Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families (FSPSF)

Waves 1-8

NDACAN Dataset Number 283
USER'S GUIDE

National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect

Duke University / Cornell University

Phone: 607-255-7799

Email: ndacan@cornell.edu

Website: www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov

Initial release: July 2024

Last Revision: July 3, 2024

Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families

Data Collected by

Dina J. Wilke, PhD, MSW
Florida State University Tallahassee, FL

Melissa Radey, PhD, MSSW, MA
Florida State University Tallahassee, FL

Lisa Magruder, PhD, MSW
Florida State University Tallahassee, FL

Funded by

Florida Institute for Child Welfare

Distributed by

National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect

User's Guide Written by

Sarah Sernaker, M.S.
National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect

in collaboration with

Dina J. Wilke, PhD, MSW
Florida State University Tallahassee, FL

Table of Contents

PREFACE

The data for *Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families* have been given to the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) for public distribution by Dina J. Wilke. Funding for the project was provided by Florida Institute for Child Welfare (Award Number(s): 0000028351).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SOURCE

Authors should acknowledge the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) and the original collector(s) of the data when publishing manuscripts that use data provided by the Archive. Users of these data are urged to follow some adaptation of the statement below.

> The data used in this publication were made available by the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect and have been used with permission. Data from *Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families* were originally collected by Dina J. Wilke. Funding for the project was provided by Florida Institute for Child Welfare (Award Number(s): 0000028351). The collector(s) of the original data, the funder(s), NDACAN, Duke University, Cornell University and their agents or employees bear no responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

> Wilke, D., Radey, M., & Magruder, L. (2024). *Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families (FSPSF): Waves 1-8* [Data set]. National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN). https://doi.org/10.34681/543Q-KC64

PUBLICATION SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT

In accordance with the terms of the *Data License* for this dataset, users of these data are required to notify the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect of any published work or report based wholly or in part on these data. A copy of any completed manuscript, thesis abstract, or reprint should be emailed to NDACANsupport@cornell.edu . Such copies will be used to provide our funding agency with essential information about the use of NDACAN resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about research activities among data users and contributors.

ABSTRACT

The Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families (FSPSF) is a longitudinal study of Florida's child welfare workforce. The primary focus of the study examines turnover and retention decisions among frontline workers. FSPSF project staff recruited all Child Protective Investigators and Dependency Case Managers in pre-service training between Sept. 1, 2015 and December 31, 2016 and 84% of eligible participants provided consent and baseline information (N = 1,500). Participants were followed during the study timeframe even if they left their child welfare positions. Workers were surveyed every six months for approximately 3.5 years focusing on individual, occupational, and organizational influences on child welfare employee retention.

This statewide study examined worker personal characteristics (e.g., educational background, family history, self-esteem, etc.) worker experiences and responses (e.g., stress and burnout, work/family balance, social support, and coping, etc.), and organizational influences (e.g., organizational climate, supervisory practices, and caseload responsibilities etc.). Respondents were surveyed every 6-7 months with a core instrument and three in-depth substantive modules that were rotated during the data collection period. Modules included a focus on

(1) supervision and organizational functioning (assessed at waves 2, 5, and 8);

(2) work/family life balance (assessed at waves 3, 6 and 8); and

(3) mental health (assessed at waves 4 and 7).

Overall, 100% of child welfare administrative units across the state of Florida agreed to be part of the study. Individual response rates for each wave were also very high. Across all waves of data collection, response rates averaged 81% and ranged from 77% to 87%, and 62% (n = 929) of participants responded at every wave of data collection.

STUDY OVERVIEW

Study Identification

Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families

Principal Investigator(s):

Dina J. Wilke, PhD, MSW
Florida State University Tallahassee, FL

Melissa Radey, PhD, MSSW, MA
Florida State University Tallahassee, FL

Project Manager:

Lisa Magruder, PhD, MSW
Florida State University Tallahassee, FL

Funded By:
Florida Institute for Child Welfare

Award Number(s): 0000028351

Purpose of the Study

The primary focus of the study examines turnover and retention decisions among frontline child welfare workers.

