



National Survey of Child
and Adolescent Well-Being

NSCAW II WAVE 2 REPORT

Child Safety

OPRE Report #2013-07
August 2012

NSCAW II WAVE 2 REPORT: CHILD SAFETY

FINAL REPORT

OPRE Report #2013-07

August 2012

Cecilia Casanueva, Keith Smith, Melissa Dolan, Stephen Tueller, and Stacey Lloyd, RTI International.

Submitted to:

Mary Bruce Webb, Project Officer
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Contract Number: HHS P2320062930YC

Project Director: Kathryn Dowd
RTI International
3040 East Cornwallis Road
Post Office Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194

This report is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary. Suggested citation: Casanueva, C., Smith, K., Dolan, M., Tueller, S., & Lloyd, S. (2012). *NSCAW II Wave 2 Report: Safety*. OPRE Report #2013-07. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

This report and other reports sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation are available at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/index.html>.



RTI International is a trade name of Research Triangle Institute.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO NSCAW II, WAVE 2.....	1
SUMMARY OF REPORT FINDINGS.....	2
GUIDE TO THE NSCAW II, WAVE 2 REPORT SERIES	3
CHILD CHARACTERISTICS AT NSCAW II BASELINE AND WAVE 2	4
SUMMARY OF MALTREATMENT CHARACTERISTICS AND NATURE OF ALLEGED ABUSE AT BASELINE	4
Most Serious Type of Maltreatment	4
Substantiation Status.....	4
RE-REPORTS OF MALTREATMENT	5
Re-report Definition and Data Sources.....	5
Child Setting and Re-reports.....	5
Re-Reports of Maltreatment Since the Index Investigation.....	6
CHILDREN’S REPORTS OF WITNESSING AND EXPERIENCING VIOLENCE.....	7
IN-HOME PARENTS’ REPORTS OF AGGRESSION AND NEGLECT	8
ADOLESCENTS’ REPORT OF CAREGIVERS’ AGGRESSION AND NEGLECT.....	9
EXHIBITS	10
REFERENCES	19
APPENDIX.....	21

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Number		Page
1.	Child Characteristics at Wave 2.....	10
2.	Most Serious Type of Child Maltreatment at Baseline and Other Reasons for Investigation by Caseworker Report.....	11
3.	Substantiation Status at Baseline by Caseworker Report	12
4.	Re-reports of Maltreatment and Substantiation Status by Caseworker Report at Wave 2 and NCANDS	13
5.	Timing of Re-report by Caseworker Report at Wave 2 and NCANDS.....	14
6.	Re-reports and Substantiation Status Within First 6 Months After Index Report by Caseworker Report at Wave 2 and NCANDS	15
7.	Exposure to Violence Among Children 8 to 17 Years Old by Child Report at Wave 2	16
8.	In-Home Parents' Aggression Toward and Neglect of Children in the Previous Year by Self-Report at Wave 2.....	17
9.	Caregiver Aggression and Neglect of Children 11 to 17 Years Old from a Caregiver in the Past Year by Child Report at Wave 2.....	18

Introduction to NSCAW II, Wave 2

The second National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW II) is a longitudinal study intended to answer a range of fundamental questions about the functioning, service needs, and service use of children who come in contact with the child welfare system (CWS). The study is sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). It examines the well-being of children involved with child welfare agencies; captures information about the investigation of abuse or neglect that brought the child into the study; collects information about the child's family; provides information about child welfare interventions and other services; and describes key characteristics of child development. Of particular interest to the study are children's health, mental health, and developmental risks, especially for those children who experienced the most severe abuse and exposure to violence.

The study includes 5,872¹ children ranging in age from birth to 17.5 years old at the time of sampling. Children were sampled from child welfare investigations closed between February 2008 and April 2009 in 83 counties nationwide. The cohort includes substantiated and unsubstantiated investigations of abuse or neglect, as well as children and families who were and were not receiving services. Infants and children in out-of-home placement were oversampled to ensure adequate representation of high-risk groups. Face-to-face interviews or assessments were conducted with children, parents and nonparent adult caregivers (e.g., foster parents, kin caregivers, group home caregivers), and investigative caseworkers. Baseline data collection began in March 2008 and was completed in September 2009. Additional information about the NSCAW II history, sample design and methods, instrumentation, as well as a summary of differences between the NSCAW I and NSCAW II cohorts can be found in the first report of this NSCAW II Baseline series.² A series of baseline reports on these data have been published (OPRE Reports 2011–27a-g) and are publicly available at: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/abuse_neglect/nscaw/index.html.

Wave 2 is a follow-up of children and families approximately 18 months after the close of the NSCAW II index investigation. The NSCAW II cohort of children who were approximately 2 months to 17.5 years old at baseline ranged in age from 16 months to 19 years old at Wave 2. Data collection for the second wave of the study began in October 2009 and was completed in January 2011.

Wave 2 data collection procedures mirrored the baseline data collection effort with a few notable exceptions. At baseline, an *investigative* caseworker interview was pursued for every child in the cohort. At Wave 2, a *services* caseworker interview was pursued only if the child was living out of home at Wave 2 or if the child or family had received services paid for or

¹ At the time the baseline analyses and reports were prepared, the size of the cohort was 5,873. One child case was identified as ineligible during Wave 2, resulting in a revised NSCAW II cohort size of 5,872.

² Comparisons between NSCAW I and NSCAW II estimates require statistical testing. Analysis for comparison purposes requires a different set of weights; these are available through the National Data Archive for Child Abuse and Neglect at Cornell University.

provided by Child Protective Services (CPS) since the baseline interview date. In cases where the caregiver reported no services or was uncertain if services had been received, service use was verified with the participating county child welfare agency. If needed, a services caseworker interview was pursued even in situations where the child and/or caregiver were not interviewed for Wave 2.

Wave 2 interviews were completed with 4,750 children and 4,958 caregivers. On average, interviews with children and caregivers were conducted 18.7 months (range 14.9 to 24.7 months) and 18.6 months (range 14.9 to 24.1 months) after the investigation end date, respectively. Approximately 51% of children and families had received services since the baseline interview and thus required a services caseworker interview. Wave 2 interviews were completed with 2,843 caseworkers. On average, services caseworker interviews were conducted 19.0 months after the investigation end date (range 15.4 to 23.3 months). Wave 2 weighted response rates were 82.8% for children, 86.3% for caregivers, and 93.9% for caseworkers.

