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Foreword

The staff of the National Child Protection Clearinghouse have led the movement in this country to close the gap between what we know and what we do in child protection. For this reason, the newly established Australian Centre for Child Protection was very pleased to be able to commission the Clearinghouse to undertake this Audit as its very first priority.

We hope that policy makers, practitioners, researchers and community members will make full use this most valuable document which pulls together the diverse research which has been done in Australia in relation to preventing, identifying and responding to child abuse and neglect.

We are delighted with the prospect that the Australian Institute of Family Studies will use the database created for this project as an ongoing resource for the research community and service sector. This will enable new research being undertaken to be identified and disseminated.

The time is now ripe for a new partnership between funders of research, researchers, policy makers, managers and practitioners. It will require resources such as money and skills, but the most important resource will be the best we can find within ourselves to work together. We all have our individual and institutional interests and imperatives, but working with one another is the only hope for the most vulnerable children and families in our society.

Professor Dorothy Scott
Director, Australian Centre for Child Protection
University of South Australia
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Preface

This report, the National Audit of Child Protection Research 1995-2004, builds on the groundbreaking work by Associate Professor Judy Cashmore and Dr Frank Ainsworth in 2004, in completing the Audit of Out of Home Care research. Their audit highlighted the small amount of research in out of home care in Australia, as does the current volume in relation to child protection research. The authors of this report greatly valued Professor Cashmore’s willingness to act as a consultant and critical friend to the project.

Ideally, the database of projects identified in the current audit will continue to grow and, as such, will represent an increasingly useful resource, both for the Australian Centre for Child Protection and the Australian Institute of Family Studies. Beyond the Institute and the Australian Centre, the audit and database will be available to researchers and policy makers, and will be invaluable in establishing current and future research priorities.

At a seminar she gave at the Australian Institute of Family Studies earlier this year, Professor Dorothy Scott, Foundation Director of the Australian Centre for Child Protection, highlighted the need for a National Research Agenda in the child protection field. I acknowledge the vision of Professor Scott and her colleagues in commissioning this audit, which is an important step in establishing such an agenda. We are delighted to be working collaboratively with Professor Scott and the Australian Centre for Child Protection. The National Child Protection Clearinghouse, within the Institute, values highly this opportunity for collaboration.

I congratulate the authors, Daryl Higgins, Ren Adams, Leah Bromfield, Nick Richardson and Melissa Aldana, for adding an important resource to the available literature on child protection.

Alan Hayes
Director
Australian Institute of Family Studies
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Executive Summary

The purpose of the audit is to bring together and disseminate information about Australian research projects in the fields of child protection and early intervention to prevent child abuse and neglect. In keeping with the aims of the audit of out-of-home care research (Cashmore and Ainsworth 2004), the specific aims of the current audit were to:

- identify child protection and early intervention research being conducted in Australia in the past decade;
- assess gaps and recognise duplication;
- enable Australian child protection research to be placed within an international context; and
- identify priorities for future research.

The aim of the audit was to identify all research that has been (or is being) conducted in Australia in the past 10 years in the field of child protection and early intervention. This audit was based on the same methodology as the audit of Australian out-of-home care research (Cashmore and Ainsworth 2004). It identifies the research areas that have been covered, and outlines the key messages emerging from this research as well as gaps and directions for future research.

Exclusion criteria were:

- evaluations of generic programs (e.g., family support) or health promotion strategies if the prevention of child abuse & neglect is not specifically targeted;
- non-evaluative program descriptions;
- tertiary/intervention research for adult victims; and
- out-of-home care research (an audit has already been conducted).

The level of response to the audit was lower than anticipated, with library searches identifying a number of publications and theses that would be relevant to the audit, but whose authors did not respond to the current audit. One of the factors that may have contributed to the low response rate for the audit was the perception of what constitutes ‘research’. People may not identify their project as ‘research’, particularly case audits and program evaluations conducted by governments and non-government agencies responsible for service provision. Analysis of the 135 valid responses to the audit showed that all abuse types were covered. A key area of focus was policy analysis. Other priorities were abuse prevention programs for children, identification of risk factors, and attitudes to child abuse and neglect.

The research identified and reviewed in this audit was largely qualitative (that is, interviews, focus groups, etc.). Research objectives tended to be exploratory rather than theoretically based and confirmatory (that is, research was descriptive rather than testing any hypotheses or identifying underlying causal relationships). It appeared, based on the reliance on descriptive statistics, that quantitative research was also primarily non-experimental and tended to rely on categorical1 rather than continuous data. There was a heavy reliance on existing case records for data.

---

1 *Categorical data* refers to data that is grouped into categories - for example, yes/no answers, gender, income band, or family type. *Continuous data* refer to data measured on a continuum with fixed interval and are able to be subjected to mathematical calculations (that is, addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, etc.) - for example, weight in kilograms, or number of children.
There are numerous types of research designs including case study, retrospective, cross-sectional, experimental, quasi-experimental, non-experimental and longitudinal designs. The study design impacts upon the accuracy of the research findings. Child maltreatment may occur at anytime in a child’s development. Similarly, the consequences of maltreatment may manifest at any time throughout the lifespan of child maltreatment survivors. Longitudinal designs are recommended over cross-sectional and retrospective research designs, as they are able to demonstrate causal relationships. In this audit, projects tended to be cross-sectional and retrospective. There were few examples of longitudinal data being collected. The qualitative research generally appeared to use adequate sample size. However, there appeared to be an over-reliance on qualitative research designs in this field. This is problematic, as qualitative research alone does not provide an adequate evidence base that can be generalised.

The strength of the research conducted was the breadth and diversity of areas covered. The detailed project descriptions submitted by the 135 respondents to the audit suggest that Australian researchers investigating child maltreatment and child protection issues have relied heavily on notifications and substantiations of ‘maltreatment’ recorded by statutory child protection services as their source of data. Consistent with this trend, there was a heavy reliance on case records as a source of data. Research that investigated a single maltreatment sub-type or specific combination of sub-types tended to focus on child sexual abuse and family violence; there was a lack of research investigating issues specifically associated with child physical abuse, psychological maltreatment or neglect. Although there were one or two exceptions, generally there was a lack of research on specific cultural groups or cultural issues, particularly in Indigenous communities (where there were only two specifically targeted projects).

The audit has highlighted the low level of collaboration between institutions, and the overall low level of funding in child protection related research. The level of funding for child protection research projects identified in this audit is very small when compared with the overall cost of statutory service delivery (child protection and out-of-home care), and other child and family welfare services. There was also little focus on researching individuals or families who were in groups that were at a high-risk for abuse and neglect (for example, drug or alcohol dependent parents). This is problematic, given that this is an area where child abuse and neglect prevention efforts are most needed and are likely to have a more significant impact.

We hope that the results of this audit—together with the results of the audit of out-of-home care research by Cashmore and Ainsworth (2004)—will provide a valuable tool for answering questions about the latest research projects and findings being conducted in Australia. The prospect of wider public access to the audit results (in an on-line format of the database) could also be considered as a user-friendly way of encouraging access to the information.
The child protection systems in each state and territory in Australia are currently under considerable pressure, as are the child and family agencies that conduct early intervention and prevention programs to reduce the incidence and impact of child abuse and neglect. Nationally, the number of children who have been the subject of a notification has increased dramatically. For example, notifications nationally have risen from 107,134 in 1999-2000 to 219,384 in 2003-4 (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2005). There is a number of explanations, such as changes in mandatory reporting, public campaigns and government reviews highlighting the problem of child maltreatment, and the changes in child protection systems focusing on the role of receiving, recording and investigating allegations of harm. The number of allegations of harm or risk of harm that are substantiated is also increasing (albeit at a lower rate than notifications), with a rise from 24,732 in 1999-2000 to 40,416 in 2002-2003 (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2005). What is clear is that child protection systems will not be able to cope with a continued increase in child protection notifications. We need to do better at prevention and early intervention.

A viable and effective approach to the protection of children and the prevention of harm across Australia requires these efforts to be informed by a broad, robust research base. We need to know which approaches work, which approaches used internationally are likely to be appropriate for Australia, and where our efforts should be best targeted. We also need to know where scarce research dollars should be directed for future research projects. In sum, a national child protection research agenda is needed.

Such an agenda needs to be based on a thorough analysis of the existing research. Before we move forward and set an agenda for future research priorities, it is timely to take stock of what research has already been conducted or is currently underway. The first step in the formation of a national research agenda in relation to the protection of children and the prevention of abuse and neglect is to catalogue the research that has currently been conducted. This will then allow us to answer questions such as:

- What have been the areas of focus?
- What are the gaps in research?
- What research is focused on child abuse prevention?
- Where has the funding for child protection research come from to date?
- What research has been conducted to show which programs or interventions are working – and should continue to receive funding?

A similar task has been performed in relation to research in the field of out-of-home care. Cashmore and Ainsworth (2004) published the results of their audit, in which they identified 94 projects completed or currently underway in Australia over a 10-year period. The audit highlighted key gaps such as national or multi-site projects; few replication studies; little research on forms of care other than foster care; and a lack of research on vulnerable subgroups within the out-of-home care population (e.g., Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children; children with culturally-diverse backgrounds; children with disabilities, complex behaviour problems, or other high-needs groups). The authors were able to suggest a number of key areas that could form the basis of priorities for future research (Cashmore and Ainsworth 2004).

The current audit will, alongside the audit of out-of-home care research, document research conducted over the past decade in Australia in the field of child abuse prevention, the protection of children, and the care of children subject to a child protection intervention.

---

2 National data for 2003-4 were not available, as data for NSW were not available, which is the jurisdiction with the largest population and the largest number of child protection notifications and substantiations.
The aim of the audit was to identify all research that has been (or is being) conducted in Australia in the past 10 years in the field of child protection and early intervention. This audit was based on similar methodology as the audit of Australian out-of-home care research (Cashmore and Ainsworth 2004). It provides a thorough identification of research areas that have been covered, and the key messages emerging from this research as well as gaps and directions for future research.

This audit differs from previous audits that have been conducted by the National Child Protection Clearinghouse. These other audits have focused on child abuse prevention programs (Tomison 2000; Tomison and Poole 2000); the focus of this audit is on research. Of the 1814 prevention programs identified, 1357 (85% of the programs) included some form of rudimentary evaluation (e.g., measuring participant satisfaction); 435 (23.8%) had pre- and post-test data, but only 47 (2.6%) included a comparison group (Tomison and Poole 2000). Although the earlier audits indicated that agencies were increasingly incorporating evaluation into their program planning and delivery, only one quarter of programs incorporated independent external evaluation (Tomison and Poole 2000). Tomison (2000) also concluded that

“few ‘gold standard’ evaluations have been done in Australia... As a result, although policymakers’ expectations of what may be accomplished by evaluation continue to grow, evaluators (and service providers) have generally become much more conservative in their claims about the potential of evaluations to demonstrate ‘success’...”

(p. 15).

The current audit of child protection research involved sending out a request to researchers asking them to complete a survey describing their past or current research studies. This involved contacting service agencies, research departments and universities via email and phone to identify relevant projects that have been – or are currently being – conducted, and asking the researcher to complete the online survey.

The aims of the audit

The purpose of the audit is to bring together and disseminate information about research projects in child protection and early intervention research in Australia. In keeping with the aims of the audit of out-of-home care research (Cashmore and Ainsworth 2004), the specific aims were to:

- identify child protection and early intervention research conducted in Australia over the past decade;
- to assess gaps and identify duplication;
- to enable Australian child protection research to be placed within an international context; and
- identify priorities for future research.
The first step was to conduct database searches to identify the main topics and fields of research to be included in the audit. The decision on how broad to make the inclusion criteria was made in part by the practicalities of conducting an in-depth audit and the likely number of responses. The focus was research on child protection and on the prevention of child abuse and neglect.

In order to appropriately limit the scope of the current audit to research on child protection and the prevention of abuse and neglect, the following areas of research were excluded from the audit:

- evaluations of generic programs (e.g., family support) or health promotion strategies if the prevention of child abuse and neglect is not specifically targeted;
- non-evaluative program descriptions;
- process evaluation or quality assurance procedures (where the impact or outcome of the program is not assessed);
- tertiary/intervention research for adult victims; and
- out-of-home care research (as it is already covered in the report by Cashmore and Ainsworth 2004).

Research studies on the long-term effects of child abuse and neglect on adults were also excluded unless they addressed one of the specific issues identified in the inclusion criteria outlined in the next section (e.g., prevalence; the treatment of offenders, etc.). The study of the effects of abuse on adults constitutes a large area of research. Internationally, there are many journals devoted to the topic, and many university research students regularly choose topics for their honours, masters and doctoral theses that are related to the long-term effects of child maltreatment on adults. In the Australian Institute of Family Studies library alone, more than 345 research publications were identified that addressed the effects of abuse on adults. The negative effects of abuse and neglect experienced during childhood on the health and wellbeing of adults have been well-documented (Higgins and McCabe 2003). The focus of the current audit instead is to identify research relevant to the goal of protecting children and preventing child abuse and neglect.

**Audit Criteria**

The audit includes research looking at the following forms of abuse and neglect:

- sexual abuse;
- physical abuse;
- psychological maltreatment (including emotional abuse/neglect);
- physical neglect; and
- witnessing family violence (exposure to domestic violence).

