

**THE CHILD ABUSE ALLEGATION INVESTIGATION INSTRUMENT  
PAIRED CONTRADICTION HYPOTHESIS TESTING MATRIX**

Developed by  
James Roger Brown  
Director  
THE SOCIOLOGY CENTER  
P.O. Box 2075  
North Little Rock, AR 72115-2075  
(501) 374-1788  
thesociologist@earthlink.net  
<http://www.thesociologycenter.com>  
Publications  
<http://www.thesociologycenter.com/OrderPublications.html>

© Copyright January 10, 2005 by James Roger Brown and Emily Catherine Brown. All rights reserved. This instruction manual may be copied or downloaded for individual family use without alteration solely for instructional use in customizing an individual case specific evidence testing matrix to analyze evidence in defending against false child abuse or molestation allegations. THE COMPREHENSIVE MODEL EVIDENCE TESTING MATRIX may be created and modified as needed for evidence analysis and entering into the record of administrative or judicial proceedings. A WordPerfect format of THE CHILD ABUSE ALLEGATION INVESTIGATION INSTRUMENT may be downloaded from THE SOCIOLOGY CENTER Publication Shopping Cart page at no cost to family and individual users at <http://www.thesociologycenter.com/OrderPublications.html>. Institutions, law firms, and government agencies who want to use THE CHILD ABUSE ALLEGATION INVESTIGATION INSTRUMENT must register and be licensed for such use and agree to a penalty clause for improper use of THE CHILD ABUSE ALLEGATION INVESTIGATION INSTRUMENT, including using the Instrument to commit any type of fraud, that undermines the credibility of THE CHILD ABUSE ALLEGATION INVESTIGATION INSTRUMENT and the EVIDENCE TESTING MATRIX protocol. To apply for an institutional license, submit a written request to:  
Institutional License Application  
THE SOCIOLOGY CENTER  
P.O. Box 2075  
North Little Rock, AR 72115-2075

## Contents

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| INSTRUCTIONS .....   | Page 1 of 34  |
| Step 1: State the paired contradictory hypotheses applied to analyze the<br>evidence ..... | Page 2 of 34  |
| Step 2: Construct the evidence analysis matrix. ....                                       | Page 3 of 34  |
| Step 3: Label the columns with column headings. ....                                       | Page 3 of 34  |
| Step 4: Begin the evidence analysis. ....  | Page 4 of 34  |
| Step 5: Summarize the results. ....  | Page 5 of 34  |
| Security Benefits of Using This Paired Contradictory Hypotheses Testing<br>Protocol .....  | Page 5 of 34  |
| Short Example Using Real Case Evidence .....   | Page 6 of 34  |
| COMPREHENSIVE MODEL EVIDENCE TESTING MATRIX .....  | Page 8 of 34  |
| PAIRED HYPOTHESIS LIST .....   | Page 10 of 34 |
| EVIDENCE TESTING MATRIX .....  | Page 11 of 34 |

## INSTRUCTIONS

Using the new evidence analysis protocol published in this Child Abuse Allegation Investigation Instrument has several important advantages over the current child abuse allegation investigation methods utilized by state child protection services investigators and law enforcement investigators. If false evidence is introduced into a case the Instrument is designed to detect it. If the investigator is corrupt, biased, or incompetent the Instrument is designed to detect it. If court-appointed or agency-contracted experts are corrupt, biased, incompetent, or engage in science fraud the Instrument is designed to detect it.

The most important consequence of using this Instrument is in the legal arena. One of the major problems with organized crime and corruption in the child protection system is that some judges and prosecutors are involved. The only remedy for a wrongful dismissal or adverse ruling in corrupt judicial proceedings is to appeal to a higher court. Appeals are decided on the record and evidence lodged in the original proceedings. New evidence can not be introduced in appeal proceedings. For this reason, it is vitally important that all relevant evidence becomes part of the original record at the earliest possible time in case it becomes necessary to appeal. By entering a properly completed Child Abuse Allegation Investigation Instrument into evidence, all relevant evidence that can be identified becomes part of the record because it is listed in the evidence matrix. Using this method to ensure all evidence is entered into the record will overcome the natural limitation of oral arguments, witness testimony, and judge imposed time limits. In the interactive mix of live court, few, if any, attorneys will be able to accomplish entering everything that might be needed on appeal into the record. This Instrument is designed to help attorneys achieve this essential task.