Summary of Report Findings

This report summarizes re-reports of abuse or neglect that occurred after the index maltreatment investigation that brought the child into the NSCAW II cohort, as well as child and caregiver reports of aggression and violence in the home within the previous 12 months. Re-reports information was based on combined data from caseworkers' interviews at Wave 2 and the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS).

Overall, 19.8% of children had at least one re-report of abuse or neglect, defined as the second, third, or subsequent report occurring at least 24 hours after the index report that alleges a child has been maltreated and that receives an investigation or assessment by the CPS agency regardless of the disposition. Males were more likely than females to have a re-report. Among all children with one or more re-reports, at least one re-report was substantiated for 27.4% of the children. For half of the children with a re-report, the first re-report occurred 6 or more months after the index report.

The *Child and Family Services Reviews* (CFSRs) define recurrence of maltreatment as the second, third, or subsequent time that a child has been found to be a victim of substantiated or indicated maltreatment within a 6-month period following a prior determination that a child was victimized. Using the CFSRs definition of recurrence 4.7% of children who had a substantiated or indicated report at NSCAW II baseline had an additional substantiated or indicated report in the following 6 months.

Irrespective of substantiation status, 10.0% of all children in the NSCAW II baseline cohort had a re-report in the first 6 months. Children living in formal kin care at baseline were less likely to have a re-report in the first 6 months when compared to children living at baseline in-home, with informal kin caregivers, in foster care, or in group home/residential treatment. Among all children with one or more re-reports in the first 6 months, at least one re-report was substantiated for 29.1% of the children.

At NSCAW II Wave 2, child and caregiver interviews provided evidence of family aggression or neglect in some families. Three quarters of in-home parents reported using

psychological aggression, and almost half reported using minor physical assault or corporal punishment. About a fifth of in-home parents reported neglect. More than half of children 11 to 17 years old reported being victims of psychological aggression; almost a third reported being victims of minor physical assault or corporal punishment and one in 10 reported severe physical assault from a caregiver in the past year, while 8.2% reported very severe physical assault.

More information on the CWS services referred and provided to children and families in the study can be found in the NSCAW II Wave 2 Report *Children and Families Receiving Child Welfare Services Post-Baseline*.

Guide to the NSCAW II, Wave 2 Report Series

This report is the fifth in a series of reports describing findings from the NSCAW II 18-month follow-up (Wave 2) data. It describes the characteristics of the index report that brought the child into the NSCAW II cohort, re-reports of abuse or neglect since the index report, and the child and caregiver descriptions of violence in the home in a nationally representative sample of children reported for maltreatment in 2008–2009.

The Wave 2 report series is not intended to describe the developmental trajectories of each child in the cohort, but instead to provide a snapshot of child and family well-being, 18 months after the index investigation of maltreatment that brought the child into the study. At Wave 2, all children are a year and a half older and may or may not be living with the same caregiver or in the same setting as they were at baseline. Two reports in this series include an examination of constructs specifically relevant to the passage of time for these children, including permanency (e.g., placement changes, adoption) and safety (e.g., re-reports of maltreatment).

The topics covered in other NSCAW II Wave 2 reports in this series include:

- Child Well-Being (physical health and special health care needs, cognitive functioning and academic achievement, social, emotional, and behavioral health, developmental assessments of young children, and risky behavior in adolescents)
- Children and Families Receiving Child Welfare Services Post-Baseline (caseworker characteristics, child and family service needs, services received)
- Children’s Services (insurance status, health and mental health services, and special education)
- Caregiver Health and Services (caregiver physical and mental health, substance use, intimate partner violence, involvement with the law, and services received by in-home parents)
- Child Permanency (permanency planning, reunification, adoption, placement changes, contact with biological parents)

The data analyzed in this report have been released through the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) in NSCAW II data version 2-1.

Child Characteristics at NSCAW II Baseline and Wave 2

At baseline, one half of the sample was male (50.8%). One fifth (20.6%) of the children were 0 to 2 years old, 22.6% were 3 to 5 years old, 27.4% were 6 to 10 years old, and 29.5% were 11 to 17 years old. Four out of 10 children (41.5%) were White (41.5%), 28.3% were Hispanic, 22.4% were Black, and 7.7% described their race/ethnicity as “Other.” At the time of the baseline interview, the majority of children were living at home with parents (87.3%), while 8.5% were living with a kin primary caregiver. A kin caregiver may be a grandparent, aunt or uncle, sibling, or other relative; 6.1% were in an informal kin care arrangement and 2.4% were in formal kin care. In formal kin care living arrangements, the caregiver receives some financial support. A smaller proportion of children were living in foster care (3.4%) and in group homes (0.5%).

Exhibit 1 gives an overview of the key characteristics of children at Wave 2. Approximately one half of the sample was male (50.9%). One ninth (12.8%) of the children were 16 months to 2 years old, 23.1% were 3 to 5 years old, 30.0% were 6 to 10 years old, and 34.2% were 11 to 17 years old. Four out of 10 children (41.2%) were White, 29.0% were Hispanic, 22.5% were Black, and 7.3% described their race/ethnicity as “Other.”

At the time of the Wave 2 interview, the majority of children were living at home with parents (85.5%), while 10.7% were living with a kin primary caregiver. Less than one in ten (8.3%) were in an informal kin care arrangement and 2.4% were in formal kin care. A smaller proportion of children were living in foster care (2.9%) and in group homes (0.5%).

Summary of Maltreatment Characteristics and Nature of Alleged Abuse at Baseline

Most Serious Type of Maltreatment. Exhibit 2 describes caseworkers’ baseline interview reports on the most serious type of maltreatment children experienced, or the reason for the index investigation. After reporting on all types of maltreatment recorded during the index investigation, caseworkers were asked their opinion about the most serious type of maltreatment the child experienced. For the most serious type of maltreatment reported, 23.3% of cases were for failure to supervise the child, 21.9% were for physical abuse, 10.6% were for a substance-abusing parent, 9.2% were for failure to provide for the child, 7.6% were for domestic violence, 7.4% were for sexual abuse, and 5.6% were for emotional abuse.

