1971) remains an accurate appraisal.

In addition to this lack of agreement about information use, the minimal insight of study respondents into their own decision behavior presents a picture of confused decision making in a high risk situation. An implication of this lack of insight is that information search by these practitioners is inefficient and that the link between the information sought and the decision task is not clear. This finding appears to be consistent with the results of Stein's (1974) previously referenced study where the relationship between intake information and subsequent decision making was not well understood by child welfare practitioners.

Finally, organizational support in the separation decision process did not appear to be functionally helpful for study participants. Despite the existence of an agency policy statement about child placement procedures, its intended impact to assist and guide practice was minimal. In the first place, not all of the respondents were familiar with the policy. Secondly, the differences between respondents about when to separate, the variability of information use and poor insight suggest that even if practitioners were familiar with policy content, it did little to improve the quality or consistency in the separation process.

The persistence of problems in decision making and the ubiquitous nature of decision tasks in practice has inspired recent attention to the decision making aspect of practice in child welfare. Wiltse (1978), for example, states
unequivocally that the provision of foster care in this country is a decision making system and identifies factors which impede decision tasks. Downs and Taylor (1980) conceptualize permanency planning for children in foster care in flow chart decision tree terms (see pp. 1.1.17 to 1.1.19) and specify various decision points in service provision in some detail. Stein's (1981) approach to social work practice in child welfare emphasizes both the information needs and the decision points in the delivery of services to children.

Given this recent attention to decision making, this study has implications in the development of both practice models and policy in child welfare. First, as discussed in the previous section, judgment modeling is a helpful tool in the construction of more precisely defined prescriptive practice models. Second, judgment modeling can be used in the training of practitioners about professional judgment and decision making. Finally, an accurate understanding of decision tasks and processes is necessary in the development of more responsive child welfare policy.

Model Building. Recent work done in the development of child welfare practice model conceptualization is thorough and detailed. In the area of permanency planning, for example, Downs and Taylor (1980) have delineated tasks and activities necessary to assure that a child in the foster care system is treated within a framework responsive to permanency needs. An issue of importance in this model is that decisions are an integral, recurring task in the planning process which require relevant and timely information. In a more general practice conceptualization, Stein's (1981) approach to intervention in child welfare
focuses on the accuracy and relevance sought in assessment and its critical relationship to subsequent decision making.

One of the problems with these practice models at this stage of their development is concerned with their relative lack of precision or clarity about the critical link between information needs and use and decision making. In the handbook, *Permanent Planning for Children in Foster Care* (1977), for example, the authors note that when considering the return of a child to his own home, a decision must be made about whether or not the "child's home meets a minimum sufficient level of care" (p. 14). While recognizing the considerable difficulty with this decision task, the lack of helpful guidance in how to understand the decision and its information needs in the handbook is highlighted by the following such a judgment is necessarily relative. There are no fixed criteria; whether or not a home falls under minimum sufficient level must be decided by informed judgment, which evaluates a particular home as a suitable placement for the child who may return there (p. 14).

The problem with variable or unknown criteria in child welfare decision making creates severe difficulties in both information search and in its use in decision tasks. Criteria refer to the standards or weights which define what information is most relevant to a decision and what information is not.

Stein (1981) is aware of the problem of the lack of criteria to guide decision making and suggests that decision tasks in child welfare should be approached in three steps: 1) developing criteria; 2) using criteria as guides for information gathering; and 3) evaluating the information that is gathered by applying criteria to evidence in order to reach a decision (p. 136). What Stein is referring to here
is the point made previously in this study that informed decision making is characterized by an understanding of the information needs of a decision task and how that information functionally relates to that task.

Judgment modeling has considerable value as a technology to improve the understanding of information needs and use in decision making in child welfare practice model development. As previously discussed, it is an adaptable decision analysis method which permits a detached examination of the relationship between information and decision making. It is also useful in applying the knowledge of this relationship in the definition of practically useful, prescriptive practice models.

The following is an example of how judgment modeling can be employed in the development of a practice model. This example uses the results of this study and focuses on how these results could be employed to provide assistance to practitioners who are confronted with the separation of a child.