The audit covers qualitative and quantitative empirical research conducted in Australia in the 10 years from 1995 to 2004. There are two broad types of research that are included in the audit:

(a) Evaluation of the outcomes of programs including:

- prevention programs for children;
- tertiary intervention programs (e.g., group or individual therapy) for child victims of abuse or neglect;
- child-focused programs within adult-oriented services (e.g., in a sexual assault, domestic violence, or substance abuse service);
family support programs;
- parent education programs;
- community education programs;
- statutory child protection services; and
- specialist/innovative child protection service programs.

(b) Other child protection research:
- reporting abuse and neglect;
- approaches to risk assessment;
- identification of risk factors for child maltreatment;
- community and professional attitudes to child abuse and neglect;
- prevalence/incidence of abuse and neglect;
- methodological/theoretical issues in the measurement or prevention of child abuse and neglect;
- treatment of adult offenders (e.g., perpetrators of child physical or sexual abuse);
- treatment of adolescent offenders;
- customer service surveys of specific prevention programs or services (e.g., parental perceptions of child protection services); and
- policy analysis or government reports.

Procedure

Service agencies relevant to child and family welfare, all universities, relevant government departments, institutes and research centres, as well as other key agencies and individuals were invited to participate. As described in the sections below, each agency or organisation was initially contacted by phone. Following the verbal contact, a letter of introduction was sent to each organisation explaining the research and inviting them and the members of their organisation to contribute to the audit. The letter refers the reader to the online audit form to complete (see Appendix A).³

The letter highlighted the importance of disseminating the information to “all available staff, members, member organisations and affiliates of your organisation” as well as to “anyone whom you believe may have conducted research in the field of child protection and early intervention in Australia at any time in the past 10 years”. The original deadline for submissions to the audit was listed in these communications as April 22, 2005. Due to slow responses, and the implementation of additional strategies to improve responses to the audit (as outlined later), the deadline was extended to July 1, 2005. All researchers and organisations were asked to complete the web form and submit it electronically. All those submitting a description of their research to the audit were also asked to send a copy of their research reports, either electronically or via post, to the National Child Protection Clearinghouse.

1. Service agencies

Child and family welfare agencies were identified from the National Child Protection Clearinghouse database of key stakeholders in the field of child protection and by conducting Internet searches, ‘link’ pages on the websites of peak bodies, and by personal referrals from members of other agencies. Internet searches were made, followed by phone contact with key staff to explain the purpose and procedure for the audit. This included a verbal request to disseminate the information as widely as possible and to make it wholly available to all members of staff and affiliates of the organisation.

All agencies contacted were asked to use their internal email lists to distribute the audit information to staff and, where appropriate, to members or clients of the organisation. They were also asked, where applicable, to place information regarding the audit within internal or membership-based electronic newsletters, directing the reader to the audit website. Although good

³ Advice from the Australian Institute of Family Studies’ Ethics Committee indicated that no ethics clearance was required because this was secondary research requiring researchers to complete an on-line template (i.e., survey) about their research.
direction was provided in relation to on how the information could be disseminated, the decision on how this was done by individual agencies was entirely theirs. A total of 30 different agencies or peak bodies were contacted directly (verbal and email). All readily agreed to assist the audit process. These were:

- Association of Children’s Welfare Agencies (NSW);
- Advocates for Survivors of Child Abuse;
- Australian Association of Social Workers;
- Australian Childhood Foundation;
- Australian Council for Children & Youth Organisations;
- Australian Foster Care Association;
- Australian Healthcare Association;
- Australian Private Hospitals Association;
- Australian Psychological Society;
- Catholic Welfare Australia;
- Child and Family Welfare Association of Australia;
- ChildWise Australia;
- Children of Parents with a Mental Illness;
- Children’s Protection Society;
- CREATE Foundation;
- Families Australia;
- Foster Care Association (NSW);
- Kids First Foundation;
- Kids Help Line;
- National Association for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect;
- National Association of Community Legal Centres;
- National Children’s and Youth Law Centre;
- New South Wales Council of Social Service;
- New South Wales Family Services;
- PeakCare Queensland;
- Philanthropy Australia;
- Save the Children;
- Secretariat of National Aboriginal and Islander Child Care;
- Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare (formerly the Children’s Welfare Association of Victoria); and
- Youth Accommodation Association.

In addition, the Child and Family Welfare Association of Australia Inc (CAFWAA)—the national peak body for the sector—sent an email inviting people to participate in the audit to all of its 18 member agencies in the states and territories, with instructions to forward on to staff within those organisations. These peak agencies cover approximately 240 service delivery agencies across Australia.

The audit was also advertised on the National Child Protection Clearinghouse website (www.aifs.gov.au/nch), a message was posted on the Clearinghouse e-discussion list for child protection practitioners (childprotect), and a flier was sent out to more than 8000 individuals and organisations on the Clearinghouse mailing list, which includes an extensive list of child and family welfare agencies, child protection workers and professionals working with children and families.

2. Universities

A list of key contacts for all universities across Australia was compiled, primarily by using the AVCC list titled “Senior Officers in Australian Higher Education Institutions, AVCC and HES”, by comprehensive searches on university web sites, and by referral from university staff. A total of 272 contacts from 38 universities were identified in this process.

The initial approach was to contact the Research Office at each University (usually the office of the Pro-Vice Chancellor of Research), to ask that a database search be made of research projects covering
child protection and/or early intervention topics. Each Research Office was also asked to ensure that the information regarding the audit was circulated throughout all applicable areas within the university. As a guide, it was suggested they circulate the request to staff in the following discipline areas: Social Work, Sociology, Education, Psychology, Early Childhood Studies, Law, History, and Health.

Following direction from research office staff as well as consulting the AVCC list and web searches, heads of schools and/or deans of departments/faculties were also contacted. They were asked to circulate the audit email to all staff under their direction. Specific centres and/or institutes with a child protection and/or early intervention focus were also identified throughout web searches and contacted individually where possible.

3. Governments

Key Commonwealth, state and territory government contacts were identified using the databases held by the National Child Protection Clearinghouse, contacts and referrals from state government departments and internet searches. These covered the departments concerned with child protection and welfare as well other departments, such as health and education, where these departments were identified as carrying out child protection research by government staff.

All state and territory government department contacts were asked to circulate the audit information throughout their entire department as well as forward to associated bodies where child protection research might have been conducted.

4. Funding Bodies

The National Health and Medical Research Council (NH&MRC) and the Australian Research Council (ARC) were contacted and asked to search their databases to identify potential research projects funded by them that may meet our criteria, using the following search terms:

- child abuse;
- child neglect;
- child maltreatment;
- child protection;
- child and “domestic violence or family violence or spousal assault”;
- child and “sexual assault”;
- child abuse prevention;
- sexual abuse prevention;
- family preservation;
- child and perpetrator;
- parent and perpetrator;
- psychological maltreatment;
- emotional abuse;
- emotional neglect;
- physical neglect;
- physical abuse;
- sexual abuse; or
- incest.

If it was not possible or practicable to use this number of terms, they were asked to use the terms “child protection”, “abuse” or “neglect” or “maltreatment” with “prevention” and/or “early intervention”.

The national peak body for philanthropic organisations, Philanthropy Australia, was asked to distribute information regarding the audit to member organisations. Unfortunately, there is no central database listing all philanthropic organisations and Philanthropy Australia was not able to ‘group email’ all trusts and foundations for this purpose. Philanthropy Australia identified a couple of “affinity groups” of philanthropic funding bodies who are interested in early intervention issues and forwarded our request for information to them. They included a note about the audit in their
newsletter. Philanthropy Australia advised that there are approximately 2000 philanthropic organisations in Australia, but that about 200 are members of their organisation, and 360 are listed in “The Australian Directory of Philanthropy”. Organisations listed in the latest edition of the Directory as having a specialist interest in funding child protection research or activities were deemed to belong to the “affinity groups” mentioned previously.

5. Other key contacts

Other key contacts, including major government-sponsored organisations and research institutes, were identified and contacts were provided with audit information for dissemination throughout the institutes and associated centres:

- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare
- Australian Institute of Criminology
- State/territory commissions for children and young people (NSW, QLD, Tasmania)
- Australian Institute of Family Studies:
  - The audit form was hosted on the website for the National Child Protection Clearinghouse, and email alerts were sent to people who have signed up to the “What’s new at AIFS” email alert.
  - All subscribers to childprotect, an e-mail discussion list operated by the National Child Protection Clearinghouse (currently in excess of 500 subscribers) were sent the email inviting them to contribute any research to the audit, and to pass the request on to colleagues who may have conducted relevant research in the past 10 years.
  - To improve the slow response, a small brochure was published to promote the audit as an insert for the Autumn 2005 (No. 22) edition of “Child Abuse Prevention Issues” series published by the National Child Protection Clearinghouse. The publication was distributed to over 8130 recipients in May 2005.
  - Researchers were contacted who were identified in a database of known child protection research projects compiled 1995-1998 by the Australian Institute of Criminology library before the National Child Protection Clearinghouse moved from the Australian Institute of Criminology to the Australian Institute of Family Studies.
  - All researchers identified in the 2004 audit of Australian out-of-home care research by Cashmore and Ainsworth (2004) were also sent an email about the current audit of child protection research, asking them to submit details of research they have conducted which was not included within that audit.

6. Library searches

As the number of audit responses were lower than expected, it was decided to compare the projects identified by the respondents with the results of literature searches of research conducted by Australian researchers, or published in Australian journals in the same time period, using the same inclusion and exclusion criteria. As anticipated, the library searches identified considerably more publications than those identified in the audit, suggesting that many researchers were either not aware of the audit, were no longer working in the field, or that they—and the organisation where they were working—did not perceive their publication as ‘research’.

Comprehensive searches were made, utilising the Australian Institute of Family Studies’ database: Australian Family & Society Abstracts. This is a bibliographic database that indexes and abstracts articles from published and unpublished material on research, policy and practice issues about, or of relevance to, Australian families. Source documents include journals, conference papers, books, book chapters, government publications, research reports, discussion and working papers, statistical documents, annual reports, bibliographies and theses. Articles and reports by Australian authors or about Australian social issues published in overseas sources are also included.

The initial strategy was to collate all results obtained from Australian Family & Society Abstracts via the following searches on: “child abuse” or “child neglect” or “child sexual abuse” or “child protection” or “emotional abuse” or “family support”. These searches were done year by year, from 1995 through 2005. A total of 3,365 results were found.
To determine the eligibility of these 3,365 publications, a two-stage process of qualification was undertaken. First, the researchers made a quick judgement based on the project abstract as to whether the research appeared to meet the criteria. This narrowed the list of potential projects to 1,094. Secondly, these 1,094 records were then scrutinised more thoroughly and coded according to the particular types of research that they represented. An attempt was then made to categorise each publication into one of the 18 research topics used for the audit. Projects were also classified according to which of the five maltreatment types were addressed. The result of this process provided 353 research projects that fit within the audit criteria. These consisted of 151 journal articles, 80 agency or government reports, 16 books or chapters, 49 conference proceedings, 56 conference papers and one thesis. For the results of library search, see Appendix D.

From the first author’s experiences teaching in a university psychology department, examining theses, and hearing presentations from students at conferences, it was known that many postgraduate university students conduct research on child protection issues – yet few student research projects were identified in the audit. In order to try and identify some of these theses, a search was conducted of the Australian Digital Thesis database, which holds records of theses from a number of Australian universities. This was supplemented by individual searches of university websites. Using both search strategies, 165 theses on topics that appeared to meet the audit criteria were identified. These are listed in Appendix E. As most of the authors did not complete the audit template, these theses were not able to be included in the analyses; however, when taken together with the publications identified in Appendices C and D, these listings of publications provide a relatively comprehensive view of the current state of child protection research publications produced in Australia in the decade 1995-2004.

7. Personal contacts

Personal networks of the National Child Protection Clearinghouse staff, the external consultant (Associate Professor Judy Cashmore) and Professor Dorothy Scott (Australian Centre for Child Protection at the University of South Australia, who commissioned the research) were used to encourage participation in the audit. This included promoting the audit among networks such as:

- National Child Protection Clearinghouse Reference Group
- Queensland Department of Child Safety Research Advisory Group
- Australian Research Alliance on Children and Youth (ARACY)
- Other key researchers in the field of child protection
- National Statutory Child Protection Learning and Development Group (an information-sharing and discussion forum organised and attended by state and territory child protection learning and development staff)
A total of 135 research projects that met the criteria were included in the audit. These are listed in Appendix B. As well as identifying the title of the project, other key information is also listed to enable matching with publications arising from the audit, as listed in Appendix C. These include: the name of the key contact person, other investigators, current status (completed/ongoing), and project identification number.

Research questions addressed in this audit are described below under five key topics:

- Coverage;
- Research Infrastructure;
- Methodology;
- Productivity; and
- Findings.