Study Design

The FSPSF is a prospective longitudinal cohort design that followed newly hired child protective investigators and dependency case managers for 45 months following baseline. Workers were surveyed electronically using Qualtrics every 6 months. The cohort was divided into quarterly panels based on study recruitment date in order to ensure that participants were surveyed at the same general point in their employment tenure, therefore it took one year to collect each wave of data.

Date(s) of Data Collection

9/15/2015 - 5/30/2020

Geographic Area

Judiciary circuits of Florida, United States of America

Unit of Observation

Individual

Sample

FSPSF project staff recruited all newly hired Child Protective Investigators (CPIs) and Dependency Case Managers (CMs) between Sept. 1, 2015 and December 31, 2016. Participants were recruited during their pre-service training, a mandatory training for all new hires not currently holding Florida certification in the job for which they have been hired. Trainees were eligible to participate if they 1) held a college degree, and 2) were being trained for positions as child protective investigators or dependency case managers. Overall, 100% of child welfare administrative units across the state of Florida agreed to be part of the study. Face-to-face recruitment was done during visits to pre-service training classes to explain the project to trainees and seek their consent for participation. Trainees also provided personal phone and email contact information so that study engagement was completed without using employer resources. When a trainee provided their consent to participate, they were sent the baseline survey.

About 84% of all eligible workers provided consent and completed a baseline survey to become part of the FSPSF cohort (N = 1,500). The overall sample was comprised of CMs (n = 877, 58%), CPIs employed by the Florida DCF (n = 486, 33%), and CPIs employed by county sheriff's offices (n = 137, 9%). The sample was comprised of 85% women, 16% Hispanic, 36% non-Hispanic Black, 44% non-Hispanic White, and 4% were another non-Hispanic race. The average age was 31.6 years old, and 81% of workers had a bachelor's degree while the remaining 19% had a graduate or other professional degree.

Data Collection Procedures

The FSPSF had a robust distribution and reminder protocol to encourage survey completion. Initial contact was made with participants via text message approximately one-week prior to survey distribution. This was to inform them of the upcoming distribution and to give them an opportunity to get in touch with project staff if they had any changes to their contact information. Surveys were distributed via email on Saturday mornings to not interfere with work obligations. Following distribution, a second text message was sent along with an email from the PI to alert participants in the event the survey was sent to a spam folder or not distributed by the email provider. Surveys remained available for completion for 50 days. Text message reminders were sent on days 20 and 27, and email reminders were sent on days 7, 14, 21, and 28.

In recognition of the time required for their involvement (each survey took approximately one hour to complete), a monetary incentive in the form of an e-gift certificate, was provided to all participants who completed a survey. In accordance with best practices in longitudinal research

incentives were gradually increased to maintain participant interest and commitment. The incentive structure included: Wave 2- 6 months post baseline, $25; Wave 3- 12 months post baseline, $40; Wave 4- 19 months post baseline, $40; Wave 5- 25 months post baseline, $50; Wave 6- 32 months post baseline, $50; Wave 7- 38 months post baseline, $60; Wave 8- 45 months post baseline, $75.

Response Rates

Response rates for each wave were very high. Across all waves of data collection, response rates averaged 81% and ranged from 77% to 87%. Further, 62% (n = 929) of participants responded at every wave of data collection.

Sources of Information

Survey participants.

Type of Data Collected

Survey

Measures

Below is a table that details which instruments were administered to each individual at each wave, depending on their employment at the time. The numbers in each cell indicate the different types of employment statuses, coded from 1-5 where

- 1 denotes all participants,
- 2 for employed participants,
- 3 for current child welfare (CW) workers,
- 4 for current CW and Health and Human Services (HHS) workers, and
- 5 for previous CW workers who left the CW workforce since their last completed survey.