Recall that the application of judgment modeling in the development of practice models requires two steps. The first of these steps includes a descriptive analysis of the decision task where the information needs are identified. This information is then functionally related to the decision through the use of multiple linear regression procedures. The second step in model development is to use this empirically obtained data, primarily the regression weights, to frame the decision tools for practitioners. The various regression weights are indicators of the relative importance of corresponding information dimensions and can be thought to represent the "criteria" suggested by Stein (1981) as integral to decision making. Depending on the level of aggregation,
these weights can be reflections of normative standards of the field, of a group of persons such as a working unit or of an individual practitioner.

Figure 9 presents a flow chart view of the judgment modeling representation of the decision to separate a child. This chart basically reflects the second step discussed above where initial documentation of information has been completed and the obtained regression coefficients (the values in parentheses by each dimension shown under the functional relationship step) express the importance of corresponding dimensions to the decision task. The data used in this example reflect the aggregate responses of the members of unit 1 in the study. The chart slightly modifies the decision as a simple, yes-no choice instead of the likelihood of action scale used in the actual decision analysis.

Once this functional relationship between information and the decision task is identified and included in the practice process, it can have considerable value as a guide to activity. First, knowing the relative importance of various information dimensions can define information search. Understanding that each of the fourteen identified information dimensions is important in the separation of the child can narrow the focus of assessment to the identification and evaluation of where a situation is relative to these dimensions. Further, the identification of information thought to be more important (see asterisks in Figure 9) can guide the practitioner to a more intensive assessment of that dimension.

A second use of the functional relationship between information and the decision task is to actually develop a "decision equation" using the regression weights and information collected during the assessment of a potential
Figure 9. Judgment Modeling Representation of the Decision to Separate a Child
separation situation. In this equation, the regression weights are mathematically related to the information obtained about a problem situation and a "predicted decision" results. This predicted decision can be used as a decision aid to guide further considerations about whether or not the child should be separated.

An example of such an equation is shown in Figure 10. In this equation, the regression weights are those obtained from unit 1. The values which represent each of the information dimensions are based on those used to represent profile 71 on page in Appendix A. It can be seen that the predicted decision for this situation based on the decision model of unit 1 members is .54. This value is expressed in the 0-1.0 scale units used in the decision analysis set up for the study.

This predicted decision falls just above the midpoint of the scale. If the score was interpreted directly it would indicate uncertainty about separation. However, as a decision aid, the predicted decision must be interpreted with other factors in mind. First, the R value of unit 1's model is .64. This R suggests that consistency in information use is considerably lower than that of any of the three models of unit 1 members considered individually. This lower R is expected because it has been observed that these individual respondents disagree about information use in the separation task and this disagreement reduces the aggregate multiple R. The lower R increases inaccuracy in prediction.

The predicted decision is valuable if factors which might affect it are kept in mind. In this situation, for example, a cutoff point on the scale could be determined where fluctuations in prediction could be accommodated. A decision
rule of no placement below .49 and placement above .50 could be established.

With this scale, the model would predict placement in this particular situation.

\[
\text{Predicted} \; .54 = \begin{align*}
(-.01)(\text{age 7}) + (.23)(\text{physical abuse 0}) + (.27)(\text{sexual abuse 2}) \\
+ (.15)(\text{physical neglect}) + (.15)(\text{emotional maltreatment 0}) \\
+ (.11)(\text{dependency 0}) + (.06)(\text{unruly 0}) + (.01)(\text{prior contact 0}) \\
+ (-.07)(\text{resource availability 1}) + (-.07)(\text{parental functioning 1}) \\
+ (.11)(\text{parental willingness 3}) + (.03)(\text{P/C relationship 3}) \\
+ (.04)(\text{child functioning 3}) + (-.03)(\text{child view 3})
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 10. A "Decision Equation" for Unit 1

However, it is important to keep in mind the fact that the lower the multiple R, the more important it is to use a predicted decision in conjunction with other information to make a decision. If the multiple R is high, error in prediction is reduced and the predicted decision is much more likely to reflect optimal choice based on the model.