Substantiation Status. Less than a quarter (22.1%) of the index maltreatment reports were substantiated. Another 7.6% of the cases were *indicated*, a classification used in some jurisdictions in cases for which some evidence exists for maltreatment but not enough for substantiation. More than two thirds (70.4%) of cases were not substantiated. The percentage of children with a substantiated case is almost the same as the estimate based on 2008 data from NCANDS (22.3%). Exhibit 3 presents substantiation status by child characteristics.³

³ Excluded from this exhibit are cases where caseworkers chose to report a risk classification (less than 2% of cases were classified as *high risk*, 2.8% were classified as *medium risk*, and 5.6% were classified as *low risk*) instead of substantiation status.

Re-reports of Maltreatment

Re-report Definition and Data Sources. A re-report was defined as the second, third, or subsequent report that alleges a child has been maltreated and that receives an investigation or assessment by the CPS agency regardless of the disposition.⁴ To be counted as a re-report, a minimum of 24 hours must have elapsed between the index report at baseline and the subsequent re-report.

Two data sources were used to analyze re-reports. The first source was the caseworker interview at Wave 2. Caseworkers were asked to describe up to 10 re-reports, including the date of re-report, status and outcome of investigation, type of abuse, alleged perpetrator, where the abuse or neglect was alleged to have occurred, and placement decision after investigation. No caseworker interview was pursued when children had a closed case after the baseline interview and a caregiver who reported no further contact or service received from the CWS (because they no longer had a caseworker). Wave 2 caseworker data were available for 2,778 of the 5,872 Wave 1 respondents, and cover the entire period between the index report and Wave 2.

The second data source was the NCANDS. NCANDS collects case-level data from states on all children who received a CPS agency response. Case-level data include information about the characteristics of screened-in referrals (reports) of abuse and neglect that are made to CPS agencies, the children involved, the types of maltreatment that are alleged, the dispositions of the CPS responses, the risk factors of the child and the caregivers, the services that are provided, and the perpetrators. The NCANDS re-report data were available for 3,859 of the baseline respondents, but cover a portion of the period (between the initial investigation and September 30, 2009). Additionally, caregivers had to provide authorization to link the NSCAW data with NCANDS.

These data sources were used to create a re-report flag for the baseline respondents. A re-report flag with a value of 1 indicates that a child has had at least one re-report according to either NCANDS or the caseworker data obtained by NSCAW from direct interviews. A re-report flag with a value of 0 indicates that neither the NCANDS data nor the caseworker data indicate a re-report. Using both sources, some information about whether or not a re-report occurred was available for 4,764 of the 5,872 baseline respondents (81%). Still, 1,108 children have neither caseworker nor NCANDS data. If these children had closed cases and their caregivers reported no further contact with the CWS (true for almost 1,100 children), for this report it was assumed they did not have a re-report and were included in the analysis.

Child Setting and Re-reports. This report summarizes re-reports by child age, gender, race/ethnicity, and setting at the time of the index report (baseline) to examine the association between characteristics of the child at the time of the index investigation and subsequent risk to their safety represented by re-reports. Caution should be used regarding the interpretation of associations between the child's setting at the time of baseline and re-reports. Of all children that participated in the baseline study, more than a fifth (22.3%) were placed out of home at some point between the index report and Wave 2. Of those placed out of home at any point, 39.0% had

⁴ The definition of re-report used here follows previous publications on re-reports (Connell, Bergeron, Katz, Saunders, & Tebes, 2007; Fluke, Shusterman, Hollinshead, & Yuan, 2008; Lipien & Forthofer, 2004).

at least one reunification attempt. During that period of reunification, children could have been reported again for maltreatment, which could have prompted a return to out-of-home placement. Thus, even if a child was in a foster care placement at baseline and Wave 2, the re-report could have occurred during a period of no foster home placement. For example, of the children who were in out-of-home placement at baseline, reunification or at least one reunification attempt was made for 19.2% of those in formal kin care, 14.2% of those in informal kin care, 23.6% of those in foster care, and 31.2% of those in group home/residential treatment.

Re-Reports of Maltreatment Since the Index Investigation. Of all children at baseline, 19.8% had a re-report. Males were more likely than females to have a re-report (22.2% and 17.4%, respectively; see Exhibit 4). There were no significant differences in re-reports by children's age, race/ethnicity, or setting at baseline.

At least one re-report was substantiated for 27.4% of children with one or more re-reports. For a small group the re-report disposition for at least one re-report was indicated (1.7%), and for 70.9% the re-report (s) was not substantiated. There were no significant differences in substantiation status of re-reports by children's gender, age, race/ethnicity, or setting at baseline.

For half of the children the first re-report occurred 6 or more months after the index report (Exhibit 5). For a small group (5.2%) the first re-report occurred from 1 to 30 days after the index report, for 7.7% it occurred from 31 to 60 days, for 9.8% it occurred from 2 to 3 months, for 27.7% it occurred from 3 to 5 months, for 32.6% it occurred from 6 to 11 months, and for 17.1% the first re-report occurred after a year or more.

Exhibit 6 provides information about re-reports that occurred within the first 6 months after the index report. This indicator was based upon the *Child and Family Services Reviews* (CFSRs) definition of re-reports as a recurrence of substantiated or indicated maltreatment within a 6-month period following a prior determination that a child was victimized.

Of all children at baseline, 10.0% had a re-report in the first 6 months. Children living in formal kin care at baseline were less likely to have a re-report in the 6-month period following the index report (4.8%) than those living at baseline in-home (9.9%), informal kin care (10.7%), foster care (12.8%), and group home/residential treatment (15.7%). There were no significant differences by children's gender, age, or race/ethnicity at baseline.

At least one re-report was substantiated for 29.1% of children with one or more re-reports in the first 6 months. For 0.8% of those children, at least one re-report was indicated and for 70.1% the re-report (s) was not substantiated. There were no significant differences in substantiation status of re-report within 6 months by children's gender, age, race/ethnicity, or setting at baseline.

Although no nationally representative comparison studies exist, the work of Fluke and colleagues (Fluke et al., 2008) includes families from eight states and provides the only nonregional estimates of maltreatment recurrence in the current literature over a 2-year period (2001–2002)

Over 2 years, re-reports occurred for 21.6% of children. Less than one in 10 children (6.9%) had substantiated re-reports. The 18-month cumulative showed that 19.5% had a re-report, and 6% of all children had a substantiated re-report. For those children whose initial investigation led to classification as a victim (i.e., substantiated or indicated), 10% were re-reported with substantiation (maltreatment recurrence).