Once The Child Abuse Allegation Investigation Instrument is entered into the record, any appeals court would have to consider the evidentiary value of the contents of the Instrument, including evidence of organized crime, science fraud, and evidence falsification.

The Child Abuse Allegation Investigation Instrument uses methodology adapted from Central Intelligence Agency analysis methodology described in declassified material contained in *Psychology of Intelligence Analysis*. This United States government publication may be obtained through <http://www.cia.gov/csi/pubs.html>. The Child Abuse Allegation Investigation Instrument is customized for analyzing evidence in child abuse allegation cases.

Paired contradictory hypotheses are tested based upon the documentary evidence in a specific case. Using paired contradictory hypotheses meets the key falsifiability (see *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, 509 US 579 (1993)) legal standard because when one member of the paired contradictory hypotheses set is confirmed the other member is falsified.

**Step 1: State the paired contradictory hypotheses applied to analyze the evidence.**

Paired contradictory hypotheses must be stated in the PAIRED HYPOTHESIS LIST with a unique identifier for each hypothesis using the format:

H#: (i.e. H1:, H2:, H3:, H4:)

Using this format allows the label H1, H2, H3, etc., to be used as a label representing the full statement of each hypothesis in the table matrix.

Paired contradictory hypothesis are two statements or propositions of fact that both can not be true and both can not be false. For example, in a child abuse allegation one of the following hypotheses will be true and one will be false:

H1: John Doe is guilty of molesting Baby Doe.

H2: John Doe is not guilty of molesting Baby Doe.

If John Doe is accused of molesting Baby Doe, then only one of these statements can be true. Either H1 will be true and H2 false or H2 will be true and H1 false.

Since it is a logical impossibility for two contradictory hypotheses to both be true, if evidence is presented that both H1 and H2 are true, then it is *prima facie* proof that either the evidence purporting to confirm H1 or the evidence purporting to confirm H2 is false.

For this important benefit, it is absolutely necessary that H1 and H2 be *contradictory* hypotheses and not *contrary* hypotheses. For *contrary* hypotheses, it is not possible for both to be true, but it is possible for both to be false. **It is important not to confuse *contradictory* and *contrary* hypotheses when setting up paired hypotheses to be tested.** The following paired hypotheses are examples of *contraries*:

H1: John Doe acting alone molested Baby Doe.

H2: Henry Doe acting alone molested Baby Doe.

Assuming the allegation is that one person acting alone molested Baby Doe, then it is not possible for both H1 and H2 to be true. However, it is possible for both H1 and H2 to be false. The molestation allegation itself may be false, in which case both John Doe and Henry Doe are innocent, or a third unnamed person may have committed the molestation.

When two hypotheses are true *contradictories*, one will be true and one will be false with no other discernable alternate possibilities.

The key judicial issue in a child abuse or molestation allegation is “guilty” or “not guilty.” This issue must be stated in H1 and H2 with additional paired contradictory hypotheses designed to ascertain from an analysis of the evidence whether the evidence in support of H1 or H2 is false, why it is false, and who is responsible for falsifying the evidence in support of the false hypotheses.

In the Comprehensive Model Evidence Testing Matrix section a series of nine paired contradictory hypotheses are stated that cover full involvement of child protective services, law enforcement investigators, prosecutors, and court-appointed or agency-contracted psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers.

In cases that do not involve all these elements, the paired contradictory hypothesis for the absent professions are not required in the final matrix.

### **Step 2: Construct the evidence analysis matrix.**

Using a spreadsheet program or the table construction function in Word, WordPerfect, or another standard software package, construct a table allocating one column for each hypothesis you will be testing, one column for listing the evidence, and one column to number each evidence item.

For example, if the full complement of paired hypotheses used in the Model Matrix are used in the case you are dealing with, then the number of columns entered during setup would be twenty (20).

To use the full complement of evidence issues identified in the Model Matrix the number of rows allocated at setup should be at least two hundred fifty-six (256).

Remember that in most software packages with table construction functions you may add or delete columns or rows as necessary to complete your particular table. To add columns, the best method is to place the cursor in the last column and use the function that allows you to specify adding the columns *after* the column the cursor is in. To add rows, the best method is to specify adding the rows *after* the row the cursor is in. By adding columns or rows after the last column or row you will avoid having to renumber all the rows and columns after the point you insert the new columns or rows. You simply continue the number sequence from the last numbered column or row.