In summary, judgment modeling techniques appear to have value in both model building in child welfare practice and in decision aiding in the actual implementation of these models. The use of these techniques to define and understand information use in decision tasks will increase the precision and responsiveness of these models in actual practice situations.

Practitioner Training. The results of this study indicate a need for practitioner training in decision making. Despite the obvious need for practice skills in professional judgment and decision making, Mech (1970) has noted that schools of social work and agencies have neglected to provide such skills in this very basic
practice activity (p. 26). The reliance on professional training and practice experience, the "practice wisdom" perspective, to guide judgment has been challenged in other professions and the evidence obtained in this research suggests that similar challenges can be raised for social work practitioners.

Hammond, et al. (1977) assert that one of the strengths of judgment modeling relates to its ability to contribute to cognitive understanding and change in decision makers. They suggest that understanding and adaptive change are enhanced through the analysis of the relationship between the information dimensions used in a decision task and the decision to be made. It is the feedback about this relationship which is important in training.

Hammond, et al. (1977) contrast two types of feedback used in training decision makers. Cognitive feedback is the detailed exposition of the functional relationship between information and judgment; the regression weights, R and $R^2$. Outcome feedback, on the other hand, focuses primarily on the decision itself and "tells individuals about whether their judgments lead to success or failure (or some variation thereof) but nothing about the reasons for this occurrence (Hammond, et al., 1977, p. 5). Research in the area of feedback and training indicates that learning about decision processes and improved decision making is best facilitated by the use of cognitive feedback (Deane, et al., 1973). Indeed, the use of outcome feedback has been found to have negative effects on learning to improve judgment (Hammond, Summers and Deane, 1973).

Judgment modeling techniques provide for the cognitive training of social work practitioners in decision making. The construction of an individual's cognitive system or model in a decision task presents a well-defined statement
about the way that individual uses information in the task. Careful feedback to the decision maker will facilitate his/her insight into the critical link between information and the judgment. The result of this insight would be a more informed, consistent future approach to the decision task.

Valuable learning is also possible when models of various practitioners based on the same decision task are compared. Feedback to decision makers about similarities and differences of these various models would assist in the precise identification of agreements and disagreements about information use. An awareness of similarities and differences between decision makers is especially necessary where that task needs to be approached with a measure of consistency as in, for example, the decision to separate a child.

Finally, training in the use of decision aids in practice would encourage the practical application of decision analysis. The use of a simple predictive equation, for example, would assist in assuring more accurate and reliable decision making. Further, Hammond (1971) suggests that an interactive computer program designed to facilitate decision analysis can provide immediate graphic feedback to a decision maker about the functional relationship between information and the decision task. Hammond, et al. (1977) report that such a computer program has been developed and that its impact on both learning and decision aiding has been positive. The use of computers in decision analysis and decision making is making its way into medical diagnosis (Pauker and Kassirer, 1981) and may hold considerable promise for social work decision making.
**Child Welfare Policy Formulation.** Defining child welfare policy in this country has been a difficult process and one far from complete. Speaking about the difficulties in the coordination of social services, Rein (1970), for example, discusses why policy in foster care has been slow in development. He states

> there are three factors in the movements of individuals through this system over time: the condition that carries the need for substitute care, the response to the condition, and the nature of the completed task. Political, philosophical and conceptual problems arise at each of these levels (p. 119).

These problems have assumed a variety of forms. First, definitional difficulties have plagued policy development. Kammerman and Kahn (1976) for example, state "there is no clear cut, consistent, and agreed upon definition of child abuse and neglect" (p. 143). Similar definitional problems exist for other terms which are meant to convey meaning about child condition such as unruly, dependent or emotionally maltreated.

Further, policy development has had to proceed in the context of value positions which sometimes conflict. Stone (1970), for example, identified eight value positions upon which substitute care is based. These various value positions focused on the rights of children, the rights of parents, the sanctity of the family, the rights of children over those of their parents and so on. Policies and practices which attempt to reflect and reconcile these different, opposing positions on values are nearly impossible to define with any clarity and, when defined, offer little assistance in the guidance of practice activities.
The data obtained in this study tend to reflect these problems. While the agency did provide a policy statement about the placement of children in alternative settings, its impact on the practitioners responsible for implementing the policy in actual practice appeared minimal. In fact, the analysis of the decision behavior of the nine respondents suggested that a difference in values about what is important to consider in the separation of children exists. For some of the respondents, information about the child was weighted more heavily. For others, information about the parents was considered to be most important in the separation task. These data indicate how poorly defined policy adds little to professional practice.