Table 1. FSPSF Instrument Inventory

Full Instrument Name/Version	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave 6	Wave 7	Wave 8
Preparation & Background								
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale	1							
The Caregiver Role Identity Scale	1							
Organizational Influences								
Job Satisfaction Survey	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Workplace Violence Scale		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Workplace Violence Scale		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Psychological Climate Questionnaire		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Physical Environment Survey Instrument		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mentoring Functions Questionnaire***		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Supervision Practice in Human Services Scale***		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Higher Education Research Institute Diverse Learning Environment: Organizational Bias		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Time Pressure		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Work Experiences & Responses								
Question A19 from WHO HPQ	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Composite International Diagnostic Interview	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Perceived Stress Scale		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Social Support Index	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Peer Support		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Child Welfare Provider Stigma Inventory		3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Child Welfare Provider Stigma Inventory		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Perceptions of Child Welfare Scale		3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Perceptions of Child Welfare Scale		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Copenhagen Burnout Inventory		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Career Planning Scale		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Intent to Stay		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Intent to Stay		3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Intent to Leave Child Welfare Scale		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Self-Efficacy		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
World Health Organization Health and Work Performance Questionnaire (HPQ)		2	2	2	2	2	2	2

****Asked of participants who indicated they had a supervisor*

Full Instrument Name/Version	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave 6	Wave 7	Wave 8
Substantive Module: Supervision & Organizational Functioning								
Association of University Centers on Disabilities (AUCD) Multicultural Council's Organizational Cultural Competence Assessment		2			2			2
Learning Culture		2			2			2
Leadership		2			2			2
The Feedback Environment Scale		2			2			2
Strengths-Based Supervision Scale		2			2			2
Substantive Module: Work/Life Balance								
Work-Life Balance Measure			2			2		2
Work-Family Conflict Scale			2			2		2
Family-Work Conflict Scale			2			2		2
The Brief Resilience Scale			2			2		2
Spiritual Experience Index Revised			2			2		2
Substantive Module: Mental Health								
Coping Inventory for Stressful Situations	1			2			2	
The Patient Health Questionnaire				2			2	
Beck Anxiety Inventory				2			2	
Abbreviated PTSD Checklist - Civilian Version				2			2	
The Defeat Scale				2			2	
The Entrapment Scale				2			2	

Perceived Stress Scale (PSS)

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *24*(4), 385-396. Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2136404

Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., & Mosher, S. W. (1992). The perceived stress scale: Factor structure and relation to depression symptoms in a psychiatric sample. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *14*(3), 247-257. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00962631

Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Rosenberg self-esteem scale (RSE). *Acceptance and commitment therapy. Measures package*, *61*(52), 18. Retrieved from: http://www.bsos.umd.edu/socy/research/rosenberg.htm

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Copenhagen Burnout Inventory

Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work & Stress*, *19*(3), 192-207. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500297720

Leadership

The Leadership scale measured a child welfare professional's perceptions of agency leadership practices. The measure included 18 items and used a 5-point agreement scale with an N/A option.
Baseline:
n =2584
M(SD) =3.38(0.80)
alpha=.96
Follow-up:
n =2625
M(SD) =3.55(0.82)
alpha=.97

Butler Institute for Families (2014). *Leadership [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Learning Culture

The Learning Culture scale measured a child welfare professional's perception of how the organization and their colleagues promote and engage in professional learning activities. The

measure included 11 items and used a 5-point frequency scale with an N/A option.
Baseline:
n =2552
M(SD) =3.06(0.97)
alpha=.93
Follow-up:
n =2564
M(SD) =3.41(1.0)
alpha=.94

Butler Institute for Families (2014). *Learning Culture [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Physical Environment Survey Instrument

New York Social Work Education Consortium (2001). *Physical Environment Survey Instrument*. Albany, NY: New York Social Work Education Consortium.

Peer Support [Adapted from Psychosocial Working Conditions Questionnaire]

At baseline, the peer support measure included two subscales: support from co-workers ("Perceived" 7 items on a 5-point agreement scale) and the extent to which peer support is "reciprocal" (7 items on a 5-point frequency scale); as well as nine follow-up questions about reasons for not seeking peer support. At follow-up, peer support was re-conceptualized as "operational support" (5 items) and "social-emotional support" (5 items). Follow-up scales used a 5-point r agreement scale with N/A option.
Baseline Reciprocal:
n =2412
M(SD) =3.79(0.83)
alpha=.87
UD modified Peer Support items from Widerszal-Bazyl, M. & Cieślak, M. (2000) Monitoring psychosocial stress at work: Development of the Psychosocial Working Conditions Questionnaire. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics, 6*, 59-70. DOI: 10.1080/10803548.2000.11105108 Baseline Perceived:
n =2400
M(SD) =4.16(0.67)
alpha=.93
Follow-up Operational:
n =2362
M(SD) =4.25(0.64)
alpha=.92
Follow-up Social/Emotional:
n =2383
M(SD) =4.25(0.64)
alpha=.93

Butler Institute for Families (2017). *Peer Support [Adapted from Psychosocial Working Conditions Questionnaire]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Widerszal-Bazyl, M. & Cieslak, M. (2000). Monitoring psychosocial stress at work: Development of the Psychosocial Working Conditions Questionnaire. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics, 6*, 59-70. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/10803548.2000.11105108

Public Perceptions of Child Welfare Scale

Auerbach, C., Zeitlin, W., Augsberger, A., Lawrence, C. K., & Claiborne, N. (2016). Societal factors impacting child welfare: Re-validating the Perceptions of Child Welfare Scale. *Children and Youth Services Review, 62*, 65-71. doi: https://doi-org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.01.020

Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale

Bride, B.E., Robinson, M.R., Yegidis, & Figley, C.R. (2004). Development and validation of the Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale. *Research on Social Work Practice, 14*, 27-35. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731503254106

Time Pressure

The time pressure scale contained five items and used a 5-point frequency scale and N/A option to measure a child welfare professional's perception of their experience with time pressure and its impact on their work.
Baseline:
n =2593
M(SD) =3.85(1.13)
alpha=.95
Follow-up:
n =2523
M(SD) =3.29(1.20)
alpha=.95

Butler Institute for Families (2011). *Time Pressure [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Brief Resilience Scale (BRS)

Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 15*(3), 194-200. doi: 10.1080/10705500802222972

Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI)

Beck, A. T., Epstein, N., Brown, G., & Steer, R. A. (1988). An inventory for measuring clinical anxiety: psychometric properties. *Journal of Consulting and Cinical Psychology*, *56*(6), 893-897. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.56.6.893

Caregiver Role Identity Scale

Siebert, D.C., & Siebert, C. F. (2005). The caregiver role identity scale: A validation study. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *15*(3), 204-212. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731504272779

Career Planning Scale

Gould, S. (1979). Characteristics of career planners in upwardly mobile occupations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *22*(3), 539-550. doi: https://doi.org/10.5465/255743

Coping Inventory for Stressful Situations

Endler, N. S., & Parker, J. D. (1990b). Multidimensional assessment of coping: A critical evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*(5), 844-854. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.5.844

Child Welfare Provider Stigma Inventory

Kennedy, S. C., Spinelli, C., & Wilke, D. J. (2019). Development and validation of the Child Welfare Provider Stigma Inventory. *Journal of Social Work*, *20*(6), 703-729. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1468017319837518

The Defeat Scale

Gilbert, P. & Allan, S. (1998). The role of defeat and entrapment (arrested flight) in depression: An exploration of an evolutionary view. *Psychological Medicine*, *28*(3), 585-598.

The Entrapment Scale

Gilbert, P. & Allan, S. (1998). The role of defeat and entrapment (arrested flight) in depression: An exploration of an evolutionary view. *Psychological Medicine*, *28*(3), 585-598.

Family-Work Conflict Scale

Netemeyer, R.G., Bole, J.S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work–family conflict and family–work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(4), 400-410. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.400

Feedback Environment Scale

Steelman, L.A., Levy, P.E., & Snell, A.F. (2004). The feedback environment scale: Construct definition, measurement, and validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 64*(1), 165-184. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164403258440

World Health Organization (WHO) Health and Work Performance Questionnaire (HPQ – Presenteeism)

Kessler, R. C., Ames, M., Hymel, P. A., Loeppke, R., McKenas, D. K., Richling, D. E., & Ustun, T. B. (2004). Using the World Health Organization Health and Work Performance Questionnaire (HPQ) to evaluate the indirect workplace costs of illness. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 46*(6), S23-S37. Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org/stable/44996637

Intent to Leave Child Welfare Scale

Auerbach, C., Schudrich, W. Z., Lawrence, C. K., Claiborne, N., & McGowan, B. G. (2014). Predicting turnover: Validating the intent to leave child welfare scale. *Research on Social Work Practice, 24*(3), 349-355. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731513494021

Intent to Stay

Butler Institute for Families (2009). *Community Resources [unpublished measure]*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Job Satisfaction Survey

Questions derived from adaptation for Child Welfare workers: Li, Y., & Huang, H. (2017). Validating the Job Satisfaction Survey in voluntary child welfare. *Children and Youth Services Review, 83*, 1-8.

Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13*(6), 693-713. Doi: 10.1007/BF00929796

Mentor Functioning Questionnaire

Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2005). Construct equivalence across groups: An unexplored issue in mentoring research. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 65*(2), 323-335. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164404268665

Higher Education Research Institute Diverse Learning Environment: Organizational Bias

Questions were asked for 1) experiencing bias and 2) witnessing bias in the workplace.

Higher Education Research Institute (2013). *Diverse Learning Environment, Core Survey [unpublished measure]*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.

Organizational Cultural Competence in Child Welfare

Schudrich, W.Z (2014). Validating a measure of organizational cultural competence in voluntary child welfare. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *24*(6), 685-694. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/10497315135165

Patient Health Questionnaire

Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. (2001). The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *16*(9), 606-613. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x

Psychological Climate Questionnaire

Gagnon, S., Paquet, M., Courcy, F., & Parker, C. (2009). Measurement and management of work climate: Cross-validation of the CRISO Psychological Climate Questionnaire. *Healthcare Management Forum*, *22*(1), 57-65. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0840-4704(10)60294-3

Composite International Diagnostic Interview (Psychological Distress)

Item 1 was removed per scoring guidelines.

Robins, L. N., Wing, J., Wittchen, H. U., Helzer, J. E., Babor, T. F., Burke, J., Farmer, A., Jablenski, A., Pickens, R., & Regier, D. A. (1988). The Composite International Diagnostic Interview: An epidemiologic instrument suitable for use in conjunction with different diagnostic systems and different cultures. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *45*(12), 1069-1077. Doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.1988.01800360017003

Abbreviated PTSD Checklist – Civilian Version

Lang, A.J., Stein, M.B. (2005). An abbreviated PTSD checklist for use as a screening instrument in primary care. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *43*(5), 585-594. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2004.04.005

Strengths-Based Supervision Scale

Lietz, C. A., Hayes, M. J., Cronin, T. W., & Julien-Chinn, F (2014). Supporting family-centered practice through supervision: An evaluation of strengths-based supervision. *Families in Society*, *95*(4), 227-235. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.2014.95.2

Self-Efficacy Scale

Pearlin, L., & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19*(1), 2-21.

Sleep Disturbance Scale

Question A19 from WHO HPQ.

Kessler, R. C., Barber, C., Beck, A., Berglund, P., Cleary, P. D., McKenas, D. & Wang, P. (2003). The world health organization health and work performance questionnaire (HPQ). *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 156-174.

Supervision Practice in Human Services Scale (SPHS)

Osteen, P. J., King, E. A., & Wilke, D. (2022). Development and validation of the supervision practice in human services scale. *Social Policy & Administration*, *56*(7), 977-989. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12815

Spiritual Experience Index – Revise

Genia, V. (1997). The Spiritual Experience Index: Revision and reformulation. *Review of Religious Research*, *38*(4), 344-361.

Social Support Index (SS)

Caplan, R.D. (1975). *Job demands and worker health: Main effects and occupational differences*. US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Center for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

Work-Life Balance

Brough, P., Timms, C., O'Driscoll, M. P., Kalliath, T., Siu, O. L., Sit, C., & Lo, D. (2014). Work–life balance: A longitudinal evaluation of a new measure across Australia and New Zealand workers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *25*(19), 2724-2744. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.899262

Workplace Violence Scale

McPhaul, K., Lipsomb, J., & Johnson, J. (2010). Assessing risk for violence on home health visits. *Home Healthcare Nurse*, *28*(5), 278-289. doi: https://doi.org/10.1097/NHH.0b013e3181dbc07b

Related Publications and Final Reports

Users are strongly encouraged to review published works, based upon these data, before doing analyses. To view a complete list of publications for this dataset, please visit our online citations collection called "canDL" at: child abuse and neglect Digital Library (canDL) NDACAN webpage.

Analytic Considerations

Reverse codes
Some variables were reverse coded to create a set of positively or negatively aligned variables. For example, consider the set of IF_W1 questions, which asks the respondents to answer a set of questions with responses Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree, coded as 0-3 respectively. The first prompt, IF1_W1_1, says "All in all I'm satisfied with myself". Therefore a higher score is associated with a positive outcome. The second prompt, IF1_W1_2, states "At times I think I'm no good at all", where a higher score indicates a negative outcome. The reverse coded variable for prompt 2, IF1_W1_2R, thereby reverses the code such that a higher score also indicates a positive outcome. Similarly for the other IF1_W1 variables and all other reverse coded variables in general. This is also why not every variable in a group has been reverse coded.

Imputed variables
In order to account for the missing data on the administered scales, sum scores were imputed for respondents who answered at least 50% of the scale's items, using person mean substitution (Dodeen, 2003; Hawthorne & Elliott, 2005). Imputed sum scores were calculated in two steps: (1) a mean scale score was computed for each respondent, and (2) an imputed sum score was calculated by multiplying the total number of scale items by the respondent's mean score.
In the data, imputed variables have "_IMP_" in the variable name.

General notes

1. Variables in each wave are organized using an outline format (e.g., IB_Wx., IIB_Wx, IIIA1_Wx) and will coordinate across waves. Thus, IIIA1_W2 is the same survey question as IIIA1_W3, IIIA1_W4, etc.

2. Variables from wave 1 are labeled with either "W1" for wave 1 or "BL" for baseline. Variables labeled with 'BL' are only presented to participants in the first wave of the study. Variables labeled with "W1" are presented in at least one subsequent wave.

3. There are derived and recoded variables that can be mapped with the documentation and accompanying replicable SPSS code.

4. Survey questions related to difficult cases (IIF2c) were originally presented as open-ended questions. These text responses were coded. Closed questions were developed based on the coding scheme and replaced the open-ended questions starting in Wave 5 and the code was applied retroactively based on the new data collection strategies. These closed questions will appear in the NDACAN Waves 2, 3, and 4 Surveys, even though

participants were administered the open-ended questions. This was done to ensure that survey questions match the variables in the datasets.

5. Data collection related to reasons for departure (IVA5) were reformatted during Wave 4. All surveys and codebooks reflect the reformatted questions.

6. The Workplace Violence Scale was administered to participants dependent on their employment status from the previous wave.

7. Users should be aware of how participants were directed through the survey questions for Waves 3-8:
    a. IID1_Wx (Variable label: CPV): Participants who indicated they were working in CW at the current wave OR participants who transitioned to HHS in the previous wave and remained in an HHS field for the current wave.

    b. IID2_Wx_1 (Variable label: CPV_PREV_CW) and IID2_Wx_2 (Variable label: CPV_CURR_NONCW): Participants who were working in CW in the previous wave but indicated they transitioned out of CW in the current wave.

    Due to this, Users should be aware that for Waves 3-8 the HHS sample is split between IID1_Wx and IID2_Wx_1/IID2_Wx_2 variable groupings depending on when they left CW. In order to fully represent HHS workers' experiences with client perpetrated violence for that wave, Users should use both sets of variable groups.

    Users should consider the wave participants left their field of employment and which variable grouping they would have been presented during that survey for any employment transitional analyses.

8. Employment history questions varied depending on participant status at the previous wave of data collection. For those who responded, participants were provided with their prior wave answers and asked if they remained. For those who missed one wave of data collection, participants were provided their most recent answers and asked if they remained. For participants who missed two consecutive waves, previous responses were not provided, and questions began with current employment status. This skip pattern is notated in the surveys.

Coded values

Missing values are coded with negative values, here are the following labeled missing codes:
-99 = Logical skip
-97 = Missing
-999 = Non-response at current wave

DCF Regions and Circuits codes[1]:
NWR – Northwest Region
NER – Northeast Region
CER – Central Region
SCR – SunCoast Region
SER – Southeast Region
SOR – Southern Region

Confidentiality Protection

This dataset has been de-identified by the data contributor, in consultation with NDACAN, prior to archiving. All primary identifiers have been removed and secondary identifiers have also been deleted or recoded to significantly reduce or eliminate disclosure risk. Users of this dataset are prohibited from attempting to re-identify any individual.

Extent of Collection

This dataset contains a User's Guide, Codebook, abbreviated survey instruments for each wave, a spreadsheet detailing the derived/recoded/imputed variables for each wave, replicable SPSS code in .sps and .pdf formats to create derived or imputed variables for each wave, and datasets for each wave in file formats native to SPSS (.sav), Stata (.dta), and SAS (.sas7bdat). There are also import program files for SAS (.sas), SPSS (.sps), and Stata (.do) to read in the text (.dat) data file, and comma-delimited (.csv) data file for use with spreadsheet programs.

Extent of Processing

The data contributor conducted all data recodes and deletions prior to depositing the data with NDACAN. NDACAN created the User's Guide, Codebook, and data files formatted for SAS, SPSS, Stata, and a text and a comma-delimited data file.

DATA FILE INFORMATION

File Specifications

There are 2 waves of data in this package, provided in separate data files. Each dataset has 1,500 observations, for each individual in the cohort. Wave 1 data has 212 variables. Wave 2 data has 832 variables. Wave 3 data has 798 variables. Wave 4 data has 855 variables. Wave 5 has 843 variables. Wave 6 has 806 variables. Wave 7 has 845 variables. Wave 8 has 888 variables.

Data File Notes

All waves of data (1-8) are released in this package. Individuals in the data can be linked between waves using the FSPSF_ID variable.

[1] https://www.myflfamilies.com/news-events/department-regions-and-circuits

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BL - Baseline
CPI - Child Protective Investigators
CM - Case Managers
CW – Child Welfare
DCF – Department of Children and Families
DJJ – Department of Juvenile Justice
HHS – Health and Human Services
SO – Sheriff's Office

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Hawthorne G, Hawthorne G, Elliott P. Imputing Cross-Sectional Missing Data: Comparison of Common Techniques. Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry. 2005;39(7):583-590. doi:10.1080/j.1440-1614.2005.01630.x
2. Dodeen, H. M. (2003). Effectiveness of valid mean substitution in treating missing data in attitude assessment. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28(5), 505-513. doi: 10.1080/02602930301674

Technical support for this dataset is provided by NDACAN.

Please send your inquiries to NDACANsupport@cornell.edu

Visit the User Support page of the NDACAN website for help documents and videos ((https://www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov/user-support/user-support.cfm).