*If you make a mistake adding or deleting columns or rows, or make any other mistake editing the table matrix, try using the "UNDO" function as the easiest fix.* The "UNDO" function is often one of the options listed under "EDIT" on the toolbar. It will undo the last thing you did.

If the software package you are using allows it to be done, place a heavy line or double line at the end of the two columns assigned to each set of paired contradictory hypotheses to demarcate each set of hypotheses. This will make it easier to make certain you are entering an "X" in the correct box when going through the evidence analysis process.

In the row after the last item of evidence, enter "TOTAL" in the "EVIDENCE" Column. This indicates that the total number of "X"s indicating confirmation of the hypothesis will be entered in the last box under the Column for each hypothesis.

### **Step 3: Label the columns with column headings.**

At the top of Column One type "#" to indicate that it is the Evidence Item Number Column. In Row Two, Column One, begin the evidence item numbers with "E1" indicating "Evidence Item 1." In Row Three, Column One, type "E2" indicating "Evidence Item 2." Continue adding item numbers using the format "E#" until you have

entered and numbered all the items of factual evidence in your case.

**Remember that by listing all the evidence items, true or false, if this Child Abuse Allegation Investigation Instrument is entered into the record, then an appeals court will have all the evidence in the record to consider, *plus the legal issue of having to address the logical impossibility of evidence being on record supporting to paired contradictory hypotheses both of which can not be true.* If courts consistently ignore this logical impossibility, it will become an increasing embarrassment to the judicial system, because it will confirm a pattern of judicial misconduct that will have to be addressed at some point.**

At the top of Column Two type in "EVIDENCE" indicating that the evidentiary facts will be listed in this Column.

At the top of Column Three type in "H1" representing "Hypothesis 1." In the next column type in "H2" representing "Hypothesis 2." Continue this until you have allocated a column for the last hypothesis you have stated for testing against the evidence.

If your software package allows you to do so, set up a heavy line or double line between each pair of columns for the paired hypotheses, this will help ensure that you are correctly labeling the paired columns, i.e., H1, H2; H3, H4; H5, H6, etc. A heavy line or double line should appear between H2 and H3, H4 and H5 if the columns are being correctly labeled.

#### **Step 4: Begin the evidence analysis.**

In Row Two, Column Two type in the first factual evidence statement. **This must be evidence that can be supported or documented, not just an opinion or unsupported belief.**

When the factual statement is typed in, proceed to the first set of paired contradictory hypotheses. Does Evidence Item E1 confirm hypotheses H1 or H2. If it does confirm one of the hypotheses place an "X" in the box in that column. If it does not confirm either hypotheses, leave both boxes unmarked.

Proceed to paired hypotheses H3 and H4. Does evidence item E1 confirm hypotheses H3 or H4. If it does confirm one of the hypotheses place an "X" in the box in that column. If it does not confirm either hypotheses, leave both boxes unmarked.

Repeat this process for Evidence Item E1 for each set of paired hypotheses. When you have completed this process for Evidence Item E1, enter Evidence Item E2 and determine if it supports either hypotheses for each set of hypotheses.

Systematically enter each item of evidence and determine whether or not it confirms either member of each set of paired contradictory hypotheses. If an evidence item does not confirm a hypothesis leave the box blank.

When the evidence analysis is completed, count the number of "X"s for each hypothesis and enter the total on the last row under each column.

If there are a total number of "X"s greater than zero for **both** H1 and H2, then evidence has been falsified to support either H1 or H2 and the falsification is the product of either intentional deception, incompetence, or bias.

The pattern of confirmations on the remaining paired contradictory hypotheses

will identify the source and method of intentional deception, incompetence, or bias.

**Step 5: Summarize the results.**

On the “TOTAL” Row at the end of the Evidence Testing Matrix identify each column that has a value greater than zero after the “X”s are counted in each column and entered on the TOTAL Row. Identify the paired contradictory hypotheses set for each column with a value greater than zero. Title this report section “CRITICAL HYPOTHESES LIST.” List all these paired hypotheses and enter “TOTAL: #” at the end of each hypothesis.

If the Matrix has been properly used, the results are simple to interpret.

If both paired contradictory hypotheses have totals greater than zero, the evidence supporting one of the hypotheses is false.

If one of the paired contradictory hypotheses has a total of zero and the other a total greater than zero, the zero total hypothesis is falsified by confirmation of the contradictory hypotheses with the total greater than zero.

If the total for both paired contradictory hypotheses is zero, then the pair is not relevant and can be dropped unless evidence emerges that raises the total for one of the pair above zero.