The importance of discussing policy formulation within the context of decision making relates to the fact that policies are choices, that is, they are products of a decision making process. When policies are viewed within the context of decision making, the role of decision analysis in both understanding and developing policies is highlighted. In fact, a number of decision theorists have applied decision analysis techniques in policy formulation (Hammond, et al., 1977; Adelman, et al., 1975) and report that they have been helpful as a means to structure policy problems and to understand how values and information relate to each other in policy choices.

The application of decision analysis techniques to policy formulation in child welfare would be an important step in reducing confusion and debate which stems from value conflicts. Hammond and Adelman (1976) suggest that using decision analysis methods reflects a more "scientific" approach to policy development by
empirically relating values and knowledge in policy tasks. The methods which these decision theorists use to assist in this process are based on the judgment making techniques used in this study.

Future Research
The application of the decision analysis technique of judgment modeling demonstrated in this study has implications for future research on decision making in social work. The need for this type of research is made acute by the current emphasis on decision processes in practice and by the documented lack of understanding about these processes. Further, the precision and helpfulness of both practice models and policy hinges on a clear understanding of how knowledge, values and information use patterns impact professional judgment. Decision analysis techniques provide a technology to understand this impact.

Various practice theorists have advanced an appreciation of the importance of decision making in practice by conceptualizing service precision as a series of critical choice points. In effect, the elaboration of these models has set the stage for considerable activity in decision research. Each choice point in practice has certain information needs and, further, requires an understanding of the functional relationship of that information to the decision task. These choice points in a practice model, therefore, need to be examined within the research framework of this study where essential questions center on: 1) What information is used? 2) Is it used consistently? 3) Is it used differentially by practitioners? 4) Do practitioners understand how they make the decision?
The range of potential research in decision making in social work is limitless. Practice and policy choices are a part of social work activity in every setting where social workers practice. Diagnosis in mental health, retiring a disturbed client to a community setting, treating a juvenile offender, selecting group home parents, institutionalizing a mentally retarded child are some of the many decision tasks engaged in regularly by social work practitioners. The need to thoroughly understand these decision tasks is pressing and it is through the systematic use of decision analysis techniques that this understanding will occur.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
Your response to the following questionnaire represents the second stage of your unit's involvement in this project on decision analysis in child welfare. In brief, the study is concerned with an application of a decision analysis technique called judgment modeling to a critically important judgment area - the decision to separate a child from his/her parents. A description and results of the research will be submitted to meet requirements for the Ph.D. at The Ohio State University's College of Social Work.

The questionnaire has three sections. Section I requests basic descriptive information about your professional background. Section II presents a series of case profiles about which you are requested to make a practice decision. The information contained in these profiles is based on that obtained in my previous interviews either with you or with other respondents from your unit. Finally, Section III is concerned primarily with your opinions about certain aspects of decision making in the child welfare area. Specific instructions for each section are provided.

Because the questionnaire is lengthy, you may choose to do only a part of it at one time. If this is the case, please do not return to previously completed profiles and change answers in Section II.

It will be appreciated if you will complete the questionnaire by . Other phases of the project cannot be completed until all questionnaires are returned.

Thank you for your cooperation and participation in the study. I will be providing a summary of the results to you at a later date and will be available for more thorough discussion if that seems useful.