Information about reports and re-reports that have been substantiated or indicated is part of the data collected from states as part of the CFSRs. The 1994 Amendments to the Social Security Act (SSA) authorized the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to review state child and family service programs to ensure conformity with the requirements in titles IV-B and IV-E of the SSA. The Children's Bureau within the ACF administers the review system. CFSR Safety Outcome 1 (*children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect*) relates to recurrence of maltreatment, defined as the second, third, or subsequent time that a child has been found to be a victim of maltreatment (substantiated or indicated) within a 6-month period following a prior determination that a child was victimized. The most recent CFSR data is from the 2007–2009 period, showing that in 2009 the median recurrence across states was 5.6% (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2010). Using the CFSR definition of recurrence, of those children who had a substantiated or indicated report at NSCAW II baseline, 4.7% had an additional substantiated or indicated report in the following 6 months. This recurrence rate is close to the 5.6% reported in the 2007–2009 CFSR report.

Children's Reports of Witnessing and Experiencing Violence

The Violence Exposure Scale–Revised (VEX-R; Fox & Leavitt, 1995) was used to measure children's experiences of maltreatment and exposure to violence among children 8 years and older at Wave 2. This measure assessed witnessing and experiencing violence from someone living in the household. The VEX-R is a cartoon-based scale of exposure to violence; it requires respondents to report how often they have either witnessed or been victims of violent acts at home. Exhibit 7 shows reported exposure to violence *ever* and in the previous month. Two dimensions of violence were reported: witnessing of violence (the child saw an adult shove, slap, beat up, point a gun, stab, or shoot another person), and being a victim of violence (an adult threw something, shoved, slapped, or beat up the child). The most common type of incident reported by children ever and during the last month was being yelled at (42.3% ever, 24.7% in the last month) and seeing an adult yell at another person (36.8% ever, 22.1% in the last month). More than a quarter of children reported seeing an adult spank a child (25.9% ever, 13.6% in the last month) and that an adult had recently spanked them (24.6% ever, 7.7% in the last month). More than one in 10 children (11.0%) reported ever having witnessed an adult shoving another person, 10.0% reported ever having witnessed an adult slapping another person, and 11.8% reported ever having witnessed an adult throwing something at another person. In terms of direct victimization, 10.8% of children reported ever having experienced been slapped by an adult, 9.2% reported ever been shoved by an adult, and 8.6% reported ever having an adult throw something at them. Estimates for witnessing and/or experiencing these acts in the previous month were around 4% or less for each individual act.

In-Home Parents' Reports of Aggression and Neglect

Caregivers reported their aggression toward and neglect of their children using the Conflict Tactics Scale–Parent-Child Version (CTS-PC; Straus, Hamby, Finkelhor, Moore, & Runyan, 1998). Permanent caregivers were administered the CTS-PC. These permanent caregivers did include some kinship caregivers and a few foster caregivers; however, since these responses did not reflect the majority of out-of-home caregivers, data from kin and foster caregivers are not reported in this portion of the report. This report presents CTS-PC results only for in-home parents.

In-home parents were asked what tactics (primarily related to discipline) they used in their conflicts with their children. Included in the questions were both nonviolent disciplinary tactics and tactics that are mildly or seriously aggressive, from spanking to hitting, slapping, and injurious actions (see Technical Appendix). The CTS-PC also asked about severe physical abuse, neglect and sexual abuse.⁵

The percentage of in-home parents who reported having used each tactic in the previous year is presented by selected characteristics in Exhibit 8. In the previous year, nearly all in-home parents (96.7%) reported having used some form of nonviolent discipline (e.g., explaining why something was wrong). The use of psychological aggression was reported by 75.4% of in-home parents (e.g., shouting, yelling, or screaming at the child). The use of minor physical assault or corporal punishment was reported by 47.9% of in-home parents (shaking; hitting on the bottom with a hard object; spanking on bottom with a bare hand; slapping on the hand, arm, or leg; pinching). Lower percentages of in-home parents reported any kind of severe assault (3.3%; hitting with fist or kicking hard, hitting on another part of the body with a hard object, throwing or knocking the child down, slapping on the face, head, or ears). Very severe assault was reported by 0.9% of in-home parents (e.g., grabbing around the neck and choking, beating up by hitting repeatedly as hard as possible, burning or scalding on purpose, threatening with a knife or gun). A small percentage (1.2%) reported that the child was touched in a sexual way or was forced to have sex by an adult or older child, including a member of the family or anyone outside the family. About a fifth (21.1%) of in-home parents reported some form of neglect in the previous year (e.g., that they were so “caught up” in their own problems that they were not able to show or tell their child that they loved him or her, that they were unable to provide needed food).

In-home parents reported discipline tactics that differed significantly by children's gender, age, and race/ethnicity. In-home parents of males were significantly more likely to report psychological aggression (78.9%) than in-home parents of females (71.8%). In-home parents of children 1 to 2 years old (55.2%), 3 to 5 years old (61.1%) and children 6 to 10 years old (56.6%) were more likely to report minor physical assault or corporal punishment than in-home parents of children 11 to 17 years old (28.3%). In-home parents of children 11 to 17 years old (30.4%) were more likely to report neglect than in-home parents of children 1 to 2 years old (16.3%), 3 to 5 years old (16.1%) and 6 to 10 years old (16.4%). In-home parents of children 11 to 17 years old (2.0%) were also more likely to report sexual abuse than in-home parents of children 1 to 2 years

⁵ Caregivers were repeatedly warned in the informed consent process that abusive or neglectful behaviors would be reported to CWS because of mandated reporting laws; these reminders may have made caregivers reluctant to disclose aggressive tactics.

old (0.1 %). In-home parents of White children were more likely to report psychological aggression and minor physical assault (83.0% and 42.7%) than in-home parents of Hispanic children (66.9% and 28.1% respectively).

Adolescents' Report of Caregivers' Aggression and Neglect

Adolescents (11 to 17 years old) living in both in-home and out-of-home settings provided their own reports on the tactics their caregiver used in the previous year to resolve conflicts (Exhibit 9). A majority of adolescents (83.9%) reported that their caregiver used some form of nonviolent discipline method. Receipt of psychological aggression was reported by 53.4% of adolescents, 31.0% reported minor physical assault or corporal punishment, 10.6% reported a type of severe physical assault, and 8.2% reported very severe physical assault.