**Security Benefits of Using This Paired Contradictory Hypotheses Testing Protocol**

In addition to detecting and identifying false evidence and bias in the investigation and prosecution of a child abuse allegation, this protocol of stating paired contradictory hypotheses and listing all case evidence in one central document makes it more difficult to manipulate the results of The Child Abuse Allegation Investigation Instrument itself to produce a false conclusion of guilt or innocence.

All anyone must do to successfully challenge the validity of any specific application of The Child Abuse Allegation Investigation Instrument is to document that evidence was omitted from the evidence list that would have raised the total for any hypothesis above zero that was originally reported to be zero. If the omitted evidence raised the total above zero for an hypothesis paired with a contradictory hypothesis that had a total above zero, that would be sufficient to conclude that the evidence supporting one of the paired hypotheses was false. While the more evidence there is that supports a specific hypothesis the stronger is the argument in favor of accepting the hypothesis, a single piece of evidence in support of the contradictory hypothesis is sufficient to require a closer examination to determination which set of evidence is false.

If the results are invalidated The Child Abuse Allegation Investigation Instrument can simply be revised to include the omitted evidence and the revised totals reported appropriately.

If it can be proven that evidence was intentionally omitted to produce a false conclusion, that is evidence of intentional fraud in a criminal investigation. For example, if the case worker in a child protective services agency falsely reported ninety-nine

pieces of evidence in support of H1 to make an overwhelming case of guilt against an accused individual, all the accused individual would have to do is identify a single piece of omitted evidence that supports H2 that he is not guilty. This single fact would be sufficient to conclude that either the evidence supporting H1 or H2 is false and require further determination. If it can be proven that the child protective services case worker possessed documents that contained the omitted evidence, that would imply that either willful intent or incompetence was responsible for the omission.

### **Short Example Using Real Case Evidence**

#### PAIRED HYPOTHESIS LIST

H1: John Doe is guilty of the criminal offense of sexual molestation.

H2: John Doe is not guilty of the criminal offense of sexual molestation.

H3: The alleged victim has made a true allegation of the criminal act of sexual molestation.

H4: The alleged victim has made a false allegation of the criminal act of sexual molestation.

H5: The child protection services agency conducted an objective investigation.

H6: The child protection services agency conducted a biased investigation.

H7: The investigating law enforcement agency conducted an objective investigation.

H8: The investigating law enforcement agency conducted a biased investigation.

H9: The prosecutor conducted an objective prosecution.

H10: The prosecutor conducted a biased prosecution.

H11: The court-appointed or agency-contracted psychological evaluator conducted an objective evaluation.

H12: The court-appointed or agency-contracted psychological evaluator did not conduct an objective evaluation.

H13: The court-appointed or agency-contracted social worker conducted an objective evaluation.

H14: The court-appointed or agency-contracted social worker did not conduct an objective evaluation.

H15: Organized criminal activity was a factor in sustaining the abuse or molestation allegation.

H16: Organized criminal activity was not a factor in sustaining the abuse or molestation allegation.



|         |   |   |   |  |   |  |  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| E<br>9  | When original statement of one child was "lost", investigating officer wrote out another statement and had the child sign this statement as a replacement for alleged original. |   |   |  |   |  |  |  | X |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>10 | All records and audio tape recordings of interview for one child were missing, and child was not called as witness.   |   |   |  |   |  |  |  | X |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|         | TOTAL   | 1 | 4 |  | 4 |  |  |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**CRITICAL HYPOTHESES LIST**

H1: John Doe is guilty of the criminal offense of sexual molestation. **[TOTAL: 1]**

H2: John Doe is not guilty of the criminal offense of sexual molestation. **[TOTAL: 4]**

H3: The alleged victim has made a true allegation of the criminal act of sexual molestation. **[TOTAL: 0]**

H4: The alleged victim has made a false allegation of the criminal act of sexual molestation. **[TOTAL: 4]**

H7: The investigating law enforcement agency conducted an objective investigation. **[TOTAL: 0]**

H8: The investigating law enforcement agency conducted a biased investigation. **[TOTAL: 5]**

H9: The prosecutor conducted an objective prosecution. **[TOTAL: 0]**

H10: The prosecutor conducted a biased prosecution. **[TOTAL: 2]**

Summary

Because both of the paired contradictory hypotheses H1 and H2 have totals greater than zero, we know that either the evidence supporting H1 is false or the evidence supporting H2 is false.