A. Coverage

1. Number of research projects examining each type of abuse or neglect

Researchers currently talk about five different types of child maltreatment: (a) sexual abuse; (b) physical abuse; (c) psychological maltreatment – including emotional abuse and psychological neglect; (d) physical neglect; and, more recently, (e) witnessing family violence. Respondents to the audit were asked to select which of these five types of maltreatment were addressed in their research. They could select either one type (if their project was exclusively focused on a particular form of abuse or neglect), or multiple types. If the research was generic or addressed the five forms of maltreatment, respondents could select all five (the number of projects assessing each type therefore sum to more than 100%). Of the 135 projects included in the audit, the total number of research projects for each maltreatment type is described in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maltreatment type(s):</th>
<th>Number of research projects:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological maltreatment</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect (physical)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessing family violence</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 5 maltreatment types</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In just over half of the research projects (54 per cent) all five maltreatment types were addressed. In the remaining 62 projects (46 per cent), either one type or, most commonly, a combination of two, three or four maltreatment types were addressed. The area that received the least attention was children’s exposure to domestic or family violence.

The inclusion of all maltreatment types may be seen as a reflection of the maturity of the child protection research community in Australia. Internationally, child maltreatment research has...
developed considerably over the past 40 years since the issues came to public recognition with the publication of the first paper on physical abuse in 1962 (Kempe, Silverman, Steele, Droegemueller and Silver 1962). In the past two decades in particular, extensive attention has been given to evaluating the prevalence and impact of childhood experiences of sexual abuse (Rind, Tromovitch and Baurerman 1998) and, to a lesser extent, physical abuse and physical neglect (Malinosky-Rummell and Hansen 1993). More recently, attention has been directed to understanding the nature, prevalence, and consequences of psychological maltreatment (Briere and Runtz 1990; O’Hagan 1995) and of witnessing family violence during childhood (Parkinson and Humphreys 1998).

At first glance, it appears that all types of maltreatment are being addressed in research on the prevention of child abuse and neglect. As we note later, however, when the content of the results and implications are analysed, a different picture can be seen, with some evidence of a greater focus on sexual abuse than other forms of abuse. This is consistent with a general societal prioritisation of issues concerning sexual abuse, compared with other maltreatment types (Higgins 2004). Given that respondents selected the maltreatment types that their research addressed, it may also be the case that the inclusion of all maltreatment types in more than half of the projects could reflect a failure on the part of respondents to adequately differentiate the maltreatment types that were addressed.

There is a growing body of evidence to show that maltreatment sub-types do not occur independently and that a significant proportion of maltreated individuals experience not only repeated episodes of one type of maltreatment, but are likely to be the victim of other forms of abuse or neglect (Higgins 2004; Higgins and McCabe 2000; McGee, Wolfe and Wilson 1997; Ney, Fung and Wickett 1994). The term “multi-type maltreatment” can be used to describe the experience of those who have experienced abusive or neglectful behaviours in more than one of the five categories mentioned (Higgins and McCabe 2000). Children from “depriving” families experience the deprivation of parental/caregiver love and protection in multiple ways. In the past, researchers have typically examined each of the maltreatment sub-types in isolation, with little attempt to evaluate their coexistence or the long-term correlates of experiencing multiple types of maltreatment (Rosenberg 1987). In contrast, the findings from the current audit would suggest that research being done in the prevention and early intervention fields in Australia may be more holistic than research looking at the long-term impact of abuse. This reflects the reality that very often, parents’ (or other adults’) negative behaviours fall into more than one category of maltreatment, and so prevention efforts need to address the variety of ways in which children are at risk of harm.

2. Number of projects addressing different topics

Table 2 provides a summary of the number of projects identified against each of the 18 topic categories on the audit form. Researchers were asked to nominate which type (or types) of abuse or neglect their research addressed (as described above). These are cross-tabulated against the research topic summary, to provide a comprehensive view of the range of topics and maltreatment types that have been covered.

The most important point is that there is no one topic, nor a single maltreatment type that has been ignored. The most frequent research output is in the form of policy analysis or government reports. At one level, this looks promising: it is important for the research community not only to generate empirical data, but to also use existing documents, policy statements and practices as a unit of analysis. On closer examination, however, much of the output here can be attributed to internal research reports generated by the state and territory governments responsible for the child protection systems in Australia. Relative to the expenditure on child protection and related services, this does not reflect a high level of research activity (38 projects over ten years across 8 states and territories).

The second most frequent topic is evaluation of prevention programs for children. In all, 35 research projects focused on evaluation of a program aimed at preventing one or more type of abuse or neglect. Almost half of the research projects (17 out of 35) were evaluations of prevention programs that addressed all five maltreatment types.

Another key focus of research activity is on the identification of risk factors for child maltreatment (n = 31) and community or professional attitudes to child abuse and neglect (n = 31). These are key
elements for understanding the causes of maltreatment, and the best ways to intervene. A thorough evidence-base in these two areas will position future activities in designing prevention programs, and addressing obstacles to implementation of prevention efforts.

The topics with the smallest number of respondents indicating their research addressed this issue are:
- child-focused programs within adult-oriented services (e.g., sexual assault, domestic violence or substance abuse services) \( (n = 9) \);
- community education programs \( (n = 8) \);
- treatment of adult offenders (e.g., perpetrators of child physical or sexual abuse) \( (n = 9) \); and
- treatment of adolescent offenders \( (n = 7) \).

It should be noted that in relation to program evaluation, the level of research may or may not be proportional to the size of the service sector or the number of programs addressing this issue. Any judgments about the number of research projects should therefore be judged within the context of the size of the service sector (e.g., the number of programs). However, another dimension is the importance of the issue, and the capacity of quality research to inform programs and services that are likely to have a significant impact on the incidence of child abuse and neglect.

The lack of research submitted to the audit on child-focused programs within adult-oriented services may mean that children are rendered invisible within many adult-focused services. An important area for future research is the capacity for those providing services for adults to be aware of the presence of children in the lives of their adult clients, to tailor specific child-focused services to address their needs, and to incorporate rigorous evaluation to document the efficacy of such services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Types of research by types of maltreatment ((N = 135))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maltreatment Types Addressed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention programs for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary intervention programs for child victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-focused programs within adult-oriented services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Child Protection Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/innovative Child Protection Service programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Child Protection Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting abuse &amp; neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of risk factors for child maltreatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; professional attitudes to child abuse &amp; neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence/incidence of abuse &amp; neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological/theoretical issues in the measurement or prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of adult offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of adolescent offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service surveys of specific prevention programs or services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy analysis or government reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Changes in the focus over the 10 years (1995-2004)

To see whether there has been any ‘developmental’ shift in the focus of research across the 10 years covered by the audit, the number of projects commencing prior to 1995, as well as those projects that commenced between 1995 and 1997 were compared with those commencing recently (2001-2004). Projects where no commencement date was listed were excluded from this analysis. The total number of projects with a valid commencement date listed was 96 (71% of total sample). The cross-tabulations described in Table 2 were re-calculated for projects commenced prior and including 1997 ($n = 28; 29\%$), and again for projects that commenced between 2001 and 2004 ($n = 40; 42\%$).

Table 3 shows the breakdown of projects commenced prior and including 1997. Comparing the proportion of projects for each topic with those identified in Table 4 (which shows projects that commenced between 2001 and 2004), a number of similarities and differences can be identified.

Projects commencing recently (2001-2004) appear to have a slightly different focus: there were more projects focused on the evaluation of tertiary intervention programs, on child-focused programs within adult services, as well as family support, parent education and community education programs. In contrast, there were fewer projects commencing in 2001 or later evaluating the treatment of adult offenders compared with those projects commencing prior to 1997.

#### Table 3: Research commenced prior to and including 1997 ($N = 28$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maltreatment Types Addressed</th>
<th>Sexual Abuse</th>
<th>Physical Abuse</th>
<th>Psychological Abuse</th>
<th>Physical Neglect</th>
<th>Witnessing family violence</th>
<th>All maltreatment types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention programs for children</td>
<td>5 6 5 5 3 3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary intervention programs for child victims</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-focused programs within adult-oriented services</td>
<td>2 1 0 1 0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support programs</td>
<td>1 3 3 3 2 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education programs</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community education programs</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Child Protection Services</td>
<td>5 5 4 5 1 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/innovative Child Protection Service programs</td>
<td>3 4 4 4 4 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Child Protection Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting abuse &amp; neglect</td>
<td>7 6 3 5 2 2 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to risk assessment</td>
<td>6 6 3 4 3 2 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of risk factors for child maltreatment</td>
<td>10 9 6 7 5 4 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; professional attitudes to child abuse &amp; neglect</td>
<td>7 6 3 5 3 2 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence/incidence of abuse &amp; neglect</td>
<td>5 6 5 4 3 2 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological/theoretical issues in measurement or prevention</td>
<td>5 6 5 3 3 2 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of adult offenders</td>
<td>6 2 2 2 1 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of adolescent offenders</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service surveys of specific prevention programs or services</td>
<td>4 4 3 4 3 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy analysis or government reports</td>
<td>5 4 3 3 2 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Audit responses compared with literature search results

Table 5 provides a summary of the publications identified from the literature searches compared with those identified by those responding to the audit, using the same cross-tabulation of maltreatment types and topics. (The projects submitted to the audit often had more than one
publication associated with them; however, it is not known whether each publication identified in this literature search is related to a discrete project, or whether there are multiple publications arising from some projects.). Comparing the results shown in Table 2 (audit response) and Table 5 (literature search), proportionately, publications identified in the literature search were more often focused on statutory child protection services, community and professional attitudes to child abuse and neglect; and policy analysis or government reports. The proportion of publications from the literature focused on parent education programs was lower than in audit responses, suggesting that studies in this area may be primarily for in-house use and that publishing in academic journals is not a high priority for service delivery organisations.
B. Research infrastructure and funding

4. Geographic breakdown of location of research

Table 6 provides a state-by-state breakdown of the location of each research project and clearly indicates that Queensland was the state with the greatest number of respondents to the audit, especially from government departments. One possible explanation for this is that it reflects a serious commitment to child protection research by a state that has come under criticism from internal reviews (such as the Crime and Misconduct Commission (CMC) report), and has undergone significant restructuring. The audit data did not, however, provide us with evidence of whether or not the CMC has affected the level of child protection research. Of the 54 Queensland-based projects, 15 were listed as commencing prior to 2003 (when the CMC was underway) and four projects as starting in 2003-4, with an additional 11 ongoing projects without a listed commencement date. Thirty-five audit entries were missing significant details, including commencement dates, so it is not possible to conclude that the CMC has driven significantly more child protection research in Queensland.

It was not within the scope of the audit to investigate, but based on the descriptions provided in their responses, a number of audit entries also appear to be policy or service system reform documents per se, rather than research analysis of policies or government reports.

Queensland is the only state with a department exclusively focused on child safety. All other states or territories have their child protection functions located within a broader department of human or community services (Bromfield and Higgins 2005). Although this may have influenced the results, it could...
also reflect a greater level of knowledge by departmental staff about the audit and its importance, or a commitment by departmental staff to publicising and disseminating the research that is going on in their department. The existence of key research centres in Queensland Universities (particularly the team led by Professor Ros Thorpe at James Cook University) may also have played an important role in the level of child protection-related research contributed to the audit from Queensland.

It is also possible that other states and territories may be doing a similar amount of research, but failed to include it in the audit. A significant amount of self-selection may have occurred. Some states/territories that did not have complete information on a project (including commencement date) may have elected not to submit an audit entry, whereas other states entered projects even though there was little detail provided. It is likely that the differences between states/territories apparent in this audit may reflect the varying levels of participation in the audit as much as actual differences in past or current research activities.

Some jurisdictions have recently established external research collaborations or have funded external research centres, which may enhance their research capacity. For example, the Australian Capital Territory has recently funded the creation of the Institute of Child Protection Studies at the Australian Catholic University, and the Western Australian Department of Community Development supports the University of Western Australia Research Unit for Vulnerable Children and Families.

The small number of research projects in Australian Capital Territory and Tasmania, and the absence of any projects reported for the Northern Territory in part reflect the smaller populations of those states, and therefore their lesser capacity to fund and engage in research projects. Notwithstanding this, the number of projects included in the audit from these states and territories suggests there may be room for improvement in either developing or communicating a research culture in the child protection and child abuse prevention fields, including opportunities such as the current audit to disseminate past and current research activities.

### Table 6: Research by state/territory and organisations where conducted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Government departments</th>
<th>Research Institutes</th>
<th>Agencies</th>
<th>Inter-agency &amp; other collaborations</th>
<th>Total by State</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes projects carried out over multiple organisations. For those conducted across multiple states/territories, only the primary state where the research was based is included.

5. **Types of organisations conducting research**

Universities account for the largest proportion of the research being conducted. Table 6 shows the breakdown by type of organisation where research is conducted in each state and territory. In addition, Table 7 shows the number of projects where respondents to the audit selected more than one organisational type, indicating a low number of collaborative projects. However, when they do occur, it is most likely to be collaboration between universities and either government departments or agencies.

Tables 6 and 7 both show that the number of interagency collaborations, or collaborations between an agency and another type of institution is very low. This is quite concerning, given the important role that universities play in the research community in Australia. As centres of academic excellence, they are most likely to have access to the latest literature, theory development, data, analytic techniques, and expertise in evaluation; however university staff are also constrained by funding and pressures from other duties, such as teaching and administrative responsibilities. Agencies are likely
to have personnel with the ‘on the ground’ experience of program development and implementation and other aspects of service delivery. It would appear from these results that this is an opportunity for fruitful research partnerships that is not as yet being adequately exploited in Australia.