Caregiver disciplinary tactics from an adolescent's self-report differed by gender and race/ethnicity. Females (58.7%) were more likely to report psychological aggression than males (46.0%). Black adolescents were significantly more likely to report severe physical assault (17.1%) than Hispanic adolescents (7.1%). Adolescents of "Other" race/ethnicity were less likely to report very severe physical assault (0.9%) than Black (10.7%), White (7.7%), and Hispanic adolescents (11.3%).

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1. Child Characteristics at Wave 2

	<i>N</i>	Total	
		<i>%</i>	<i>SE</i>
Total	4,972	100.0	0.0
Gender			
Male	2,549	50.6	1.5
Female	2,423	49.4	1.5
Age (years)			
1–2	2,225	12.7	0.8
3–5	770	23.0	1.2
6–10	958	29.9	1.1
11–17	1,019	34.4	1.2
Race/ethnicity			
Black	1,569	22.4	2.7
White	1,675	41.4	4.0
Hispanic	1,379	28.9	3.7
Other	329	7.3	1.1
Setting			
In-home	3,420	86.2	1.0
Formal kin care	414	2.5	0.4
Informal kin care	419	7.8	0.8
Foster care	655	2.8	0.3
Group home or residential program	47	0.5	0.1
Other out of home	17	0.4	0.2
Insurance status			
Private	505	15.0	1.1
Public	4,141	75.0	1.5
Other	73	2.3	0.5
Uninsured	233	7.7	0.8

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories.

Exhibit 2. Most Serious Type of Child Maltreatment at Baseline and Other Reasons for Investigation by Caseworker Report

Most serious type of child maltreatment or reason for investigation	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>SE</i>
Total	5,054	100.0	0.0
Physical abuse	846	21.9	1.4
Sexual abuse	300	7.4	0.9
Failure to provide	446	9.2	1.0
Lack of supervision (neglect)	980	23.3	1.5
Emotional abuse	149	5.6	1.2
Abandonment	85	0.7	0.2
Moral/legal maltreatment	3	0.0	0.0
Educational maltreatment	39	0.7	0.2
Exploitation	4	0.2	0.2
Other	560	9.3	0.9
Prematurity or low birth weight	12	0.0	0.0
Substance exposure	495	2.5	0.5
Substance-abusing parent	605	10.6	1.1
Domestic violence	466	7.6	1.0
Voluntary relinquishment	13	0.1	0.0
Children in need of services	29	0.6	0.2
Investigation only way to get services	22	0.5	0.3

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II baseline data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories.

Exhibit 3. Substantiation Status at Baseline by Caseworker Report

	<i>N</i>	Substantiated <i>n</i> = 2,046		Indicated <i>n</i> = 1,000		Unsubstantiated <i>n</i> = 1,565	
		%	<i>SE</i>	%	<i>SE</i>	%	<i>SE</i>
Total	4,611	22.1	1.5	7.6	0.9	70.4	1.8
Gender							
Male	2,569	21.9	1.7	7.0	0.8	71.1	2.1
Female	2,449	22.3	2.3	8.1	1.3	69.6	2.9
Age (years)***							
0–2	2,511	31.7 ^a	2.8	9.3 ^a	1.5	59.0	3.3
3–5	720	21.3 ^b	2.9	7.0	1.6	71.7	3.5
6–10	891	15.6	1.4	7.1	1.2	77.3	1.8
11–17	886	22.1 ^c	2.5	7.1	1.1	70.8	2.7
Race/ethnicity							
Black	1,544	21.6	2.5	11.0	1.8	67.4	3.2
White	1,764	21.7	1.7	5.2	1.1	73.0	2.0
Hispanic	1,352	24.5	2.6	7.9	1.4	67.7	3.0
Other	345	17.0	3.7	8.6	3.6	74.4	4.8
Setting***							
In-home	3,139	18.4 ^d	1.4	7.4 ^d	1.0	74.3	1.9
Formal kin care	399	47.5	8.1	8.6	2.4	43.9	8.9
Informal kin care	465	33.6 ^e	3.6	9.5	2.2	57.0	3.9
Foster care	924	70.3	5.5	7.1	1.9	22.6	5.2
Group home or residential program	58	68.3	9.1	5.4	3.3	26.3	9.0

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II baseline data; *N*s are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *N*s vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests. Asterisks indicate statistical significance (*** $p < .001$). An asterisk associated with the name of the covariate applies across columns representing categories of case disposition.

^a Children 0 to 2 years old were significantly more likely to have a substantiated report than an indicated report when compared to children 6 to 10 years old ($p < .05$); significantly more likely to have a substantiated report than an unsubstantiated report when compared to children 3 to 5 years old ($p < .001$), children 6 to 10 years old ($p < .001$), and children 11 to 17 years old ($p < .01$); and significantly more likely to have an indicated report than an unsubstantiated report when compared to children 6 to 10 years old ($p < .05$) and children 11 to 17 years old ($p < .05$).

^b Children 3 to 5 years old were significantly more likely to have a substantiated report than an unsubstantiated report when compared to children 6 to 10 years old ($p < .05$).

^c Children 11 to 17 years old were significantly more likely to have a substantiated report than an unsubstantiated report when compared to children 6 to 10 years old ($p < .05$).

^d Children living in-home with parents were significantly less likely to have a substantiated report than an indicated report when compared to children living with formal kin care ($p < .05$), children living in foster care ($p < .001$), and children living in a group home or residential program ($p < .05$). Children living in-home were significantly less likely to have a substantiated report than an unsubstantiated report compared to children living with formal kin ($p < .001$), children living with informal kin ($p < .001$), children living in foster care ($p < .001$), and children living in a group home or residential program ($p < .01$); and were significantly less likely to have an indicated report than an unsubstantiated report compared to children living in foster care ($p < .01$).

^e Children living with informal kin were significantly less likely to have a substantiated report than an indicated report compared to children living in foster care ($p < .05$); and were significantly less likely to have a substantiated report than an unsubstantiated report compared to children living in foster care ($p < .001$) and children living in a group home or residential program ($p < .05$).