H3 with a zero total is falsified by the confirmed H4 with a total of 4. The alleged victim has made a false allegation of molestation against John Doe.

H7 with a total of zero is falsified by the confirmed H8 with a total of 5. The investigating law enforcement agency conducted a biased investigation.

H9 with a total of zero is falsified by the confirmed H10 with a total of 2. The prosecutor conducted a biased prosecution.

We must conclude that H1 is supported by false evidence due to the alleged victim having made a false allegation sustained by a biased criminal investigation and biased prosecution. John Doe is not guilty of the criminal offense of sexual molestation.

**COMPREHENSIVE MODEL EVIDENCE TESTING MATRIX**

In the matrix of this instrument the numbered list of evidence items is derived from research regarding grant fraud, insurance fraud, federal fund claims fraud, organized crime, and science fraud in the child protection, mental health, and social work systems documented in COMPENDIUM OF DOCUMENTATION OF ORGANIZED CRIME METHODS AND PROCEDURES INTEGRATED INTO STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES THROUGH STATE AND FEDERAL CHILD PROTECTION, MENTAL HEALTH, AND SOCIAL WORK SYSTEMS that may be downloaded or reviewed at

<http://www.thesociologycenter.com/EvidenceBooks/COMPENDIUM.pdf>.

Numbering each evidence item on the matrix provides a structure for organizing the documents in each case which can be quite extensive. Each document which contains facts relevant to each numbered evidence item on the matrix should be labeled with that number (i.e. E2 or E17 or E243). Since a document or other evidence might contain facts that address more than one evidence item, it is recommended that a cover sheet be placed on each document or piece of evidence and all matrix number evidence items addressed by facts contained in the document or evidence should be listed on the cover sheet, noting the page and paragraph or page and line numbers of the facts addressing each item (i.e. E15, H2 p. 12 line 7-12, H15 p. 22, paragraph 3). Organizing the supporting documentation around the structure of the Evidence Testing Matrix will expedite locating the supporting documentation or evidence during hearings and legal proceedings.

Please note this Matrix comprehensively addresses a broad range of evidence that may not be factors in any particular case. For example, if there is no criminal investigation and no criminal prosecution, the paired hypotheses regarding law enforcement and prosecutors, as well as the numbered evidence items relevant only to law enforcement and prosecutors, will not be needed in the final form produced for a specific case.

Remember that this matrix can be constructed from scratch using any word processing software with a table function or any presentation or database management software that can construct tables. When constructing a new matrix for a particular case either the original matrix protocol described in the CIA Manual or this stronger paired hypothesis protocol may be used.

Also remember with regard to interpretation of the testing of paired contradictory hypotheses, since Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 are contradictories (both can not be true, both can not be false), if purported evidence is put forth indicating that both hypotheses are true, we immediately know that one set of evidence is false. The false evidence is either the product of intentional deception by one or more parties, investigator incompetence, or investigator bias. The "investigator" may be one or more of the following; (1) case worker, (2) child protection service investigator, (3) law enforcement criminal investigator, (4) agency-contracted or court-appointed psychiatrist, (5) agency-contracted or court-appointed psychologist; or (6) agency-contracted or court-appointed social worker. There are no other possible explanations

for purported evidence supporting both these contradictory hypotheses.

The additional paired hypotheses are present and designed to identify the source of intentional deception, incompetence or bias that produced false evidence to support Hypothesis 1 or Hypothesis 2.

### PAIRED HYPOTHESIS LIST

H1: \_\_\_\_\_ is guilty of the criminal offense of \_\_\_\_\_.

H2: \_\_\_\_\_ is not guilty of the criminal offense of \_\_\_\_\_.

H3: The alleged victim has made a true allegation of the criminal act of \_\_\_\_\_.

H4: The alleged victim has made a false allegation of the criminal act of \_\_\_\_\_.

H5: The child protection services agency conducted an objective investigation.

H6: The child protection services agency conducted a biased investigation.

H7: The investigating law enforcement agency conducted an objective investigation.

H8: The investigating law enforcement agency conducted a biased investigation.

H9: The prosecutor conducted an objective prosecution.

H10: The prosecutor conducted a biased prosecution.

H11: The court-appointed or agency-contracted psychological evaluator conducted an objective evaluation.

H12: The court-appointed or agency-contracted psychological evaluator did not conduct an objective evaluation.

H13: The court-appointed or agency-contracted social worker conducted an objective evaluation.