Table 7: Number of research projects by organisation where conducted and collaborations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>In collaboration with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments/hospitals</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research institutes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (including inter-agency collaborations)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages add to more than 100% as respondents could indicate more than one organisational affiliation for each project.

6. Level of funding

Table 8 provides a summary of the funding reported by respondents to the audit. Many of the projects did not list the level of funding, and only few identified ‘in kind’ support offered by institutions or organisations hosting the researchers and their activities.

Table 8: Levels of funding ($N = 47$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$477,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$112,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$40,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,303,637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 47 of the respondents (35 per cent) indicated the level of funding (grant or ‘in kind’ assistance) for their research. The overall level of funding for the projects identified in the audit for the decade 1995-2004 was $5.3 million.

In its Report on Government Services 2004, the Productivity Commission estimated the annual cost of running the eight statutory child protection and out-of-home care systems in Australia was $899 million in 2002-03 (Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision 2005a, b). The total cost of the child protection and out-of-home care systems in Australia for 1995-2004 is estimated to be $6.9 billion. This does not include the significant expenditure by non-government agencies and the philanthropic sector on prevention or other non-statutory early intervention activities. In comparison to the cost of the service sector, the amount of money reported to be spent on research – as reflected in responses to this audit – is very small.

There are some important caveats to this analysis of research funding. The level of funding for research reported here is likely to be a significant underestimation of the full extent of research

---

5 As data are not available back to 1995, the cost of the statutory service system needs to be estimated. In order to make it comparable with the costing of research in this audit (which are reported in actual dollars spent at the time, and not adjusted for inflation), the cost of the service systems needs to be estimated in actual dollars at the time, rather than in current dollars (allowing for inflation). If the mid-point in the decade (1995-2004) is taken as the average annual rate for the period (1999-2000) and multiplied by 10, the total cost of the child protection and out-of-home care systems in Australia for the 10-year period (1995-2004) is estimated to be $6.9 billion. The cost of the out-of-home care sector is included in these calculations, as the level of success in preventing harm to children directly influences the need for out-of-home care - and the out-of-home care sector is part of the continuum of child protection services.
expenditure on child protection, as many projects did not include ‘in-kind’ costs (e.g., where research staff time was already funded by a university or other institution), and the audit significantly under-represents the full extent of research outputs when compared with a literature search for publications in the same period. Given that the number of research publications identified through the literature search outnumbered the audit entries by a ratio of 2.6:1, if the level of funding identified in the current audit is multiplied by 2.6, it still only represents $13.8 million.

Even allowing for the significant underestimation of the extent and costing of research, the figures identified in this audit show that the amount of money spent on research in the child protection field is very small, particularly when compared with the massive ongoing investment per annum in the service sector.

The level of funding ($5.3 million) for the 47 projects for which data were submitted is higher in total than the level of funding reported by the 91 out-of-home care research projects ($3.9 million) identified by Cashmore and Ainsworth (2004) in the same period. Looking at the funding on a per-project basis, the funding levels appear to be significantly higher than those reported in the audit of out-of-home care research, particularly when looking at the mean (which is inflated, due to a few projects with very large amounts of funding). Instead, the median ($40,612) is only moderately higher than that reported in Cashmore and Ainsworth’s audit of out-of-home care research ($29,500). However in both audits there was considerable variability. The higher funding levels per project in the child protection research audit may reflect the focus on the investigatory crisis end of the system. The child protection system has greater numbers of children, and therefore the scope and cost of projects may be higher than in the out-of-home care sector.

7. Type of funding agencies

Table 9 provides a breakdown of the frequency with which different types of funding bodies supported research projects represented in the audit. The largest proportion of projects was funded by Commonwealth Research Granting Agencies (Australian Research Council Discovery, Australian Research Council Strategic Partnerships with Industry-Research and Training (SPIRT) or Linkage Grant Schemes, National Health & Medical Research Council, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, etc.). State/territory or local governments were the next most frequent source of funding. Both statutory child protection services and the child and family welfare agencies who implement many of the prevention and early intervention programs are the responsibilities of state/territories (Bromfield and Higgins 2005).

After commonwealth, state and local government funding, the next highest frequency as a funding source was universities. Around half of the university-funded projects omitted the actual grant amount. Of those that did include an amount, the range was from a small priming grant of $526 to a scholarship worth $17,800 (per annum). The mean for university funding alone is approx $8,000. A small number of projects were funded by agencies, philanthropic trusts, or from other sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of funding body</th>
<th>Frequency (%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Research Granting Agencies - Total**</td>
<td>35 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Local Government</td>
<td>24 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Agencies = 7, Self funded = 6, Others = 3)</td>
<td>16 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities***</td>
<td>11 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic trusts</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC - non specific***</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH&amp;MRC***</td>
<td>5 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC - SPIRT/Linkage***</td>
<td>3 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of projects as a percentage of the total projects submitted (NB: projects can include multiple types of funding agencies and includes in-kind contributions)
** Includes funding directly from Commonwealth Government Departments, ARC & NH&MRC
*** Funding grants may include grants for higher degree by research programs such as PhD scholarships
8. Whether research was part of a degree program

Research conducted by students as part of a formal university degree program made up a substantial proportion of the projects submitted to the audit (39%), but this is still a potential area for growth, given the number of students doing honours, higher degree by research or professional masters/doctorates that include substantial research components. It will need to be supported, however, to encourage academics to engage partnerships and other opportunities to link their research students into evaluations of programs or other critical areas of research in the field of child protection.

Although the number of honours students in Australia is likely to be much higher than the number of doctoral students, the distribution of research submitted to the audit shows the reverse pattern: more doctoral students responded to the audit than did honours or masters students. This may reflect the greater ease of identifying larger doctoral research projects compared with those conducted as part of honours or masters research programs, especially in relation to projects undertaken up to a decade earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: Types and frequencies of degree programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional doctorates and PhDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C Number of projects where degree program was indicated

**Number of degree programs as a percentage of the total projects submitted

9. Discipline area

Child protection and child abuse prevention is a truly interdisciplinary field. Health, education and social service professionals perform the practice elements. Research into child protection and child abuse prevention was undertaken by professionals from these and related disciplines. The multidisciplinary nature of child protection and child abuse prevention is reflected in the breakdown of discipline areas identified by audit respondents.

The highest number of research projects was conducted in the field of social work, followed closely by social policy and psychology (see Table 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Types and frequencies of discipline area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (includes health science, humanities, business)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C Number of projects indicating a nominated discipline area

**Number of discipline areas as a percentage of the total projects submitted

10. Sample type

Table 12 shows the source of data or ‘informants’ in each research project. Parents were the source of data in the largest proportion of projects (31%), followed by professionals – other than child protection workers or welfare/family support workers (29%). Children were the next largest group of informants, followed by child protection workers, then welfare/family support workers. There was also little focus
on research on individuals or families who were in groups that were high-risk for abuse and neglect (e.g., drug or alcohol dependent parents). This is problematic, given that this is an area where child abuse and neglect prevention efforts are most needed and are likely to have a more significant impact.

11. Sample size

Respondents were given four categories of sample size, and asked to indicate to which category their project belonged. From audit responses where sample size was listed \((n = 81)\), most projects were medium, small or very small. Only 15% of projects with valid audit responses to this question had a large sample size (500 or more participants).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community sample of parents</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professionals</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community sample of children</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare/family support workers</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection workers</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection clients</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical intervention sample</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-risk</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of projects where sample type was represented (projects can include multiple sample types)
**Number of sample types represented as a percentage of the total projects submitted

12. Number of projects that had ethics approvals

As Table 14 shows, just over half of the projects reportedly had received approval from an institutional ethics committee (56%). Six projects (4%) noted that ethics approval was not required (e.g., for policy analysis, internal quality assurance processes, or some methodological studies that did not involve people as direct research participants). This is similar to the findings of Cashmore and Ainsworth (2004): just over half (55%) respondents to their audit of out-of-home care research had ethics approval. The fact that 40% of those submitting a project to the audit did not respond to this question, suggests that there is a need for education about the nature of research. This is particularly problematic, given that respondents were given the option of indicating that their project did not require formal ethics approval, yet many respondents did not select this response.

Particularly in agencies where there may not be an internal ethics review process, it is important to increase the understanding of ethical obligations of researchers, and the importance of adhering to rigorous guidelines set by ARC and NH&MRC concerning the role of institutional ethics review boards in order to protect research participants and ensure high quality research.

Quality assurance and internal audits may not require ethics approval. Requirements regarding ethics approval have evolved in the past decade. Greater attention is now paid to the complex
issues involved, with some agencies developing their own protocols or ethics committees. For example, Uniting Care Burnside—a major non-government child and family welfare agency—has developed a code of ethics for researchers, designed to protect the clients of non-government child and family welfare organisations in collaboration with University of Wollongong. (Burnside’s Research Code of Ethics can be accessed at: http://www.ro.mq.edu.au/ethics/human/policy.htm)

13. Multiple site projects

There were 57 projects identified in the current audit as having been conducted across multiple sites. Multi-site research was self-defined. Respondents were simply asked to respond ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to the question: “Was the project conducted across multiple sites?” Although these data are informative, it could include research that is conducted at different sites within the same agency, in different areas within one jurisdiction (e.g., rural/regional/metro), across different states/territories, or across different agencies. Details on the nature of the multiple sites would need to be examined individually in each of these studies.

Cashmore and Ainsworth (2004) emphasised the importance of multiple site research, as well as clearinghouses, research centres and collaborative networking arrangements between organisations and between states, to assist the development of a cohesive approach to research in out-of-home care. Such cross-jurisdictional or multi-site research is the most likely way of being able to engage in large-scale projects to assess the effectiveness of different child abuse and neglect prevention programs, or of different approaches to child protection practice.

Universities had the highest level of multi-site research with a total of 45 individual projects identified. Of these, 28 projects were conducted exclusively across multiple sites of the same university, whereas just two projects involved cross-university collaboration. University and government agencies accounted for nine multiple site collaborations; university and non-statutory agencies accounted for eight; four projects where the research was conducted across a university, non-statutory agency and an institute; and one was a collaboration between a university, government agency and a research institute.

Government agencies showed the second highest level of multi-site research with a total of 18 projects. Half (9) of these were in collaboration with universities; five (5) across multiple sites of the one department; four (4) across multiple government bodies, with two (2) of these involving interstate collaboration; and four (4) in collaboration with non-statutory agencies. As with the universities, government bodies were involved in a total of five (5) projects where the collaboration was not just over multiple sites but also across more than two separate organisations.

D. Productivity/output

14. Frequency of different publication types

It is a difficult task to accurately summarise the research outputs (in terms of publications) from the projects submitted to the audit. One difficulty is that at the time of the audit, some projects were completed (and are therefore more likely to have a publication as a finished product), whereas other projects were still underway (and therefore were less likely to have published results). Accordingly, the number of each different type of publication output is described separately for ‘completed’ and ‘ongoing’ projects (see Table 15). Results can also be viewed in two ways: the number of projects that had a particularly publication type (listed under ‘projects’), as well as the total number of outputs for that
particular publication type, given that projects could have resulted in multiple publication outputs (e.g., two or three journal articles based on the one research project).

In addition to the publication outputs, respondents were also asked to list the total number of conference presentations made concerning the research. In total, respondents indicated that 194 conference presentations were made. These were counted separately from ‘conference proceedings’, which refer to papers in refereed or edited conference proceedings; however, examination of the details of the outputs revealed that some respondents listed as a ‘conference paper’ what appears to be an oral presentation only.

### Table 15: Publication types - frequencies for completed projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>Completed projects (n = 101)</th>
<th>All projects (n = 135)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects*</td>
<td>Output**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed journal articles</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Proceedings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/book-chapters</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Reports</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (university theses and other projects not within other categories)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO/Agency Reports</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of completed projects = 101, Number of projects underway = 34
* refers to number of projects where publication type occurred
** refers to total output publications from projects

All publications identified from projects included in the audit are listed in Appendix C. These have not been significantly edited or had any exclusion criteria applied. The quality of this listing highlights the problematic nature of a self-report audit, as a number of these ‘publications’ appear to be conference presentations (rather than papers published in conference proceedings), or lack crucial details. As well as identifying the publication, a project identification number is also listed to enable matching publications with specific projects, as listed in Appendix B. This will be useful if readers wish to contact the researchers about a particular publication.

### 15. Projects addressing Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander issues

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their sample included Indigenous participants, non-Indigenous participants, or both. Five projects (3.7 per cent) were listed as having an Indigenous sample. Thirty-eight projects (28.1 per cent) were listed as having an exclusively non-Indigenous sample. Ninety-two projects (68.1 per cent) selected “both” (respondents did not have a choice to leave this question blank, as using an electronic pull-down menu on the audit required this field to be completed). Unless researchers had specifically excluded Indigenous people as part of their recruitment strategy, this is the option they would most likely select, even if their samples were unlikely to have included Indigenous people. This was a consequence of the method of answering the question using the online pull-down menu, which did not allow the respondent to leave the answer blank, which most likely inflated the number of respondents selecting the category ‘both’, even if Indigenous participants were not explicitly identified or included in their research design.

### E. Findings: What we now know

#### Findings from Research

Respondents were asked to briefly summarise the key aims and objectives, results and implications of their research. Based on a qualitative analysis of these responses, project findings were grouped under six key headings:

- Statutory child protection services
- Prevention
Where possible, a summary of major findings or implications for research, policy and practice are highlighted, with an emphasis on implications for gaps in our knowledge.

**Statutory Child Protection Services**

**Trends in research**
Statutory child protection service issues fell into five main areas: risk assessment models, child protection service structure, professional issues, mandatory reporting, and community attitudes. Research investigating child protection issues was the largest body of research identified through the review of audit respondents’ description of their project objectives, design and findings.

1. **Risk assessment**
The frameworks and procedures for statutory child protection risk assessment, investigation and decision-making were the most common foci of researchers investigating child protection issues. Investigations included critical approaches to current statutory risk assessment frameworks, and the investigation of alternate assessment and decision-making frameworks. The underlying aim of these research projects was to improve accuracy in decision-making and to assess whether appropriate responses were made to clients and notifications.

2. **Child protection service structure**
The focus of research was to examine and evaluate policy and procedural frameworks guiding service provision. Studies examined existing practice and provided an evidence base for preferred practices or recommendations for practice change.

3. **Professional issues**
Researchers examined the specific problems, issues and factors that influenced practitioners (for example, personal history, exposure to workplace violence). The implications of this research were that further professional development and education in the areas identified are needed.

4. **Mandatory reporting**
Attitudes of non-child protection workers to mandatory reporting and factors that increase or decrease the likelihood of professionals to report were examined. Professionals largely supported mandatory reporting but lacked understanding about child protection actions and processes, and what happened after they made a report (for example, why were some notifications acted upon and others not). The implication of the findings from this body of research was the need for education and support for professionals such as those in the health, welfare and education sectors to better understand when they needed to make a report and information on how the child protection system responded to an improvement in child protection systems.

5. **Community attitudes**
Researchers examined the community attitudes towards what constitutes child abuse and neglect. Implications were for further community education. Several studies included victims’ and children’s assumptions as to what constitutes abuse. This has implications for approaches to child disclosure.

**Trends in design**
About two-thirds of the research studies were qualitative. Some used a mixed-methodology, but retained a qualitative orientation. The qualitative research designs were found to have appropriate sample sizes for the research undertaken. There were some quantitative designs, generally non-experimental with small sample sizes. In some cases, it appeared that the statistical analyses employed were inappropriate because (a) the sample size was inadequate to meet the statistical assumptions of the analysis employed, or (b) the analysis chosen was inappropriate to answer the
research question. Child protection service and other health and welfare service records were the predominant source of data, and qualitative interviews were often conducted in conjunction with case file analysis.

**Prevention**

**Trends in research**
Research focused on three main areas:

- parental intervention programs;
- children’s service programs; and
- family support and home visiting programs.

General trends found among the studies were the need for:

- adequate training for program workers;
- further longitudinal studies to assess the long-term impact of programs; and
- continued follow-up sessions of program support to refresh parents, families and children and also to assess their progress.

**Trends in design**
Most designs were cross-sectional but a small number of longitudinal studies (covering the short-to-medium term) were included. The longitudinal studies ranged from six months to three years following the implementation of the tested program. Medium to large sample sizes were used. Most data collected were mixed methodology or purely qualitative in design. Few researchers used control groups, and if control groups were included, the designs were quasi-experimental, not randomised control studies, and researchers tended to select participants from program wait lists. Interviews with program participants and workers were a common source of data.

**Intervention Programs**

**Trends in research**
There were 17 projects with sufficient information to enable a determination in relation to research findings and design, three of which were ongoing. The submitted studies largely involved researchers evaluating therapeutic intervention programs. Evaluations indicated that the impact of the therapeutic interventions were all largely positive (this is consistent with a positive bias observed in published evaluations). Research into intervention programs fell into four areas: services, domestic and family violence, victims of child sexual abuse, and perpetrators of child sexual abuse.

1. **Services**
Examples of those evaluated were: parent education, family reunification, family support, high risk families, family support and substance abuse, family decision making, and family preservation. For child protection service clients, evaluations tended to focus on the efficacy of the programs for preventing the child experiencing further harm, this was operationalised through notifications.

2. **Domestic and family violence**
The focus on families where domestic violence was an identified problem included those targeted at mothers designed to prevent violence and those targeted at ameliorating the effects of witnessing violence on children.

3. **Victims of child sexual abuse**
There were several studies evaluating the efficacy of treatment programs for child victims of sexual abuse. Evaluations with exploratory qualitative designs were being used as a form of critical reflection on practice.

4. **Perpetrators of child sexual abuse**
These studies included interventions that focussed upon both adult and juvenile offenders of child sexual abuse.
**Trends in design:**
Most studies used mixed-method and qualitative designs with small to medium sized samples. There was only one randomised control study; this was also the only purely quantitative research design. Child protection service records were employed as a source of data and as the means of identifying a sample in several studies. The remaining studies focused on children and families with high-risk backgrounds and on offenders.

**Risk Factors**

**Trends in research**
A limited body of research examined offender characteristics and factors that increased the likelihood of a child experiencing abuse or neglect (that is, risk factors - not approaches to risk assessment). However, the research available examined:

- juvenile offenders;
- adult sex offenders’ history of child sexual assault;
- bullying; and
- substance abuse.

One study examined factors related to organisational safety. A few studies looked at the risk factors for maltreatment chronicity and recidivism. These studies examined both child protection service assessments and service provision. Across the samples key findings related to the volume of abuse and chronicity as predictors of maltreatment (past abuse predicted future abuse). The specific nature of the research – combined often with a lack of details about the results – makes it difficult to summarise the key findings.

**Trends in design**
Several studies were still ongoing at the point of submission to the audit and/or inadequately described to make a determination of their methodology. Case files were found to be a common source of data. The studies were largely quantitative and mixed methodology designs predominately with moderate sample sizes. The qualitative designs also comprised moderate to large samples (for qualitative research designs). Respondents tended to focus on describing the factors they were trying to predict (e.g., offending behaviour), rather than the results that they found in terms of key risk and protective factors. Therefore, it is not possible to identify which specific risk or protective factors have been researched to a greater degree than others, or to identify possible gaps. When developing research priorities for future research, it would be useful if risk and protective factors were considered within a developmental-ecological perspective (Bronfenbrenner 1979).

Risk and protective factors can be used to predict both the likelihood of maltreatment occurring and the likelihood of adverse effects for the child as a consequence of child maltreatment. The balance of protective factors is believed to explain the range of different outcomes observed (Cicchetti and Howes 1991) and helps explain why the same incident can affect different children in remarkably different ways and why not all children who have been maltreated will be observably harmed.

When developing research priorities for future research, it would be useful if risk and protective factors were considered within a developmental-ecological perspective. The developmental-ecological theory is recommended as the underpinning theory for future research into child maltreatment by the US National Research Council (1993). Ecological models can be applied to research into both cause and consequences of child maltreatment. An ecological perspective takes into account all victimisation experiences rather than focusing on the impact of one specific type of child abuse or neglect (Briere and Runtz 1989). The ecological model has four levels: (a) the macro-system (cultural beliefs and values), (b) the exo-system (neighbourhood and community settings), (c) the micro-system (family environment) and (d) development (the individual’s own developmental adaptation) (Lynch and Cicchetti 1998). The developmental stage of the child is now considered very important in research into child maltreatment, and has implications for a range of issues including determining if an adult action fits within the realm of child maltreatment. For example,
shaking a 7-year-old child by the shoulders is a vastly different level of abuse to the same action on a 7-month-old (Bromfield 2005).

**Incidence**

Incidence and prevalence studies are used to investigate the extent to which phenomena occur. In general, a prevalence study investigates how many people in a population have ever experienced maltreatment and reflects this as a proportion of the sample, whereas an incidence study investigates the number of incidents of maltreatment in a specific time interval. The studies in the audit that examined the extent of maltreatment in specific samples were all incidence studies. The lack of prevalence research in Australia is a major problem in understanding the true extent of the problem, and factors likely to be associated both with the occurrence of maltreatment (or specific abuse or neglect types), which is necessary information for developing accurate prevention programs – and its impact on individuals’ lives.

**Trends in research**

Most studies focused on recurrent maltreatment and re-notifications to child protection services. There was only a very small body of incidence research in the audit (6 studies).

Incidence research indicated some key issues:

- Recurrence was highly concentrated in a minority of families, and children in larger families were more likely to experience chronic maltreatment than children in smaller families.
- There was a need for services to be available/accessible to families already notified to prevent maltreatment recurrence.
- The families in these studies averaged 3-4 notifications to a child protection service.
- The majority of children subject to multiple notifications had experienced multiple instances of maltreatment over a long period of time.
- There was a need to improve upon the information gap in reporting: it is not possible to make sound policy without reliable facts.

**Trends in design**

Research was largely based on the recorded prevalence of maltreatment recurrence in existing cases for children and families who had already been the subject of notifications to statutory child protection services. Sample sizes were generally large and researchers employed quantitative research designs to analyse their data.

**Methodological Issues**

Only one project examined methodological issues. The lack of research in this area is a serious deficit in the field.

**Trends in research**

In this study, the researcher examined whether respondents are best classified according to their experience of separate maltreatment types (sexual abuse, physical abuse, psychological maltreatment, neglect, and witnessing family violence). The best cluster analysis solution grouped individuals according to the degree to which respondents reported having experienced maltreating behaviours: low, moderate, or high frequency, based on a number of items ranging in severity. Individuals classified into the high maltreatment frequency cluster had significantly more adjustment problems than those in both the moderate and the low maltreatment clusters, suggesting that it may be more meaningful to talk about the degree of maltreatment (frequency and/or severity), rather than about the type.

**Summary: Research and Design Trends**

The detailed project descriptions suggest that Australian researchers investigating child maltreatment and child protection issues have largely operationalised ‘maltreatment’ in terms of the
notifications and substantiations recorded by statutory child protection services. Consistent with this trend, there was a heavy reliance on case records as a source of data. Research that investigated a single maltreatment sub-type or specific combination of sub-types tended to focus on child sexual abuse and family violence; there was a lack of research investigating issues specifically associated with child physical abuse, psychological maltreatment or neglect. Although there were one or two exceptions, generally there was a lack of research on specific cultural groups or cultural issues, particularly in Indigenous communities (where there were only two projects).

In order to review the research and design trends in the audit projects, projects were reviewed within each of the topic areas selected by the audit respondents. The audit included only those projects that respondents had identified as having met the selection criteria. However, in reviewing the detailed project descriptions it became apparent that respondents experienced some confusion about what constitutes ‘research’ and in effectively applying keywords to describe their research. There were several projects that at face value do not appear to meet the audit criteria (for example, literature reviews that did not include analysis of any data) – these anomalies were not apparent when viewing summary information such as that provided in Table 2. Since the respondents were given explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria, the audit responses are included as submitted; however, the validity of the categorisations assigned by some respondents may be questionable. A more rigorous approach—and a much more time-consuming and expensive alternative—would have been to have respondents submit documentation (project descriptions; research output, etc.) to the audit, and to have the audit team interview the researcher(s) and be responsible for categorising and entering data on the project.

The detailed review also showed that not all respondents appropriately classified their projects using the ‘areas of research’ categories provided (i.e., prevention programs for children, tertiary intervention programs for child victims, and so on). Although some projects clearly fell into multiple classification fields, there were many for which there was no clear link between the information provided in the description of the methodology and results and the particular classification fields selected for the project. This may lead to inaccurate estimates of the amount of research conducted in particular topic areas.

A key implication of the current audit is the need for agreed definitions of what constitutes ‘research’ in the child and family welfare sector. Research encompasses a variety of disciplines and utilises multiple analytic methods – both qualitative and quantitative. It involves systematically gathering data to investigate questions about the effectiveness of programs and processes or client outcomes.

**Implications for Policy and Practice**

The project descriptions provided in the audit were generally brief (and in some cases there was no description provided). It is difficult to assess research quality without looking at each of the project reports/publications in detail. The information provided precluded a critical review of the audit projects from being undertaken. The audit provides a general overview of trends in research.

A critical review of the identified research may need to be undertaken to determine the implications of the present body of research for policy and practice (taking into account the way in which design issues influence the reliability and validity of the evidence base). Based on the information provided, it was beyond the scope of this audit to identify implications for policy and practice emerging from Australian child protection and child maltreatment research.

The findings of this audit – in terms of the amount and quality of the research, and its ability to form a useful base for policy and practice – are consistent with the conclusions drawn by others who have reviewed the efficacy of early intervention research. In their report, Wise, da Silva, Webster and Sanson (forthcoming) conclude:

“While this review provides a basis for estimating likely future benefits of early childhood interventions, it is not a comprehensive study. The dearth of evaluation data on interventions generally, and missing data on the restricted and unrepresentative
number of interventions in this review, makes it impossible to comment on the util-
ity of early childhood interventions as a general strategy to sustain improvements for
children in the long-term” (p. 65).

However, they temper this conclusion by noting:

“Evaluation findings suggest that early childhood interventions can produce
improvements across a wide range of outcome domains. There is also some limited
evidence that early childhood interventions can produce potential returns in public
investment” (p. 69).

**Implications for Research**

**Researchers**

Perhaps of most significance are the implications arising from the audit findings for researchers.