Exhibit 4. Re-reports of Maltreatment and Substantiation Status by Caseworker Report at Wave 2 and NCANDS

	<i>N</i>	Re-reports <i>n</i> = 1107		<i>N</i>	Substantiated <i>n</i> = 325		Indicated <i>n</i> = 59		Unsubstantiated <i>n</i> = 636	
		%	<i>SE</i>		%	<i>SE</i>	%	<i>SE</i>	%	<i>SE</i>
Total	5,872	19.8	1.5	1,020	27.4	2.3	1.7	0.6	70.9	2.4
Gender		*								
Male	3,017	22.2	2.1	539	25.1	3.5	1.1	0.4	73.8	3.5
Female	2,855	17.4	1.8	481	30.4	4.6	2.5	1.1	67.1	4.6
Age (years)										
1–2	2,937	20.4	2.2	477	38.1	5.4	1.9	0.7	60.0	5.3
3–5	828	18.5	2.1	158	17.2	4.0	2.0	0.7	80.7	4.2
6–10	1,053	22.4	2.6	211	19.7	5.6	1.2	0.6	79.2	5.6
11–17	1,054	18.0	2.3	174	35.4	5.9	2.0	1.6	62.7	6.0
Race/ethnicity										
Black	1,827	17.0	2.8	251	26.7	6.0	1.6	0.6	71.7	6.0
White	2,003	22.6	2.5	379	29.3	4.3	1.8	1.0	68.8	4.3
Hispanic	1,614	18.8	2.0	315	23.9	4.9	1.7	0.8	74.4	5.0
Other	407	16.2	3.4	69	24.8	8.4	1.6	1.0	73.6	8.4
Setting at baseline ^a										
In-home	3,635	19.5	1.6	685	27.4	2.5	1.6	0.6	71.1	2.5
Formal kin care	495	11.9	3.6	55	29.5	10.7	6.7	3.4	63.7	12.7
Informal kin care	540	25.4	5.9	85	21.2	8.5	1.2	1.3	77.6	8.7
Foster care	1,105	21.9	2.8	166	38.1	8.5	4.9	2.2	57.1	8.2
Group home or residential program	68	32.3	10.1	23	33.3	13.6	0.0	0.0	66.7	13.6

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *N*s are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *N*s vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests. Asterisks indicate statistical significance ($***p < .001$). An asterisk associated with the name of the covariate applies across columns representing categories of case disposition.

^a Of those placed out of home, 39.0% had at least one attempt of reunification. During that period of reunification, children could have been reported again for maltreatment, and that could have prompted a return to an out-of-home placement. Thus, even if a child was at a foster care placement at the baseline and 18-month follow-up, the re-report could have happened during a period of no foster home placement. Of the children who were at any point placed out of home, 36.0% were in-home with biological parents at baseline. Of those, 73.4% were reunified or had at least one reunification attempt across time. Of the children who were in out-of-home placement at baseline, at least one reunification attempt was made for 19.2% of those in formal kin care, 14.2% of those in informal kin care, 23.6% of those in foster care, and 31.2% of those in group home/residential treatment.

Exhibit 5. Timing of Re-report by Caseworker Report at Wave 2 and NCANDS

	N	Re-reports											
		1–30 days N=74		31–60 days N=120		61–90 days N=89		91–182 days (3–5 months) N=268		183–364 days (6 to 11 months) N=294		365 days or more (12 months or more) N=262	
		%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE
Total	1,107	5.2	2.0	7.7	1.6	9.8	2.9	27.7	2.2	32.6	2.7	17.1	2.6
Gender													
Male	591	6.1	3.4	8.3	2.1	7.4	2.8	28.3	3.0	33.1	3.7	16.8	3.1
Female	516	3.9	1.2	6.8	1.8	12.9	4.0	27.0	2.7	31.8	4.4	17.5	3.0
Age (years)													
0–2	521	8.3	4.9	8.8	2.3	4.3	2.4	35.2	5.8	26.2	5.3	17.2	3.9
3–5	176	4.3	1.7	6.2	2.7	17.9	6.5	26.3	5.2	31.1	5.9	14.2	4.2
6–10	227	5.3	2.8	7.1	2.0	6.4	3.4	23.1	4.0	37.8	4.2	20.2	4.8
11–17	183	3.1	1.6	8.7	2.4	11.6	5.3	28.3	5.5	32.7	6.0	15.6	4.1
Race/ethnicity													
Black	275	1.4	0.7	7.6	2.4	8.7	4.6	29.4	6.8	38.1	7.3	14.9	5.2
White	416	6.3	2.5	7.9	2.3	12.5	5.6	27.6	3.9	26.7	4.0	19.0	3.9
Hispanic	335	6.7	3.3	4.5	1.4	5.7	3.0	29.7	4.1	40.9	5.5	12.6	2.9
Other	75	2.0	1.1	20.6	9.2	9.9	5.9	16.7	6.5	21.4	7.4	29.6	8.5
Setting at baseline ^a													
In-home	744	4.7	2.3	7.7	1.8	10.5	3.3	28.0	2.5	32.7	3.2	16.4	3.0
Formal kin care	60	6.5	3.3	12.4	5.7	10.0	5.2	11.4	5.8	42.3	17.8	17.5	9.0
Informal kin care	95	2.1	1.4	4.8	1.6	2.9	1.9	32.6	7.0	36.2	10.6	21.5	9.6
Foster care	179	12.4	3.6	13.2	3.9	7.6	2.3	23.6	7.1	19.7	6.7	23.5	4.2
Group home or residential program	23	26.0	13.4	6.0	4.7	8.0	4.8	8.7	6.5	34.6	20.6	16.8	8.6

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *N*s are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *N*s vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. No comparisons across columns were performed.

^a Of those placed out of home, 39.0% had at least one reunification attempt. During that period of reunification, children could have been reported again for maltreatment, which could have prompted a return to an out-of-home placement. Thus, even if a child was at a foster care placement at the baseline and 18-month follow-up, the re-report could have happened during a period of no foster home placement. Of the children who were at any point placed out of home, 36.0% were in-home with biological parents at baseline. Of those, 73.4% were reunified or had at least one reunification attempt across time. Of the children who were in out-of-home placement at baseline, at least one reunification attempt was made for 19.2% of those in formal kin care, 14.2% of those in informal kin care, 23.6% of those in foster care, and 31.2% of those in group home/residential treatment.

Exhibit 6. Re-reports and Substantiation Status Within First 6 Months After Index Report by Caseworker Report at Wave 2 and NCANDS

	N	Re-reports within 6 months		N	Substantiated n = 170		Indicated n = 15		Unsubstantiated n = 353	
		%	SE		%	SE	%	SE	%	SE
Total	5,872	10.0	1.1	538	29.1	3.2	0.8	0.3	70.1	3.2
Gender										
Male	3,017	11.1	1.3	283	24.7	4.5	1.0	0.5	74.4	4.5
Female	2,855	8.8	1.3	255	35.1	6.5	0.6	0.4	64.3	6.4
Age (years)										
1–2	2,937	11.6	1.9	243	36.3	7.9	0.4	0.3	63.3	7.9
3–5	828	10.1	1.7	91	18.8	5.7	1.3	0.8	79.9	5.8
6–10	1,053	9.4	1.3	108	26.7	9.9	1.1	1.0	72.2	9.9
11–17	1,054	9.3	1.8	96	33.5	9.8	0.5	0.3	66.0	10.0
Race/ethnicity										
Black	1,827	8.0	2.1	129	28.4	9.9	0.8	0.5	70.8	10.0
White	2,003	12.3	2.0	200	29.3	5.8	0.9	0.6	69.8	5.8
Hispanic	1,614	8.8	1.0	173	31.0	7.6	0.3	0.2	68.7	7.5
Other	407	8.0	2.3	34	21.8	8.7	2.4	1.7	75.8	8.2
Setting at baseline ^a		*								
In-home	3,635	9.9	1.2	347	29.3	3.6	0.6	0.3	70.1	3.7
Formal kin care	495	4.8 ^b	1.1	33	48.3	10.5	9.6	5.8	42.1	8.9
Informal kin care	540	10.7	2.5	51	20.7	6.9	0.0	0.0	79.3	6.9
Foster care	1,105	12.5	2.1	86	34.5	8.2	3.5	3.1	62.1	8.4
Group home or residential program	68	15.7	5.4	16	41.4	13.5	0.0	0.0	58.6	13.5

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *N*s are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *N*s vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests.

Asterisks indicate statistical significance (***) $p < .001$). An asterisk associated with the name of the covariate applies across columns representing categories of case disposition.

^a Of those placed out of home, 39.0% had at least one reunification attempt. During that period of reunification, children could have been reported again for maltreatment, which could have prompted a return to an out-of-home placement. Thus, even if a child was at a foster care placement at the baseline and 18-month follow-up, the re-report could have happened during a period of no foster home placement. Of the children who were at any point placed out of home, 36.0% were in-home with biological parents at baseline. Of those, 73.4% were reunified or had at least one reunification attempt across time. Of the children who were in out-of-home placement at baseline, at least one reunification attempt was made for 19.2% of those in formal kin care, 14.2% of those in informal kin care, 23.6% of those in foster care, and 31.2% of those in group home/residential treatment.

^b Children living in formal kin care at baseline were significantly less likely to have a re-report in the 6 month period following the index report than those living at baseline in-home ($p < .01$), informal kin care ($p < .05$), foster care ($p < .05$), and group-home/residential treatment ($p < .05$).

Exhibit 7. Exposure to Violence Among Children 8 to 17 Years Old by Child Report at Wave 2

	VEX-R Ever			VEX-R Last month		
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>SE</i>	<i>N</i>	%	<i>SE</i>
VEX-R violence witnessing items						
Child saw adult yell at other	1405	36.8	2.3	1408	22.1	1.6
Child saw adult throw something at other	1418	11.8	1.5	1418	3.9	0.8
Child saw adult shove other	1417	11.0	1.6	1418	5.1	1.1
Child saw adult slap other	1419	10.0	1.4	1419	5.2	1.2
Child saw adult beat up other	1421	4.6	0.6	1421	1.3	0.4
Child saw adult steal at home	1418	8.0	1.0	1418	3.4	0.6
Child saw adult point knife or gun at other	1414	2.1	0.5	1418	1.0	0.4
Child saw adult stab other	1423	1.2	0.5	1423	0.6	0.3
Child saw adult shoot other	1421	0.5	0.2	1421	0.4	0.2
Child saw person arrested at home	1416	11.1	1.1	1417	2.5	0.5
Child saw person deal drugs at home	1416	2.5	0.6	1414	1.9	0.6
Child saw child being spanked	1417	25.9	1.8	1417	13.6	1.2
VEX-R violence victimization items						
Adult yelled at child	1419	42.3	2.2	1418	24.7	2.2
Adult threw something at child	1420	8.6	1.2	1421	3.9	0.9
Adult shoved child “really hard”	1417	9.2	1.3	1417	3.9	0.1
Adult slapped child “really hard”	1418	10.8	1.4	1418	4.2	1.0
Adult beat up child	1392	3.2	0.7	1393	1.2	0.4
Adult pointed a gun or knife at child	1397	0.3	0.2	1397	0.3	0.2
Adult spanked child	1418	24.6	2.1	1417	7.7	1.2

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *Ns* are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *Ns* vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Instrument used was the Violence Exposure Scale–Revised (VEX-R) (Fox & Leavitt, 1995). Only children 8 to 17 years old responded to the VEX-R. Results reported here are only for acts of violence committed by people living at home with the child.

Exhibit 8. In-Home Parents' Aggression Toward and Neglect of Children in the Previous Year by Self-Report at Wave 2

	N	CTS-PC Nonviolent Discipline		CTS-PC Psychological Aggression		CTS-PC Minor Physical Assault (Corporal Punishment)		CTS-PC Severe Physical Assault		CTS-PC Very Severe Physical Assault		CTS-PC Neglect		CTS-PC Sexual Abuse	
		%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE
Total	3,346	96.7	0.6	75.4	1.5	47.9	1.8	3.3	0.6	0.9	0.3	21.1	1.3	1.2	0.3
Gender				**											
Male	1,726	97.9	0.5	78.9	1.7	50.7	2.4	2.9	0.7	0.9	0.4	19.0	1.7	0.8	0.4
Female	1,620	95.4	1.2	71.8	2.1	45.0	2.7	3.7	1.0	0.9	0.4	23.2	2.3	1.7	0.6
Age (years)						***		*				***		**	
1–2	1,384	96.5	0.9	67.5	4.0	55.2 ^a	4.4	1.6	0.9	3.4	1.5	16.3	2.9	0.1 ^a	0.0
3–5	531	97.7	1.1	77.1	2.7	61.1 ^b	3.2	4.6	1.9	0.5	0.5	16.1	3.9	0.8	0.6
6–10	717	97.5	0.9	77.7	2.5	56.6 ^c	3.0	4.5 ^c	1.1	0.6	0.4	16.4	2.2	0.9	0.4
11–17	714	95.3	1.1	75.0	2.9	28.3	2.9	2.0	0.5	0.5	0.3	30.4 ^d	2.8	2.2 ^d	0.7
Race/ethnicity				*		***									
Black	326	97.0	1.3	73.6	5.3	44.6	5.2	6.3	2.3	1.1	0.5	26.0	3.6	1.1	0.5
White	582	98.2	0.8	83.0 ^e	2.5	42.7 ^e	3.8	1.6	0.6	0.7	0.5	24.7	2.8	2.5	1.0
Hispanic	160	91.2	3.2	66.9	5.5	28.1	5.8	1.3	0.9	0.0	0.0	26.4	4.9	0.6	0.4
Other	76	92.3	5.0	62.4	8.7	35.3	7.5	2.8	2.0	0.0	0.0	32.5	8.7	0.0	0.0