H14: The court-appointed or agency-contracted social worker did not conduct an objective evaluation.

H15: Organized criminal activity was a factor in sustaining the abuse or molestation allegation.

H16: Organized criminal activity was not a factor in sustaining the abuse or molestation allegation.

H17: Science fraud was a factor in sustaining the abuse or molestation allegation.

H18: Science fraud was not a factor in sustaining the abuse or molestation allegation.



























|                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| E<br>1<br>5<br>3 | The psychologist has stated that as a therapist they have no responsibility to determine if information obtained from the alleged victim is true or false.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>5<br>4 | The social worker has stated that as a therapist they have no responsibility to determine if information obtained from the alleged victim is true or false.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>5<br>5 | The psychologist has stated that they have no responsibility to inform the court if they subsequently determine that their conclusion or recommendations were in error or not in the best interest of the alleged victim.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>5<br>6 | The social worker has stated that they have no responsibility to inform the court if they subsequently determine that their conclusion or recommendations were in error or not in the best interest of the alleged victim. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>5<br>7 | The psychologist used experimental therapy or interview techniques without informing the parties involved and/or did not obtain the informed written consent of the alleged victim or their guardian.                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>5<br>8 | The social worker used experimental therapy or interview techniques without informing the parties involved and/or did not obtain the informed written consent of the alleged victim or their guardian.                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>5<br>9 | The psychologist does not use a specific theory to interpret the information obtained from the alleged abuse victim.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>6<br>0 | The social worker does not use a specific theory to interpret the information obtained from the alleged abuse victim.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>6<br>1 | The psychologist claims not to use any specific theory, but has no methodology for determining when one theory should be used over another to attribute meaning to the information obtained from the alleged victim.       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|                  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| E<br>1<br>6<br>2 | The social worker claims not to use any specific theory, but has no methodology for determining when one theory should be used over another to attribute meaning to the information obtained from the alleged victim. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>6<br>3 | The psychologist does not determine if information received at child abuse seminars or workshops is true or false prior to incorporating it into their practice.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>6<br>4 | The social worker does not determine if information received at child abuse seminars or workshops is true or false prior to incorporating it into their practice.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>6<br>5 | The psychologist has no academic credentials specifically relating to child abuse.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>6<br>6 | The social worker has no academic credentials specifically relating to child abuse.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>6<br>7 | The techniques used by the psychologist have a high rate of error.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>6<br>8 | The techniques used by the social worker have a high rate of error.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>6<br>9 | The psychologist did not determine if information provided by the alleged victim and others was true or false before using the information to reach conclusions.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>7<br>0 | The social worker did not determine if information provided by the alleged victim and others was true or false before using the information to reach conclusions.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>1<br>7<br>1 | The psychologist did not use the correct protocol or methodology when conducting forensic interviews of the alleged victim and/or perpetrator.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |















|                  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| E<br>2<br>4<br>7 | The social worker used "the best interest" of the alleged victim to obstruct normal prosecutorial and/or investigative procedures with the consequence that exculpatory evidence was not discovered or disclosed.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>2<br>4<br>8 | The psychologist used emotional blackmail to obtain a statement or testimony against the alleged perpetrator by threatening to make allegations of abuse against other individuals or family members and recommend to the court permanent removal of children from parental or family custody.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>2<br>4<br>9 | The social worker used emotional blackmail to obtain a statement or testimony against the alleged perpetrator by threatening to make allegations of abuse against other individuals or family members and recommend to the court permanent removal of children from parental or family custody. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>2<br>5<br>0 | The psychologist used emotional blackmail to obtain a statement or testimony from the alleged victim.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>2<br>5<br>1 | The social worker used emotional blackmail to obtain a statement or testimony from the alleged victim.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>2<br>5<br>2 | The psychologist disregarded or refused to comply with court orders.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>2<br>5<br>3 | The social worker disregarded or refused to comply with court orders.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E<br>2<br>5<br>4 | The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory 2 was used in the psychological evaluations conducted.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|                            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>E<br/>2<br/>5<br/>5</p> | <p>A judicial benchguide, benchbook, legal policy manual, or other reference book relied upon by the judge or administrative hearing officer contained an instruction or recommendation to consider maximizing federal funds as a criterion for deciding to remove a child from parental custody and place the child in State child protective custody or terminate parental rights and place the child for adoption.</p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>E<br/>2<br/>5<br/>6</p> | <p><b>TOTAL</b></p>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |