

# Abuse and responsibility essay

[Economics](#), [Budget](#)



Sexual abuse entails “ virtually all sexual interactions between children and significantly older persons” (Rind et. Al. ). Child endangerment consists of a broad list of items from “[l]eaving a child unattended in a motor vehicle [to] [f]allure to report suspected child abuse” (“ Child Abuse”). Obviously, child abuse in any of its forms should be avoided and prevented, if possible.

The real question this paper will address is how far should we go to stop and prevent child abuse? What should the responsibilities of child service agents and the general public be? There are two basic sides to these questions. On one side, there is a push for more strict laws that would hold everyone more accountable for the protection of children from abuse. On the other, there is the opposition to the laws concerning child abuse becoming stricter and also a push for more of a laxity in some of the laws. Through my research, I have come to the conclusion that the current laws concerning child abuse are not sufficient and that they do need to become stricter in order to properly protect children. I will present my case by first stating and evaluating the arguments against this decision, then stating and evaluating the arguments for my decision. There are three main arguments to defend the viewpoint that it is not a good idea to increase the laws dealing with child abuse or to make them stricter. The first is that child services caseworkers are doing the best they can while dealing with problems such as budget cuts and being understaffed.

The second argument is that mandatory reporting (of child abuse) laws are impractical and will cause many false alarms as the common person isn't trained to recognize child abuse. The final argument used is that the children that mandatory reporting laws are supposed to protect might end up going

through unneeded emotional duress due to a false reporting of child abuse. With the current laws, there is a great strain placed on child services caseworkers. Those opposed to holding child services caseworkers responsible claim that “ the caseworkers are doing their best under adverse conditions and should not be punished when tragedy occurs” (“ Child Abuse”). They blame budget cuts, which cause a problem of understaffed child welfare agencies.

This problem of too few personnel causes some child abuse to be overlooked as caseworkers are trying to take care of more children than they can feasibly handle. With laws that hold caseworkers responsible for child abuse, that just adds to the understanding problem Abuse and Re and Responsibility exactly IS child abuse? TTT “‘ verbally’ assaulting and Abuse”). Abuse through food and shelter. Ere not nor, wanly death abuse entails “ virtually a older (Rind et. Trot a child our suspected child abuse” ( Obviously, Child abuse, possible, ‘ he real quests ann.

prevent child abuse the general public be? TTL there a for ironer ere protection of children laws concerning child at Through my’ research cancer mining child abuse order TU proper 19’ protect evaluating rag. Element arguments for my decides. O Increase the laws dead problem, such us budge mandatory reporting (of alarms as ere common p argument used IS that TTT protect end up go report-ring of child abuse Walt the current laws leeches opposed to holding caseworkers are doing TTY punished when tragedy cause d of personnel causes some take care oaf mare children caseworkers

responsible by putting caseworkers behind bars for something that they can prevent.

They also argue that this causes other caseworkers potentially being arrested for child abuse and makes them do the huge amount of work they already have to deal with. In their merit. The situation of budget cuts causing loss of person childhood of a case of child abuse being overlooked makes being arrested creating an even greater strain on remaining sense. However, their job is to protect the children under the circumstances that less accountability would make caseworker look after than they are used to want to work even harder. Mandatory reporting laws are impractical. The impracticality of everyone to report suspected child abuse is twofold.

The first person isn't trained to detect child abuse. The second stems deals with the police potentially not being able to handle the calls. The problems connected with untrained people being suspected child abuse are rather serious. There is a very large false alarm. According to Debra Schilling Wolfe, "an executive Center for Children's policy, Practice & Research at the University of Pennsylvania" ("Child Abuse"), "Child abuse and neglect reports by professionals are substantiated 27. % of the time, while only nonprofessional reports are substantiated" ("Child Abuse"). People who report suspected abuse with serious consequences could end up reporting even less accurately out of fear naturally leads into the problems that the police would have laws stay in use where they are in use and come into use with 4.

4% of reported cases being substantiated, the police waste money and effort for a false alarm. With people being afraid of suspicion of abuse, the police

could easily become swamps unable to function properly. This argument is a very good one and the statistic helps give it added validity. It is clear that untrained people being forced to report suspicions of child abuse make it harder to prevent the actual cases of abuse by so many going down dead ends because of a false report. The final point is that the public should be more responsible when it comes to reporting child abuse than the previous argument because it too deals with mandatory reporting that can cause children emotional distress because of a report that was incorrect. Children who are reported as child abuse “are subjected to forensic interviews and invasive medical procedures in and of itself” (Lengthiest). Besides the interviews a child could go through, there is the added emotional trauma of being charged with their abuse. With the current child abuse laws, a parent could be considered guilty on “a substantially less evidentiary standard needed for a criminal conviction” (Lengthiest).

That, coupled with a 75% reversal rate “when cases of child abuse were brought to court” (Lengthiest), makes it more likely than not that some are putting caseworkers behind bars to prevent. They also argue that this potentially being arrested for a crime is a huge amount of work they do not merit. The situation of budget cuts! Likelihood of a case of child abuse being arrested creating an even greater sense of helplessness. However, their job is to protect and seem likely that less accountability is looked after than they are used to. Mandatory reporting laws are implemented on everyone to report suspected child abuse, but a person isn't trained to detect child abuse deals with the police potentially unnecessary calls. The problems connected with suspected child abuse are rather a false alarm. According to Debra Center for Children's policy, Practice. Pennsylvania” (“Child Abuse”), “Child abuse professionals are substantiated 21 nonprofessional reports are submitted by people

to report suspected abuse people could end up reporting even naturally leads into the problems laws stay in use where they are in 14.4% of reported cases being suit money and effort for a false alarm suspicion of abuse, the police could be unable to function properly.