The primary limitation of the audit was the low number of responses compared with the amount
of research identified in the literature search for publications. Published research is an under-esti-
mation of research undertaken, as not all research is actually published. This suggests that the
research identified in this audit may be a significant under-estimation of the amount of Australian
research that has been or is being conducted in the field of child protection and prevention of child
abuse and neglect.

One of the factors that may have contributed to the low response rate for the audit was the per-
ception of what constitutes ‘research’. People may not identify their project as ‘research’,
particularly case audits and program evaluations conducted by governments and non-government
agencies responsible for service provision. Changing the later audit promotion material to remove
the word ‘research’ and replace it with alternate descriptors resulted in additional responses to the
audit.

The detailed review of audit projects showed that there were problems with self-selection (both in
and out of the audit) and self-completion of the topic classification criteria leading to errors and
misclassifications. The quality of responses to the audit and errors in completing the template sug-
gest many people conducting program evaluations or other research are not adequately trained in,
or ‘steeped’ in a research culture (further emphasised by the poorly tapped capacity to link with
universities).

Some of the valuable contributions of this audit are that it highlights the need for education about
what research is, and for the building of research capacity and the promotion of a research culture
in agencies, government departments and others organisations implementing programs or services
for the prevention of child abuse and neglect or the protection of children.

**Research design**

The research identified and reviewed in this audit was largely qualitative. Quantitative research was
primarily non-experimental, descriptive and tended to rely on categorical data (or so it appeared
as there was limited evidence of multivariate analyses being used). Research objectives tended to
be exploratory rather than confirmatory (that is, researchers largely failed to undertake hypothesis
testing). There was a heavy reliance on existing case records for data. Projects tended to be cross-
sectional and retrospective. The qualitative research appeared to use adequate samples. However,
there appeared to be an over-reliance on qualitative research designs in this field, and this is prob-
lematic, as qualitative research alone does not provide an adequate evidence base that can be
generalised.

Research investigating child protection is a sensitive area in which it is often difficult to obtain par-
ticipants. Even after obtaining access to an appropriate group of participants, there are still many
methodological issues involved in research in this area. However, maltreated children are among
the most vulnerable in our community. There is a need for an evidence base to inform practice as practice decisions have the potential to impact on children’s immediate safety and wellbeing as well as their long-term outcomes.

A quality research base to inform policy and practice is a priority if Australia and other Westernised countries with similar child protection and out-of-home care service frameworks are to intervene more successfully to ensure the safety and wellbeing of vulnerable children.

When evaluating the merit of research proposals or when commissioning or conducting research, individuals, organisations and institutions need to consider the following methodological issues:

- the dangers of overly-ambitious research questions (which can lead to superficial coverage of issues);
- realistic timelines for research projects;
- appropriate choice of research design to answer the research question posed (for example, consideration of the respective limitations of quantitative and qualitative designs, such as the inability to make generalisations from qualitative research);
- adequate description of methodology;
- the need for representative samples and adequate sample sizes;
- appropriate comparison groups;
- assuming causal relationships between variables without longitudinal data to show the direction and nature of this relationship; and
- the inclusion of dissemination and implementation strategies in funding models or research proposals.

Gaps and Duplication

There was no evidence of overt gaps, nor was there evidence of unnecessary duplication. However, across the board, the volume of research was small, suggesting there is significant need for research to be conducted to answer critical research questions relevant to child protection and prevention of child abuse and neglect. The ability to address these gaps may be diminished by the organisational capacity and research infrastructure within the child welfare sector – as evidenced by the low rate of research investment relative to the size of the sector that was highlighted by respondents to this audit. As with all areas of research (whether in the physical or social sciences), replication and extension of previous studies is a critical method for testing previous findings and expanding our understanding by applying theories that have been supported in one context to another related area. This is an important issue to be addressed in Australian research in the field of child protection.

The principal issue that this audit has highlighted is the overall shortage of research in each area, such that it is not possible to claim an adequate evidence-base for sound policy and practice decisions, or to be able to single out particular areas as a priority for research. A broad research agenda is needed if we are to expand the knowledge base we have in order to increase the protective factors and reduce the risk factors associated with child abuse and neglect. Risk and protective factors may provide a framework for discussion of future research priorities, but the lack of detail provided by many of the audit respondents to the open-ended questions concerning the research question, methodology and findings mean that it is difficult to provide any over-arching views of coverage and gaps beyond the categories described earlier in Table 2.

Researchers working in different organisations will have different research priorities. For example, the priorities for child protection departments may be around service system improvements – although one can argue their greatest priority should be risk factors for abuse and the efficacy of primary prevention programs. The priorities for child and family welfare agencies intervening with children in need of protection, as well as the priorities for agencies or programs working with vulnerable families may be more focused on evaluation of practice models. Finally, the priorities for government and agencies working with communities and the whole of society to prevent abuse will be around the efficacy of prevention strategies.
Dissemination

This report has highlighted the need for further methodologically rigorous child protection research. However, the problems encountered in sourcing completed Australian child protection research demonstrate that merely funding further research is not adequate – research must be accessible and able to be translated into policy and practice changes.

Access to research—both in terms of availability and language/format—is the cornerstone of effective dissemination to inform policy and practice. Further investigation is needed with regard to the feasibility of establishing a model to ensure a national collection of Australian research is held at an appropriate location that will ensure accessibility (for example, the Australian Institute of Family Studies). The current audit entries provide a valuable database that can be searched to identify past or current projects, using any of the fields contained in the audit. This would be a valuable resource for researchers wanting to identify existing projects to replicate, expand or extend. It provides a useful way of contacting researchers currently working on topics, and will hopefully lead to useful collaborations. This information is currently available in hard copy in Appendix B and C, where each project – and each publication arising from the project – is listed. Similarly, policy makers, program managers or practitioners wanting up-to-date information on current Australian research findings can also use this audit to identify work that has been done—or is currently underway—in their field of interest. However, in each of these uses, access to a searchable electronic database would provide a richer set of data for researchers to use. Such a resource would soon lose its value unless there is a coordinated approach to updating the database. This would entail two key processes:

1. contacting existing respondents who have projects listed as current, and regularly updating projects until they are completed (e.g., as new publications emerge); and
2. publicising and expanding the number of researchers who submit their research projects to the audit (given the gap between the number of audit responses and the number of publications and theses identified through library searchers, many researchers where either unaware of or did not meet the deadline for submitting their research).

Research and information staff at the National Child Protection Clearinghouse currently have responsibility for responding to national research queries that include questions about latest research projects and findings being conducted in Australia. The audit will provide a valuable tool for answering these questions. The prospect of wider public access to the data (in an online format of the database) could also be considered as a user-friendly way of encouraging access to the information.

However, to remain useful, such a database needs to be regularly updated, otherwise it quickly becomes an archival record, rather than a ‘living resource’. A widely accessible and frequently used audit would act as an incentive for other researchers to submit their projects, to ensure that their efforts are reflected in the data. However, this will only occur if the database is perceived as comprehensive, accurate, and accessible. Ongoing maintenance of the audit database would be required. If the database were maintained, as it grows, it would become a more accurate reflection of the scope of child protection research in Australia. With greater accuracy will be greater awareness and greater motivation for researchers to submit their research.

It is important that the results of this audit are considered—and disseminated—together with the audit by Cashmore and Ainsworth (2004). Any ongoing use of the database would be enhanced by having a similar format and access to the responses to the out-of-home care research audit currently held by CAFWAA.

In this area, the role of state and territory statutory child protection departments is crucial. As one of the key sites for research, accurate documentation of their service improvement research would emphasise the importance of research to statutory child protection departments that are committed to evidence-based practice.
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Appendix A: Introductory letter and criteria

National Audit of Child Protection Research

The National Child Protection Clearinghouse at the Australian Institute of Family Studies has been contracted by the Australian Centre for Child Protection at the University of South Australia to conduct a national audit of Australian child protection research over the past decade, covering prevention and intervention (but excluding out-of-home care research). The purpose of this letter is to request your cooperation by providing details of any research related to the prevention of child abuse and neglect being conducted by you, or in conjunction with your agency or department.

This audit follows on from the audit of research into out-of-home care (Cashmore & Ainsworth, 2004), available from the Association of Children’s Welfare Agencies (www.acwa.asn.au/acwa/resources/ResearchLinks.html) or the Child and Family Welfare Association of Australia (www.acwa.asn.au/cfwa/researchaudit). Once completed, these two audits will provide a comprehensive view of child protection research from prevention and early intervention through to out-of-home care placements.

The purpose of this audit is to bring together and disseminate information about quality research projects in child protection and early intervention research in Australia. The audit will help to identify the gaps and the priorities for research as a first step in developing a national research agenda in this area. It will also be used to compare Australian research findings with those from international research.

The audit is being conducted by Dr Daryl Higgins, Manager of the National Child Protection Clearinghouse with Dr Judy Cashmore as an external consultant.

An outline of the criteria for including research projects in this audit follows this letter. We are asking government departments, agencies and researchers to complete the details for research projects that fit within the audit criteria. Please forward this request to any other relevant researchers or organisations.

Please submit completed forms via www.aifs.gov.au/nch/cpsaAudit/introduction or phone (03) 9214 7821 if you have any queries. If it is necessary to clarify any information, the research team will email you.

Finally, may I thank you in advance you for your cooperation in this important and exciting project. The outcomes of this project should advance our knowledge and understanding of effective practice in this area and will be useful to a wide range of academics, policy makers and personnel in child and family service agencies. The final report will be available sometime after July 2005 at www.aifs.gov.au/nch.

Daryl Higgins
Manager, National Child Protection Clearinghouse
March 2005

Australian Institute of Family Studies 300 Queen Street Melbourne Victoria 3000 Australia
Telephone (03) 9214 7888 Facsimile (03) 9214 7839 Internet www.aifs.gov.au

ABN 64 067 353 579
National Audit of Child Protection Research - Criteria

The audit includes research looking at the following forms of abuse & neglect:

- sexual abuse
- physical abuse
- psychological maltreatment (including emotional abuse/neglect)
- physical neglect
- witnessing family violence (exposure to domestic violence)

The audit covers qualitative and quantitative empirical research conducted in Australia in the past 10 years (1995-2004) that addresses:

(a) Evaluation of program outcomes (not just process evaluation) of:

- Prevention programs for children
- Tertiary intervention programs (eg, group or individual therapy) for child victims of abuse or neglect
- Child-focused programs within adult-oriented services (eg, Centres Against Sexual Assault; Domestic Violence; substance abuse services, etc.)
- Family support programs
- Parent education programs
- Community education programs
- Statutory Child Protection Services
- Specialist/innovative Child Protection Service programs

(b) Other child protection research:

- Reporting abuse & neglect
- Approaches to risk assessment
- Identification of risk factors for child maltreatment
- Community & professional attitudes to child abuse & neglect
- Prevalence/incidence of abuse & neglect
- Methodological/theoretical issues in the measurement or prevention of child abuse & neglect
- Treatment of adult offenders (eg, perpetrators of child physical or sexual abuse)
- Treatment of adolescent offenders
- Customer service surveys of specific prevention programs or services (eg, parental perceptions of child protection services)
- Policy analysis or government report

The following are excluded from the audit:

- Evaluation of generic programs (eg, family support) or health promotion strategies if the prevention of child abuse & neglect is not specifically targeted
- Non-evaluative program descriptions
- Tertiary/intervention research for adult victims
- Research relating exclusively to out-of-home care

Should your research fall within any of the above exclusion criteria your research will not be eligible for this audit.
Appendix B: Projects from the Audit

Each project submitted to the audit is listed in the order it was entered on the database. Database identification numbers are attached, and can be used to cross-reference projects with publications listed in Appendix C. (Note: some project identification numbers are missing where project duplicates or incorrectly submitted projects were deleted by the audit team).

Contact: Andrew Day
andrew.day@unisa.edu.au
Status: Completed
Investigators: M. Proeve
A. Day

ID #: 3  MOSAIC (MOtherS Advocates In the Community), a community randomised trial.
Contact: Angela Taft
a.taft@latrobe.edu.au
Status: Underway 2003
Investigators: Angela Taft
Rhonda Small
Kelsey Hegarty
Judith Lynam

ID #: 4  The Discursive Construction of Risk in Child Protection Practice.
Contact: Arthur Firkins
afirkins@yahoo.com
Status: Underway 1999
Investigators: Arthur Firkins
Chris Candlin
Anne Burns

ID #: 5  The perceived experiences of children and adolescents living with thier grandparents: why living with my grandparents is so ... good.
Contact: Barbara Horner
b.j.horner@curtin.edu.au
Status: Completed 2004
Investigators: Barbara Horner
Angela Alsup

ID #: 6  Perceptions of grandparents as primary carers of thier grandchildren.
Contact: Barbara Horner
b.j.horner@curtin.edu.au
Status: Completed 2004
Investigators: Angelica Orb
Margaret Davey
Saras Henderson

ID #: 7  Psychological and psychophysiological examination of the sex offence process utilising a guided imagery methodology.
Contact: Caroline Spirano
ccspirano@postoffice.utas.edu.au
Status: Underway 2003
Investigators: Caroline Spirano
Dr. Chris Williams
Dr. Janet Haines

ID #: 8  Single Mothers Social Policy and Gendered Violence.
Contact: Elspeth McInnes
elspeth.mcinnes@unisa.edu.au
Status: Completed 2001
Investigators: Elspeth McInnes

ID #: 9  Risk factors and treatment outcomes in intrafamilial adolescent sex offenders.
Contact: Jan Grant
J.Grant@curtin.edu.au
Status: Underway 2004
Investigators: Jan Grant
David Indermaul
Jenny Thornton
Christabel Chamarette
Andrea Halse
Amanda Thompson

ID #: 10  Early childhood teachers and child abuse and neglect: A critical study of their work and knowledge.
Contact: Kerryann Walsh
k.walsh@qut.edu.au
Status: Completed 2004
Investigators: Kerryann Walsh
Ann Farrell
Robert Schweitzer
Ruth Bridgstock

ID #: 11  Critical factors in teachers’ detecting and reporting child abuse and neglect: Implications for practice.
Contact: Kerryann Walsh
k.walsh@qut.edu.au
Status: Completed 2004
Investigators: Kerryann Walsh

ID #: 12  Chronic Child Maltreatment in an Australian Statutory Child Protection Sample.
Contact: Leah Bromfield
leah.bromfield@aifs.gov.au
Status: Completed 2005
Investigators: Leah Bromfield
Daryl Higgins

ID #: 13  Decision-making thresholds of child protection workers during risk and safety assessments at intake.
Contact: Linda Chia
chias@psy.uq.edu.au
Status: Completed 2000
Investigators: Len Dalgleish (supervisor)
Linda Chia

Contact: Mark Palmer
markp@chw.edu.au
Status: Completed 2003
Investigators: Mark Palmer
Deborah Plath

ID #: 16  Orana Supported Playgroups.
Contact: Reg Humphreys
rhumphreys@burnside.org.au
Status: Underway 2002
Investigators: Sullivan Kate
Johnson Luana
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #:</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Investigators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Monograph 46 - The Role of Community Work in Barnardos Australia and the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect.</td>
<td>Vivienne Cunningham Smith <a href="mailto:vcsmith@barnardos.org.au">vcsmith@barnardos.org.au</a></td>
<td>Completed 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Developing best practice at the interface of child protection and adult mental health.</td>
<td>Yvonne Darlington <a href="mailto:y.darlington@uq.edu.au">y.darlington@uq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Underway 2002</td>
<td>Yvonne Darlington, Judith Feeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sex offences against children: An overview of statistics from the Western Australian criminal justice system.</td>
<td>Anna Ferrante <a href="mailto:Anna.Ferrante@uwa.edu.au">Anna.Ferrante@uwa.edu.au</a>, John Fernandez</td>
<td>Completed 2002</td>
<td>Anna Ferrante, John Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The voice of front-line workers in family support: A qualitative study of early intervention in child abuse and neglect.</td>
<td>Christine Gibson <a href="mailto:cgibson@burnside.org.au">cgibson@burnside.org.au</a></td>
<td>Completed 2001</td>
<td>Michael Wearing, Megan Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Differentiating between different child maltreatment sub-types.</td>
<td>Daryl Higgins <a href="mailto:dary.higgins@aifs.gov.au">dary.higgins@aifs.gov.au</a>, Marita McCabe</td>
<td>Completed 2004</td>
<td>Daryl Higgins, Marita McCabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Risk and protective factors on burnout experienced by those who work with maltreated children.</td>
<td>Daryl Higgins <a href="mailto:dary.higgins@aifs.gov.au">dary.higgins@aifs.gov.au</a>, Michelle Stevens, Daryl Higgins</td>
<td>Completed 2001</td>
<td>Michelle Stevens, Daryl Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Effectiveness of training as professional development: Teachers as mandated notifiers of child abuse and neglect.</td>
<td>Faye McCallum <a href="mailto:faye.mccallum@unisa.edu.au">faye.mccallum@unisa.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Completed 2000</td>
<td>Faye McCallum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Home-based family assessment and factors that predict long term outcomes for families at high risk of child removal due to child abuse and/or neglect.</td>
<td>Janet Clark-Duff <a href="mailto:janet.clark-duff@community.nsw.gov.au">janet.clark-duff@community.nsw.gov.au</a>, Brian English</td>
<td>Underway 1997</td>
<td>Janet Clark-Duff, Brian English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The Production of the Incest Offender As A Modern Subject.</td>
<td>Kisane Slaney <a href="mailto:drlslaney@upnaway.com">drlslaney@upnaway.com</a></td>
<td>Completed 2001</td>
<td>Kisane Slaney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A study of a Child Protection Program - NEWPIN. What are the experiences of the participants - children, mothers and staff?</td>
<td>Linda Mondy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Risk Assessment and Decision Making in Child Protection.</td>
<td>Lisa Coker <a href="mailto:lisa.coker@communities.qld.gov.au">lisa.coker@communities.qld.gov.au</a></td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Lisa Coker,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Performance Measurement in Child Protection.</td>
<td>Lisa Coker <a href="mailto:lisa.coker@communities.qld.gov.au">lisa.coker@communities.qld.gov.au</a></td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Lisa Coker,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The Long Term Effects of Child Abuse and Neglect on Adolescents.</td>
<td>Melinda Bradley <a href="mailto:s026492@student.uq.edu.au">s026492@student.uq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Melinda Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Building and evaluating child friendly health services.</td>
<td>Nigel Spence <a href="mailto:nigel@acwa.asn.au">nigel@acwa.asn.au</a>, Eric Scott, Louise Mulroney, Judy Cashmore</td>
<td>Completed 2004</td>
<td>Nigel Spence, Eric Scott, Louise Mulroney, Judy Cashmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Expectations and reality: non-government child and family workers' experience of mandatory reporting.</td>
<td>Sue Jennings <a href="mailto:sjennings@burnside.org.au">sjennings@burnside.org.au</a>, Helen Bryce, Lisa Ellison, Alaine Corning, Sue Curtis</td>
<td>Completed 2000</td>
<td>Sue Jennings, Helen Bryce, Lisa Ellison, Alaine Corning, Sue Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Northern Lakes Home Visiting: A pilot project by UnitingCare Burnside evaluated by the University of Newcastle.</td>
<td>Sue Jennings <a href="mailto:sjennings@burnside.org.au">sjennings@burnside.org.au</a></td>
<td>Completed 2000</td>
<td>Sue Jennings, Helen Bryce, Lisa Ellison, Alaine Corning, Sue Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Men in Families and Families First Evaluation.</td>
<td>Megan-Jane Johnstone <a href="mailto:m.johnstone@rmit.edu.au">m.johnstone@rmit.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Completed 1999</td>
<td>Megan-Jane Johnstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Reporting Child Abuse: Ethical Issues for the Nursing Profession and Nurse Regulating Authorities.</td>
<td>Megan-Jane Johnstone <a href="mailto:m.johnstone@rmit.edu.au">m.johnstone@rmit.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Completed 1999</td>
<td>Megan-Jane Johnstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ID #: 39  Measuring ‘performance’ in family support: Service users’ perspectives.  
Contact: Natasha Cortis  
natasha.cortis@student.usyd.edu.au  
Status: Underway 2002  
Investigators: Natasha Cortis  
Gabrielle Meagher  
Karen Healy  
Christine Gibson  

ID #: 40  Constructing meanings and identities in practice: Child protection in Western Australia.  
Contact: Heather D’Cruz  
hmdcruz@deakin.edu.au  
Status: Completed 1999  
Investigators: Heather D’Cruz  
Philip Gillingham  

ID #: 41  Developing a practice-generated approach to policy implementation.  
Contact: Heather D’Cruz  
hmdcruz@deakin.edu.au  
Status: Completed 2003  
Investigators: Heather D’Cruz  
Philip Gillingham  

ID #: 42  ‘Protecting the Innocent: Tasmania’s Neglected Children, their Parents and State Care, 1890-1918’.  
Contact: Caroline Evans  
caroline.evans@utas.edu.au  
Status: Completed 1999  
Investigators: Caroline Evans  

ID #: 43  Family Reunification: The Journey Home.  
Contact: Annette Jackson  
a.jackson@berrystreet.org.au  
Status: Completed 1996  
Investigators: Annette Jackson  

ID #: 44  Child Protection Assessment, an Ecological Perspective:  
Contact: Dorothy Scott  
Dorothy.A.Scott@unisa.edu.au  
Status: Completed 1996  
Investigators: Dorothy Scott  

Contact: Elizabeth Fernandez  
e.fernandez@unsw.edu.au  
Status: Completed 2004  
Investigators: Elizabeth Fernandez  

ID #: 46  Understanding social theory: Exploring child neglect.  
Contact: Elizabeth Reimer  
lirezreimer@nswfamilyservices.asn.au  
Status: Completed 2001  

ID #: 47  Disclosure patterns in children’s allegations of sexual abuse.  
Contact: Lisa Richardson  
lisa.richardson@rch.org.au  
Status: Completed 2003  
Investigators: Lisa Richardson  

ID #: 48  Parents Under Pressure program.  
Contact: Sharon Dawe  
s.dawe@griffith.edu.au  
Status: Completed 2004  
Investigators: Sharon Dawe  
Paul Harnett  

ID #: 49  A project involving members of client families in defining agency strategies for helping families function more effectively.  
Contact: Jan Mason  
jan.mason@uws.edu.au  

ID #: 50  Children and Families in Transition.  
Contact: Dale Bagshaw  
dale.bagshaw@unisa.edu.au  
Status: Underway 2004  
Investigators: Dale Bagshaw  
Karo lynne Quinn  
Birte Schmidt  
Amanda Shea Quinn  
Jeanette Fiegehen  
Catherine Opitz  

ID #: 51  Children and Domestic Violence: An Evaluation of Jannawi Resources.  
Contact: Dale Bagshaw  
dale.bagshaw@unisa.edu.au  
Status: Completed 2002  
Investigators: Dale Bagshaw  
Alan Campbell  
Lena Jelinek  

ID #: 52  Reshaping responses to domestic violence.  
Contact: Dale Bagshaw  
dale.bagshaw@unisa.edu.au  
Status: Completed 1999  
Investigators: Dale Bagshaw  
Donna Chung  

Contact: Jan Mason  
jan.mason@uws.edu.au  
Status: Completed 2004  
Investigators: Jan Mason  
Annette Michaux  

ID #: 54  Adolescents who Sexually Abuse Their Siblings: A Study of Family and Individual Factors, and Nature of Abuse.  
Contact: Joanne Hatch  
j.hatch@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au  
Status: Underway 2000  
Investigators: Joanne Hatch  
Associate Professor Elisabeth Northam  

ID #: 55  Children exposed to domestic violence: Who’s ‘best interests’ in the Family Court?  
Contact: Amanda Shea Hart  
amanda.shea.hart@hotkey.net.au  
Status: Underway 2000  
Investigators: Amanda Shea Hart  

ID #: 56  Peer Abuse as a Legislated Child Protection Issue for Schools.  
Contact: Jean Healey  
J.healey@uws.edu.au  
Status: Completed 2001  
Investigators: Jean Healey  

ID #: 57  Childhood Intervention: Exploring the middle ground between victims and offenders.  
Contact: B Carpenter  
b.carpenter@qut.edu.au  
Status: Underway  

ID #: 58  Improving mental health services for children with child protection concerns.  
Contact: Bre tt_McDermott@mater.org.au  
Status: Underway  

ID #: 59  Putting Families First: Listening to Queensland Families.  
Contact: dick.white@communities.qld.gov.au  
Status: Completed  
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ID #: 60  Putting Families First: Queensland Families - Across Three Generations .
Contact: dick.white@communities.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
Contact: dick.white@communities.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
Contact: dick.white@communities.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
ID #: 63  Life at School Project.
Contact: Eliza Ahmed
Status: Underway 1996
Investigators: Eliza Ahmed
Valerie Braithwaite
Brenda Morrison
Nathan Harris
John Braithwaite
Jacqui Homel
Contact: michael.walsh@childsafety.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
ID #: 65  Reform of Queensland's Child Protection System - One year on .
Contact: michael.walsh@childsafety.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
ID #: 66  Blueprint for implementing the CMC report recommendations .
Contact: michael.walsh@childsafety.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
ID #: 67  Strengthening Practice, Stronger families: Interim report from the Child Protection Think tank to the Director General.
Contact: michael.walsh@childsafety.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
Contact: michael.walsh@childsafety.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
Contact: michael.walsh@childsafety.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
Contact: michael.walsh@childsafety.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
ID #: 71  The transtheoretical model of change as a framework for working with child abusive parents.
Contact: p.harnett@psy.uq.edu.au
Status: Underway
ID #: 72  Evaluation of the Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Program.
Contact: Petra Staiger
pstaiger@deakin.edu.au
Status: Completed
Investigators: Staiger Petra
Wallace Stephen
ID #: 73  Responsible Citizenship Program.
Contact: Valerie Braithwaite
ID #: 74  Maintaining families: a response to the needs of children with disabilities and families, currently in crisis and seeking alternative care.
Contact: michael.walsh@childsafety.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
ID #: 75  The Social and economic impact of gaming machines on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities in Queensland. Long term study into the social impact of gaming machines in Queensland.
Contact: dick.white@communities.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
ID #: 76  Risk Assessment and Decision Making in Child Protection.
Contact: Len Dalgleish
len.dalgleish@stir.ac.uk
Status: Completed 2001
Investigators: Len Dalgleish
Jenny Smith
Anne Elliott
ID #: 79  The Impact of Individual, Family and Maltreatment Factors on Behavioural Differences in Maltreated Adolescents.
Contact: Cath Peake
cipe@deakin.edu.au
Status: Completed 2000
Investigators: Cath Peake
Daryl Higgins
ID #: 80  Managing individuals with seriously harmful behaviours.
Contact: dick.white@communities.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
ID #: 81  Preventing and responding to the abuse, assault and neglect of people with a disability.
Contact: dick.white@communities.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
ID #: 82  Culture counts: working with young offenders from culturally diverse backgrounds.
Contact: dick.white@communities.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
ID #: 83  Indigenous Children on Protective in Queensland.
Contact: dick.white@communities.qld.gov.au
Status: Completed
Contact: Elizabeth Fernandez
e.fernandez@uns.w.edu.au
Status: Underway 2001
Investigators: P Saunders
K. Fisher
J. Cashmore
E. Fernandez
Contact: Elizabeth Fernandez
e.fernandez@uns.w.edu.au
Status: Completed 2000
Investigators: Elizabeth Fernandez
ID #: 87  Parental perspectives in the context of the challenges and issues related to child abuse .
Contact: Fhardy@bigpond.net.au
Status: Completed
An Audit of Home Visitor Programs and the Development of an Evaluation Framework.

Contact: Graham Vimpani
g.vimpani@newcastle.edu.au

Status: Completed 1996

Investigators: Graham Vimpani
Margarita Frederico
Lesley Barclay
Cathy Davis

ID #: 89

Shaken Baby Campaign Evaluation.

Contact: Lindsay Leek
lindsay.leek@dcd.wa.gov.au

Status: Completed 2004

Investigators: Rhonda Zappelli
Anthea Mellor

ID #: 90

Research and Evaluation of Berry Street Victoria Take Two Intensive Therapeutic Program for children.

Contact: Margarita Frederico
m.frederico@latrobe.edu.au

Status: Underway 2003

Investigators: Margarita Frederico
Annette Jackson
Carly Black
Martin Ryan
Shane Thomas

ID #: 91

Mandatory Reporting of Child Abuse: Evidence and Options.

Contact: Mark Crake
mark.crake@dcd.wa.gov.au

Status: Completed 2002

Investigators: Maria Harries
Mike Clare

ID #: 92


Contact: Michael Walsh
michael.walsh@childsafe.qld.gov.au

Status: Completed

ID #: 93


Contact: Michael Walsh
michael.walsh@childsafe.qld.gov.au

Status: Completed

ID #: 94

The relationship between child mental health symptoms and service provision and past child protection issues.

Contact: Michael Walsh
michael.walsh@childsafe.qld.gov.au

Status: Underway

ID #: 95

Perceptions of sexual behaviours between child and adolescent siblings: Do age and gender factors influence the decisions of child protection practitioners.

Contact: Michael Walsh
michael.walsh@childsafe.qld.gov.au

Status: Underway

ID #: 96

Building best practice in child protection at the intersection of Child Protection and Mental Health Services.

Contact: Michael Walsh
michael.walsh@childsafe.qld.gov.au

Status: Underway

ID #: 97

Risk assessment and decision making in child protection.

Contact: Michael Walsh
michael.walsh@childsafe.qld.gov.au

Status: Underway

ID #: 98

Performance Measurement in Child Protection.

Contact: Michael Walsh
michael.walsh@childsafe.qld.gov.au

Status: Underway

ID #: 100

Enhancement of community capacity in Caloundra City to respond to child protection issues.

Contact: Michael Walsh
michael.walsh@childsafe.qld.gov.au

Status: Underway

ID #: 101

Methodology Evaluation of Experiential Wilderness Programs for Young People.

Contact: Michael Walsh
michael.walsh@childsafe.qld.gov.au

Status: Underway

ID #: 102

New Directions in child protection and family support in Western Australia: a policy initiative to re-focus child welfare.

Contact: Richard Mathews
richard.mathews@dcd.wa.gov.au

Status: Completed 1999

Investigators: Nigel Parton
Richard Mathews

ID #: 103

Evaluation of the Joint Approach to Child Abuse.

Contact: Richard Mathews
richard.mathews@dcd.wa.gov.au

Status: Completed 2001

Investigators: Social Systems and Evaluation (contracted consultants)

ID #: 104

Resubstantiation and further maltreatment Family and Children’s Services 1990-95.

Contact: Richard Mathews
richard.mathews@dcd.wa.gov.au

Status: Completed 1995

 Investigators: Richard Mathews

ID #: 105


Contact: Graham Brewster
graham.brewster@dhs.vic.gov.au

Status: Completed 2001

Investigators: Graham Brewster

ID #: 106

Children’s Definitions of Child Abuse.

Contact: Jan Mason
jan.mason@uws.edu.au

Status: Completed 1996

Investigators: Jan Mason
Jan Falloon

ID #: 107

Efficacy of a group treatment program for adolescent girls who have been sexually abused.

Contact: Kellie Cassidy
kellshaun@bigpond.net.au

Status: Underway 2003

Investigators: Kellie Cassidy
Corinne Reid
Marjorie Collins

ID #: 108

An evaluation of an intervention strategy of protective behaviours program for children aged 4-7yrs who have experienced or who are at risk of sexual abuse.

Contact: Catherine Campbell
C.Campbell@murdoch.edu.au

Status: Underway 2004

Investigators: Catherine Campbell
Corinne Reid
Jennifer Brodie
Marjorie Collins

ID #: 109

An evaluation of an intervention strategy of protective behaviours program for children aged 4-7yrs who have experienced or who are at risk of sexual abuse.

Contact: Fotina Hardy
fotina@bigpond.net.au

Status: Completed 2005

Investigators: Fotina Hardy

ID #: 110

The challenges associated with being a parent and experiences of family support in the context of child abuse: A study of the perspectives of a group of parents.

Contact: Fotina Hardy
fotina@bigpond.net.au

Status: Completed 2005

Investigators: Fotina Hardy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 134</th>
<th>The Link between Children's Services and Child Protection.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Marilyn McHugh <a href="mailto:m.mchugh@unsw.edu.au">m.mchugh@unsw.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Karen Fisher  Marilyn McHugh  Cathy Thomson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 135</th>
<th>Children as Witnesses: Age as a factor in determining children's competence in criminal courts following disclosures of sexual abuse.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Judith Oliver <a href="mailto:j.oliver@qut.edu.au">j.oliver@qut.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Judith Oliver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 136</th>
<th>An exploration of the co-existence of domestic violence and child protection and the implications for child welfare practice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Jude Irwin <a href="mailto:j.irwin@edfacs.usyd.edu.au">j.irwin@edfacs.usyd.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Jude Irwin  Marie Wilkinson  Fran Waugh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 137</th>
<th>Protecting Children in a Multicultural Society. An Australian Story.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Eduardo Farate <a href="mailto:secret@optusnet.com.au">secret@optusnet.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Eduardo Farate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 138</th>
<th>Prevalence of Substance Abuse in Care and Protection Applications. A Western Australian Study.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Eduardo Farate <a href="mailto:eduardo.farate@dcd.wa.gov.au">eduardo.farate@dcd.wa.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Eduardo Farate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 139</th>
<th>It was what we wanted too: An Evaluation of Family Connexions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Linda Ray <a href="mailto:linda@lighthouseresources.com.au">linda@lighthouseresources.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Linda Ray  David Lees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Sue Couper <a href="mailto:suecou@qec.org.au">suecou@qec.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Sue Couper  Melissa Coutts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 141</th>
<th>Finding a Voice: Including children and families in policy and service development in child protection.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Margarita Frederico <a href="mailto:m.frederico@latrobe.edu.au">m.frederico@latrobe.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Margarita Frederico  Cathy Davis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 142</th>
<th>Triple P- Positive Parenting Program for indigenous families in community and health settings in far north Queensland.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Matthew Sanders <a href="mailto:matts@psy.uq.edu.au">matts@psy.uq.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Underway 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Matthew Sanders  Karen Turner  Ernest Hunter  Radhika Santhanam  Sven Silburn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 143</th>
<th>The every family project: A population health approach to reducing emotional and behavioural problems in young children and their families.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Matthew Sanders <a href="mailto:matts@psy.uq.edu.au">matts@psy.uq.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Underway 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Matthew Sanders  Carol Markie-Dadds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 144</th>
<th>P Goes Bush: Supporting families in rural communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Matthew Sanders <a href="mailto:matts@psy.uq.edu.au">matts@psy.uq.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Matthew Sanders  Carol Markie-Dadds  Judy Cashmore  Karen Fisher  Kathy Gray  Elizabeth Fernandez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 145</th>
<th>Outcome Study on the Use of Children's Services as a Strategy in Child Protection.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Cathy Thomson <a href="mailto:CM.Thomson@unsw.edu.au">CM.Thomson@unsw.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Underway 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Peter Saunders  Judy Cashmore  Karen Fisher  Kathy Gray  Elizabeth Fernandez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 146</th>
<th>The role of behavioural family intervention in the prevention of children's disruptive behaviour disorders.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Matthew Sanders <a href="mailto:matts@psy.uq.edu.au">matts@psy.uq.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Matthew Sanders  William Bor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 147</th>
<th>Child Abuse and Neglect: A rethink.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Lillian De Bortoli <a href="mailto:Lillian.DeBortoli@med.monash.edu.au">Lillian.DeBortoli@med.monash.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Underway 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Lillian De Bortoli  Chris Goddard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #: 148</th>
<th>The Rapists' Camouflage: Child Prostitution.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Lillian De Bortoli <a href="mailto:Lillian.DeBortoli@med.monash.edu.au">Lillian.DeBortoli@med.monash.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators:</td>
<td>Lillian De Bortoli  Chris Goddard  Bernadette Saunders  Joe Tucci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Publications from projects identified in the audit

All publications identified from projects included in the audit are listed below. These have not been significantly edited or had any exclusion criteria applied. The quality of this listing highlights the problematic nature of a self-report audit, as a number of these ‘publications’ appear to be conference presentations (rather than papers published in conference proceedings), or lack crucial details. As well as identifying the publication, a project identification number is also listed to enable matching publications with specific projects, as listed in Appendix B. This will be useful if readers wish to contact the researchers about a particular publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Briggs, F. Invited to University of Illinois at Normal to present an annual public address, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Briggs, F. Trends and Issues 271, Australian Institute of Criminology February 2004 “Violence, threats and intimidation in the lives of professionals whose work involves children”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(McHugh, M.) NSW Department of Community Services, (DoCS), (2000) Insights into Research; Four Studies on Early childhood Issues and Children's Services, DoCS, Office of Childcare, Sydney.


McInnes, E. (1999) 'Gender Struggles over the Post Nuclear Family: Mapping the Terrain,' 6th Interdisciplinary Gender Studies Conference, Newcastle University.


Sanders, M.R. (2000, November). Randomized controlled trial of group delivered behavioural family intervention for parents at risk for child abuse and neglect. Invited presentation to the Social Learning and the Family pre-conference meeting at the 34th Annual Convention of the Association for Advancement of Behavior Therapy, New Orleans, USA.


Uniting Care Burnside (Humphreys, R., ed.) (2004), Evaluation of UnitingCare Burnside's Orana Supported Playgroup Project, Sydney.


The references listed in this appendix have been provided via direct submissions to the audit by researchers and their representatives. Although due care has been taken, the authors of this audit report do not take any responsibility for the accuracy of the references listed in this appendix. In some instances, respondents to the audit omitted critical elements of the reference citation.
Appendix D: Results of Library Search


Brydon, K. (2001), “Professional development: Has supervision reached its ‘use by’ date or are there opportunities to (re)empower protective workers as autonomous professionals?” in One child's reality, everyone's responsibility, Proceedings, 8th Australasian Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect, Melbourne, Department of Human Services.


Mentally Ill Parents and their Children; The Australian Contribution. Department of Social Work and Human Services, Monash University, Clayton.


Tomison, A. M. (1999c), Professional decision making and the management of actual or suspected child abuse and neglect cases: An in situ tracking study, Monash University, Clayton.


Appendix E: Australian University Theses on Child Protection Issues

Based on searches of the Australian Digital Project and individual searches of University's websites, the following 165 theses conducted or submitted between 1995 and 2004 were identified:


Louis, A. (2001), Development and psychometric evaluation of the mother and child risk observation (MACRO) forms to assess the risk to mother and infant (MACRO 1) or mother and child (MACRO 2) in the presence of maternal mental illness. Unpublished PhD thesis, Flinders University of South Australia.

Mueller, R. (2002), Pre-service teachers’ knowledge, understanding and confidence about identifying and reporting child abuse and neglect, Unpublished BED(Hons) thesis, University of South Australia.


Nakos, J. D. (1998), Understanding the influence of different interviewing techniques used with children, Unpublished BA(Hons) thesis, University of South Australia.


O’Leary, P. J. (2003), Men who were sexually abused as children, Unpublished PhD thesis, Flinders University of South Australia.


Pridham, E. J. (1998), Designing an evaluation for a program for children and their parents responding to the stakeholders' evaluation needs, Unpublished MSc(PHC) thesis, Flinders University of South Australia.


Scholes, L. (2000), A study of the level of protection provided by Queensland educators for children at risk of abuse and neglect, Unpublished MA(JusSt) thesis, Queensland University of Technology.