Jerry Bean, M.S.W., A.C.S.W.
The Ohio State University
College of Social Work
SECTION I: PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name: ____________________________________________

Unit: ____________________________________________

Position: Supervisor: ______________

            Direct Service Worker: ______

Number of Years Employed in Your Present Position: ______

Number of Total Years Employed in Child Welfare (in Any Agency Setting): ______

Educational Background: BS/BA ______

            BSW ______

            MA ______

            MSW ______

Other (Specify) _____
SECTION II: CASE PROFILES

INSTRUCTIONS

Each of the following case profiles presents a situation which could require consideration of a decision to recommend separation of a child from his/her parents. You are asked to carefully review each profile and, based on your evaluation of that information, to indicate your decision on the scale immediately following the profile. This scale is expressed as the likelihood of action on your part to recommend that the separation process be initiated. Indicate your response by circling the corresponding number.

Please keep in mind that the information presented in the profiles is a product of previous assessment and decision making. Therefore, you should consider each profile a complete and valid representation of a situation which might require action on your part.
Profile No. 1

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 1 month old child is at risk of emotional maltreatment. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available ______________________________.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible) ________. The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance ______________________________.

Your Decision:

0  .1  .2  .3  .4  .5  .6  .7  .8  .9  1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Profile No. 2

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 15 year old child is at risk of physical abuse ________. The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available ______________________________.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely) ________. The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility ______________________________.

Your Decision:

0  .1  .2  .3  .4  .5  .6  .7  .8  .9  1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 11 year old child is at risk of physical abuse. The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 3

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 16 year old child is at risk of dependency. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 4
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 1 year old child is dependent (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 5

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 10 year old child is neglected (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 6
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 6 month old child is emotionally maltreated (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 7

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 17 year old child is unruly (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 8
Profile No. 9

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 11-year-old child is at risk of being unruly. The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain
Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 10

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 10-year-old child is at risk of physical abuse. The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able) The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain
Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 11

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 8-year-old child is physically abused (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Profile No. 12

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 6-year-old child is at risk of sexual abuse. The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Profile No. 13

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 17-year-old child is sexually abused (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certainty Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 14

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 6-month-old child is physically abused (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certainty Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 15

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 10-year-old child is **unruly** (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are **available**.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is **moderately limited (change possible)**. The parents have demonstrated they are **willing and open** to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is **strained** and **rejecting**. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is **moderately limited**. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with **anxiety and resistance**.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Profile No. 16

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 8-year-old child is **emotionally maltreated (confirmed)**. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are **available**.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is **severely limited (change unlikely)**. The parents have demonstrated they are **openly hostile** to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is **strained and rejecting**. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is **good (child is able)**. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with **open hostility**.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 17

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 8-year-old child is at risk of dependency. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation

to Separate

Profile No. 18

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 12-year-old child is physically abused (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation
to Separate
Profile No. 19

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 9-year-old child is sexually abused (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0  .1  .2  .3  .4  .5  .6  .7  .8  .9  1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 20

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 13-year-old child is at risk of dependency. The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0  .1  .2  .3  .4  .5  .6  .7  .8  .9  1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 13-year-old child is unruly (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 22

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 1-year-old child is at risk of physical abuse. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 23

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 15-year-old child is at risk of being unruly. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0.1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 24

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 15-year-old child is at risk of physical neglect. The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0.1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 25

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 16-year-old child is physically neglected (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 26

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 16-year-old child is emotionally maltreated (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 27

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 2-year-old child is at risk of sexual abuse. The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Profile No. 28

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 14-year-old child is physically neglected (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation
Profile No. 29

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 1-year-old child is at risk of emotional maltreatment. The family has had contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change. The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0

No Separation

Certainty Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 30

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 4-year-old child is at risk of emotional maltreatment. The family has had contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change. The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0

No Separation

Certainty Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 31

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 9-year-old child is at risk of physical abuse. The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated that they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Profile No. 32

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 12-year-old child is unruly (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated that they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Yes Certain Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 33

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 10-year-old child is dependent (confirmed). The family has had contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available...

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance...

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain
Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 34

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 17-year-old child is at risk of physical abuse. The family has had contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available...

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance...