This sound and the statistic helps give untrained people being forced to make it harder to prevent the ACTA going down dead ends because of public to be more responsible in his previous argument because it too that 01 causing children emotion that was incorrect. Children who “subjected to forensic interviews abuse in and of itself” (Lenghiest) children could go through, there one charged with their abuse. With abuse could be considered guilty, needed for a criminal conviction” up to reversal rate “when case court” (Lenghiest), makes it more This could negatively affect the child’s relationship that they were abused, even though they weren’t in the child’s mind. This argument was very well a compelling point.

It rather effectively contends that child abuse, we might create child abuse through if that mandatory reporting laws for all citizens, as AR are not the way to go. I found that this was a strong argument. As you can see, the arguments against a law concerning child abuse are rather compelling but the remaining two were fairly strong and well the other side of the issue to understand why I have argument.

There are four main arguments to defend the law need to be stricter. The first is that child services are accountable for the safety of the children under the that those working with children should be required to report signs of child abuse and to report suspicions of child abuse everyone should feel a responsibility to report

chill be exempt from mandatory reporting laws. The fin to very likely to speak out for themselves when the to speak for them.

In complete opposition to the fir is the argument that child services caseworkers SSH safety of the children under their care. They argue serves the interests of children and society’ (“ Child passing off the death of a child due to budget cuts make that death any better. Through holding case children under their care, only the caseworkers who children will be free of consequences. This could incapable or simply unwilling to protect the children care. This means that those caseworkers left would despite any added difficulty of budget cuts or cocoa heir toes. Budget cuts are affecting basically every doesn’t seem right to use those cuts as an excuse f protected by child welfare agencies have died. If a after the welfare of its children, what is the point o Agencies that have children under their watch shoo should be punished for irresponsibility. This argue the opposite side didn’t address.

It focused on the safety of children the first priority of child welfare did address the added difficulty of budget cuts, buy problem for basically all of us. However, it didn’t ad replace those who were arrested for the severe ABA watch. That’s a bit of an important oversight. All in argument against it, though. Now, we will move on according to this side of the argument, for those w to spot child abuse.

This deals, in part, with mandatory reporting laws as those on this side of the argument want people such as “ teachers, camp counselors, day care workers, and others in close contact with children on a daily basis” (“ Child

Abuse”) to be required to be trained to spot child abuse and report their suspicions. By having the proper training, those who work closely with children would be able to feel confident in recognizing basically any form of abuse and be able to report it. This is more than just a moral problem as it has legal implications as well.

It is a responsibility for anyone whose job has them working with children to “understand the law and err on the side of caution in order to prevent more children from being hurt” (“Child Abuse”). This argument does a good job of finding a balance between the two sides of this issue. It holds those who work with children responsible to know if the children are being abused because of training they would have to go through. I think both sides would agree that this would be a good step in the right direction for reverting child abuse, which is really the main goal no matter what side of this particular argument you are on.

The third argument for increased accountability also deals with mandatory reporting laws and consists of two parts. The first is that everyone, no matter who they are or what they do, should feel that they are responsible to report child abuse if they suspect it. Those who are in support of this part argue that most people need to be required to report or face a punishment. They also argue that the punishment needs to be rather severe in order to instigate, even if it is through fear of the consequences, this feeling of responsibility. The second part of this argument involved getting rid of any exemption for a group when it comes to mandatory reporting laws. An example of one such group is the Catholic Church.



Because of the exemption from reporting laws, the Catholic Church has had “ a persistence of sexual abuse” (“ Child Abuse”). Those opposed to exemptions state that “ exceptions to reporting requirements turn the organizations that receive them into unduly dangerous places for children” (Hamilton). The first part of this argument ally isn’t very convincing, especially with the argument presented by the opposing side as to why the average person shouldn’t be required by law to report child abuse. However, the second part of this argument does a much better Job. It does a good Job of using a fairly well known example of the Catholic Church, which helps to validate the argument.

The strength of this argument with both parts isn’t very impressive, but it does add some strength with the need to get rid of exemptions. The final argument for this side of the issue is the need of adults to speak out for children who are abused. This is needed because children who are abused will usually not speak out for themselves until much later, if they do at all. This again deals with mandatory reporting laws, but in a rather different way. This argument calls those who have witnessed the abuse of a child to speak up. It doesn’t really state that there needs to be a law to this effect, but it seems implied through the way it is worded.

Children who are abused are usually told by their abuser to not tell anyone about the abuse. This can be accompanied with a threat that effectively keeps them silent about their abuse in many cases. Because of this, the need for adults to report is quite evident. The reasons behind this argument are probably the best reason for laws that require even the average person

to report abuse that they have witnessed. This is different than simply requiring anyone who suspects abuse to report, because it is more likely to be a valid case of child abuse if it was by the one who reported it. Because of that, the argument is fairly strong on the strength of this side without being countered too much by the very strong argument against laws requiring the average person to report abuse.

Although sides present compelling arguments and neither are perfect, the push for SST hill abuse laws involving responsibility and reporting are the better backed the better defended.