

# Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families (FSPSF)

Waves 1-6

## NDACAN Dataset Number 281 USER'S GUIDE



National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect

Duke University / Cornell University

Phone: 607-255-7799

Email: [ndacan@cornell.edu](mailto:ndacan@cornell.edu)

Website: [www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov](http://www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov)



**FLORIDA  
INSTITUTE  
FOR CHILD  
WELFARE**

AT FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE FLORIDA STUDY OF  
PROFESSIONALS FOR

**SAFE  
FAMILIES**



Initial release: October 31, 2023

Last Revision: October 26, 2023

# **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

**©2023 National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect**

# Table of Contents

Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families (FSPSF).....	1
Table of Contents.....	4
PREFACE.....	5
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SOURCE.....	5
PUBLICATION SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT.....	5
ABSTRACT.....	6
STUDY OVERVIEW.....	7
<b>Study Identification</b> .....	7
<b>Purpose of the Study</b> .....	7
<b>Study Design</b> .....	7
<b>Date(s) of Data Collection</b> .....	7
<b>Geographic Area</b> .....	8
<b>Unit of Observation</b> .....	8
<b>Sample</b> .....	8
<b>Data Collection Procedures</b> .....	8
<b>Response Rates</b> .....	9
<b>Sources of Information</b> .....	9
<b>Type of Data Collected</b> .....	9
<b>Measures</b> .....	9
<b>Related Publications and Final Reports</b> .....	19
<b>Confidentiality Protection</b> .....	21
<b>Extent of Collection</b> .....	21
<b>Extent of Processing</b> .....	21
DATA FILE INFORMATION.....	21
<b>File Specifications</b> .....	21
<b>Data File Notes</b> .....	21
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	22
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	22

## 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. (2023). *Florida Study of Professionals for Safe Families (FSPSF): Waves 1-6* [Data set]. National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN). <https://doi.org/10.34681/WJMW-7N19>

## 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](mailto: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
<b>Preparation &amp; Background</b>								
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale	1							
The Caregiver Role Identity Scale	1							
<b>Organizational Influences</b>								
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
<b>Work Experiences &amp; Responses</b>								
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

<b>Full Instrument Name/Version</b>	<b>Wave 1</b>	<b>Wave 2</b>	<b>Wave 3</b>	<b>Wave 4</b>	<b>Wave 5</b>	<b>Wave 6</b>	<b>Wave 7</b>	<b>Wave 8</b>
<b>Substantive Module: Supervision &amp; Organizational Functioning</b>								
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
<b>Substantive Module: Work/Life Balance</b>								
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
<b>Substantive Module: Mental Health</b>								
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.chilyouth.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](https://doi.org/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 Clinical 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](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<sup>1</sup>:

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.

### **Data File Notes**

Waves 1-6 are released in this package, waves 7-8 will continue to be released as they are prepared. Individuals in the data can be linked between waves using the FSPSF\_ID variable.

---

<sup>1</sup> <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](mailto: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>).**