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain
Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 35

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 9-year-old child is unruly (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 36

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 12-year-old child is dependent. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 37

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 4-year-old child is at risk of sexual abuse. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Profile No. 38

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 13-year-old child is at risk of emotional maltreatment. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 37

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 4-year-old child is at risk of sexual abuse. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Profile No. 38

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 13-year-old child is at risk of emotional maltreatment. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 39

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 4-year-old child is at risk of physical neglect. The family has had contact with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 40

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 8-year-old child is at risk of being unruly. The family has had no contact with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 2-year-old child is at risk of dependency. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 42

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 11-year-old child is at risk of dependency. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 5-year-old child is dependent (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certainty Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 43

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 8-year-old child is at risk of sexual abuse. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certainty Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 44
Profile No. 45

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 13-year-old child is at risk of physical neglect. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

Certain Separation Recommendation

Profile No. 46

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 17-year-old child is at risk of being unruly. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

Certain Separation Recommendation
Profile No. 47

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 14-year-old child is at risk of being unruly. The family has had contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited. The family has had contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited. The family has had contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited. The family has had contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Separation</th>
<th>Certain Recommendation to Separate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile No. 48

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 8-year-old child is at risk of physical neglect. The family has had contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited. The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Separation</th>
<th>Certain Recommendation to Separate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 49

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 4-year-old child is at risk of dependency. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated that they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 50

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 2-year-old child is at risk of emotional maltreatment. The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated that they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 51

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 7-year-old child is emotionally maltreated (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are [somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is [supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 52

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 12-year-old child is at risk of sexual abuse. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 53

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 3-year-old child is physically neglected (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9   1.0
No Separation

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Profile No. 54

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 6-year-old child is physically abused (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9   1.0
No Separation

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Profile No. 53

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 3-year-old child is physically neglected (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9   1.0
No Separation

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Profile No. 54

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 6-year-old child is physically abused (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9   1.0
No Separation

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 13-year-old child is unruly (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  1.0

No Separation  Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 55

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 1.4-year-old child is dependent (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are open and willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  1.0

No Separation  Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 56
Profile No. 57

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 9-year-old child is at risk of dependency. The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Profile No. 58

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 14-year-old child is unruly (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 59

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 11-year-old child is at risk of being unruly. The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Profile No. 60

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 5-year-old child is at risk of physical abuse. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 61

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 13-year-old child is sexually abused (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 62

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 10-year-old child is unruly (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 63

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 14-year-old child is at risk of emotional maltreatment. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change. The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain
Separation Recommendation to Separate

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Profile No. 64

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 13-year-old child is at risk of physical neglect. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change. The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain
Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 65

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 11-year-old child is emotionally maltreated (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Separation</th>
<th>Certain Recommendation to Separate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile No. 66

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 3-year-old child is sexually abused (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Separation</th>
<th>Certain Recommendation to Separate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile No. 67

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 6-year-old child is at risk of dependency. The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0.1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 68

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 6-month-old child is physically neglected (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0.1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 69

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 2-year-old child is **physically abused** (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are **not available**.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is **moderately limited** (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are **somewhat willing** to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is **supportive, but conflictual**. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is **severely limited**. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with **acceptance**.

Your Decision:

0  .1  .2  .3  .4  .5  .6  .7  .8  .9  1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Separation</th>
<th>Certain Recommendation to Separate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile No. 70

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 10-year-old child is **dependent** (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are **not available**.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is **moderately limited** (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are **somewhat willing** to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is **strained and rejecting**. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is **good** (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with **willingness, but expressed concern**.

Your Decision:

0  .1  .2  .3  .4  .5  .6  .7  .8  .9  1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Separation</th>
<th>Certain Recommendation to Separate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 7-year-old child is sexually abused (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 72

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 10-year-old child is physically abused (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 73

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 9-year-old child is unruly (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 74

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 1-year-old child is at risk of physical neglect. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 75

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 7-year old child is at risk of physical abuse. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0.1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9.10

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 76

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 7-year old child is dependent (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0.1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9.10

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 77

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 15-year old child is at risk of being unruly. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 78

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 3-year old child is at risk of physical abuse. The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 79

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 5-year old child is sexually abused (confirmed). The family has had one contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but
conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Separation</th>
<th>Certain Recommendation to Separate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile No. 80

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 5-year-old child is physically neglected (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but
conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Separation</th>
<th>Certain Recommendation to Separate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 16-year-old child is at risk of being unruly. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Separation</td>
<td>Certain Recommendation to Separate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile No. 82

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 16-year-old child is physically abused (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Separation</td>
<td>Certain Recommendation to Separate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 16-year-old child is at risk of sexual abuse. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain
Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 83

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 8-year-old child is unruly (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain
Separation Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 6-year-old child is at risk of emotional maltreatment. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Separation</th>
<th>Certain Recommendation to Separate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Profile No. 86

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 7-year-old child is at risk of sexual abuse. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Separation</th>
<th>Certain Recommendation to Separate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 4-year-old child is physically abused (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain
Separation Recommendation to Separate

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 3-year-old child is emotionally maltreated. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain
Separation Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 3-year-old child is dependent (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No
Separation

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Profile No. 90

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 16-year-old child is sexually abused (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No
Separation

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Profile No. 91

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 5-year-old child is at risk of emotional maltreatment. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 92

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 17-year-old child is physically neglected (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 93

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 9-year-old child is sexually abused (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able) The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 94

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 13-year-old child is at risk of physical abuse. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 10-year-old child is at risk of sexual abuse. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 10-year-old child is at risk of emotional maltreatment. The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 97

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 6-year-old child is at risk of physical neglect. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 98

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 15-year-old child is at risk of being unruly. The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 14 year old child is physically abused (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 100

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 7 year old child is emotionally neglected (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 101

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 9 year old child is at risk of physical neglect. The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 102

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 5 year old child is dependent (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate
Profile No. 103

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 9 year old child is at risk of emotional maltreatment. The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 104

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 14 year old child is at risk of sexual abuse. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Certain Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 12 year old child is at risk of physical neglect. The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but confictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 105

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 1 month old child is physically abused (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 106
Profile No. 107

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 1-month-old child is dependent (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 108

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 11-year-old child is sexually abused (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 12-year-old child is at risk of being unruly. The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
0 & .1 & .2 & .3 & .4 & .5 & .6 & .7 & .8 & .9 & 1.0 \\
\hline
\text{No Separation} & \text{Certain Recommendation to Separate}
\end{array}
\]

Profile No. 109

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 7-year-old child is physically neglected (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
0 & .1 & .2 & .3 & .4 & .5 & .6 & .7 & .8 & .9 & 1.0 \\
\hline
\text{No Separation} & \text{Certain Recommendation to Separate}
\end{array}
\]
Profile No. 111

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 6-month-old child is emotionally maltreated (confirmed). The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible) ______. The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited . The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance ______.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation

Profile No. 112

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 12-year-old child is emotionally maltreated (confirmed) . The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible) ______. The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting . The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good(child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness but expressed concern ______.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation
Profile No. 113

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 11-year-old child is physically neglected (confirmed). The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change. The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern. Your Decision:

0  .1  .2  .3  .4  .5  .6  .7  .8  .9  1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 114

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 2-year-old child is at risk of physical neglect. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available. The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change. The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is moderately limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0  .1  .2  .3  .4  .5  .6  .7  .8  .9  1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 12-year-old child is at risk of sexual abuse. The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are willing and open to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 15-year-old child is at risk of dependency. The family has had no contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is good (quite able to change). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with open hostility.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Certain Separation Recommendation to Separate
After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 15-year-old child is emotionally maltreated (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely).

The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with anxiety and resistance.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 117

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 15-year-old child is sexually abused (confirmed). The family has had 2 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely).

The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is strained and rejecting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is good (child is able). The child views the possibility of separation/placement with willingness, but expressed concern.

Your Decision:

0 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5 .6 .7 .8 .9 1.0

No Separation Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 118
Profile No. 119

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 6-month-old child is at risk of dependency. The family has had 3 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are available, but limited.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is moderately limited (change possible). The parents have demonstrated they are somewhat willing to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is satisfactory, accepting. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0  .1  .2  .3  .4  .5  .6  .7  .8  .9  1.0

No Separation  Certain Recommendation to Separate

Profile No. 120

After thorough review and assessment of the details involved in this case, you have determined that this 1-month-old child is physically neglected (confirmed). The family has had 1 contact(s) with your agency around this or other child-related problems. It has also been determined that resources which could be effective in working with the intact situation are not available.

The overall ability of the parents to adequately use resources necessary to change the situation is severely limited (change unlikely). The parents have demonstrated they are openly hostile to such change.

The relationship between the parents and the child is supportive, but conflictual. The overall ability of the child to function responsibly and on an independent basis is severely limited. The child views the possibility of separation/placement with acceptance.

Your Decision:

0  .1  .2  .3  .4  .5  .6  .7  .8  .9  1.0

No Separation  Certain Recommendation to Separate
As a final task in this section, would you please do the following: The items listed below have been suggested as important considerations in the process of deciding to separate a child from his/her parents. For each item, assign a number from 1 - 100, which indicates how important it is in your separation decision-making. 100 would indicate most important and 1 would indicate least important.

- Condition of Physical Abuse
- Condition of Sexual Abuse
- Condition of Physical Neglect
- Condition of Emotional Maltreatment
- Condition of Dependency
- Condition of Unruliness
- Age of Child
- Prior Family Contacts with F.C.C.S.
- Availability of Resources to Work with the Situation
- Parental Ability to Function
- Parental Willingness to Change
- Parent/Child Relationship
- Child Ability to Function
- Child View of Separation
SECTION III: DECISION-MAKING AND CHILD WELFARE PRACTICE

Please respond by either checking, filling in or circling the answer which best corresponds to your knowledge or opinion of the question.

1. Have you reviewed the agency document, "Administrative and Program Staff Report on Planned Placement?"
   Yes ____  No ____

2. If you have reviewed that document, have the guidelines it details assisted you in making the recommendation to separate a child from his/her parents?
   Yes ____  No ____

3. Do you use other specific guidelines to assist in the decision to separate? If so, please indicate their name and source.

4. Would you say that the decision to separate a child contributes to the job stress of either a child welfare direct service worker or supervisor?
   Yes ____  No ____

5. If the answer to Item 4 is yes, how is this stress handled or minimized in your agency?
APPENDIX B

CODING/DATA ANALYSIS GUIDE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Respondent Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>1. XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1. Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Direct Service worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>Yrs--Pres</td>
<td>00-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>Yrs--Tot</td>
<td>00-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ed--Back</td>
<td>1. BS/BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. BSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. MSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17-18</td>
<td>Profile</td>
<td>001-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>01-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Phys--Ab</td>
<td>0. Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. At Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sex--Ab</td>
<td>0. Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. At Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Phys--Neg</td>
<td>0. Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. At Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Emot--Mal</td>
<td>0. Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. At Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Depend</td>
<td>0. Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. At Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 26 | Unruly | 0. Not  
26 |        | 1. At Risk  
26 |        | 2. Confirmed  
| 27 | Prior--Co | 0-3  
| 28 | Resource | 1. Not Available  
| 28 |        | 2. Available But Limited  
| 28 |        | 3. Available  
| 29 | Par--Func | 1. Severely Limited (Unlikely)  
| 29 |        | 2. Moderately Limited (Possible)  
| 29 |        | 3. Good (Able to Change)  
| 30 | Par--Will | 1. Willing and Open  
| 30 |        | 2. Somewhat Willing  
| 30 |        | 3. Openly Hostile  
| 31 | PC--Rela | 1. Satisfactory, Accepting  
| 31 |        | 2. Supportive But Conflictual  
| 31 |        | 3. Strained, Rejecting  
| 32 | Chi--Func | 1. Severely Limited  
| 32 |        | 2. Moderately Limited  
| 32 |        | 3. Good  
| 33 | Chi-View | 1. Acceptance  
| 33 |        | 2. Willingness But Expressed Concern  
| 33 |        | 3. Anxiety and Resistance  
| 34-35 | Decision | 00-10  
| 36 | Reviewed | 1. Yes  
| 36 |        | 2. No  
| 37 | Assisted | 1. Yes  
| 37 |        | 2. No  
| 38 | Stress | 1. Yes  
| 38 |        | 2. No  