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *N*s are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *N*s vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. The instrument used was the Conflict Tactics Scale Parent-Child Version (CTS-PC) (Straus et al., 1998). Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests. Asterisks indicate statistical significance (* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$). Asterisks in a column apply to the subsequent results for the covariate.

^a Caregivers of children 1 to 2 years old were significantly less likely to report sexual abuse than caregivers of children 6 to 10 years old ($p < .05$) and more likely to report minor physical assault than caregivers of children 11 to 17 years old ($p < .001$).

^b Caregivers of children 3 to 5 years old were significantly more likely to report minor physical assault than caregivers of children 11 to 17 years old ($p < .001$).

^c Caregivers of children 6 to 10 years old were significantly more likely to report severe physical assault than caregivers of children 1 to 2 years old ($p < .05$) and caregivers of children 11 to 17 years old ($p < .05$), and more likely to report minor physical assault than caregivers of children 11 to 17 years old ($p < .001$).

^d Caregivers of children 11 to 17 years old were significantly more likely to report child neglect ($p < .001$) and sexual abuse ($p < .01$) than caregivers of children 1 to 2 years old, and more likely to report child neglect than caregivers of children 3 to 5 years old ($p < .01$) and caregivers of children 6 to 10 years old ($p < .01$).

^e Caregivers of White children were significantly more likely to report psychological aggression ($p < .05$) and minor physical assault ($p < .05$) than caregivers of Hispanic children.

Exhibit 9. Caregiver Aggression and Neglect of Children 11 to 17 Years Old from a Caregiver in the Past Year by Child Report at Wave 2

	<i>N</i>	CTS-PC Nonviolent Discipline		CTS-PC Psychological Aggression		CTS-PC Minor Physical Assault (Corporal Punishment)		CTS-PC Severe Physical Assault		CTS-PC Very Severe Physical Assault	
		%	<i>SE</i>	%	<i>SE</i>	%	<i>SE</i>	%	<i>SE</i>	%	<i>SE</i>
Total	927	83.9	1.6	53.4	2.7	31.0	2.6	10.6	1.2	8.2	1.6
Gender				*							
Male	413	80.0	3.1	46.0	4.2	29.4	4.0	10.8	1.9	5.8	1.4
Female	514	86.7	2.1	58.7	3.6	32.2	3.3	10.4	1.6	9.9	2.5
Age (years)											
11–12	279	84.2	3.4	50.4	5.3	33.5	4.4	9.4	2.0	5.0	1.9
13–14	267	82.9	3.3	52.4	4.5	29.3	5.0	9.4	2.5	9.3	3.9
15–17	376	84.4	2.4	56.8	4.0	30.6	3.2	12.4	2.3	10.0	2.2
Race/ethnicity								**		***	
Black	257	81.5	4.3	53.8	4.8	34.0	5.9	17.1 ^a	3.2	10.7 ^a	2.8
White	360	82.6	2.5	54.3	3.5	31.9	3.5	11.9	2.3	7.7 ^b	1.9
Hispanic	223	87.7	4.2	52.4	7.2	34.1	7.2	7.1	2.1	11.3 ^c	4.9
Other	58	83.3	5.7	51.8	11.2	10.9	4.1	4.9	3.1	0.9	0.5

Note: All analyses were on weighted NSCAW II Wave 2 data; *N*s are unweighted and, therefore, direct percentages cannot be calculated by hand. Reported *N*s vary slightly across analyses because of missing data in some variable categories. Instrument used was the Conflict Tactics Scale Parent-Child (Straus et al., 1998). Pearson χ^2 tests for cluster samples were used for significance tests. Asterisks indicate statistical significance (* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$). Asterisks in a column apply to the subsequent results for the covariate.

^a Black children were significantly more likely to report severe physical assault than Hispanic children ($p < .01$) and significantly more likely to report severe physical assault ($p < .05$), and very severe physical assault ($p < .01$) than children of “Other” race/ethnicity.

^b White children were significantly more likely to report very severe physical assault than children of “Other” race/ethnicity ($p < .01$).

^c Hispanic children were significantly more likely to report very severe physical assault ($p < .05$) than children of “Other” race/ethnicity children.

REFERENCES

- Barnett, D., Manly, J. T., & Cicchetti, D. (1993). Defining child maltreatment: The interface between policy and child research. In D. Cicchetti & S. L. Toth (Eds.), *Defining child maltreatment: The interface between policy and child research* (Vol. 8, pp. 7–73). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Connell, C. M., Bergeron, N., Katz, K. H., Saunders, L., & Tebes, J. K. (2007). Re-referral to child protective services: The influence of child, family, and case characteristics on risk status. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 31*(5), 573–588.
- Fluke, J. D., Shusterman, G. R., Hollinshead, D. M., & Yuan, Y. Y. T. (2008). Longitudinal analysis of repeated child abuse reporting and victimization: Multistate analysis of associated factors. *Child Maltreatment, 13*(1), 76–88.
- Fox, N. A., & Leavitt, L. A. (1995). *The Violence Exposure Scale for Children—Revised (VEX-R)*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Lipien, L., & Forthofer, M. S. (2004). An event history analysis of recurrent child maltreatment reports in Florida. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 28*(9), 947–966.
- Raviv, A., Erel, O., Fox, N., Leavitt, L., Raviv, A., Dar, I., Shahinfar, A., & Greenbaum, C. (2001). Individual measurement of exposure to everyday violence among elementary schoolchildren across various settings. *Journal of Community Psychology, 29*(2), 117–140.
- Raviv, A., Raviv, A., Shimoni, H., Fox, N., & Leavitt, L. (1999). Children's self-report of exposure to violence and its relation to emotional distress. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 20*(2), 337–353.
- Shahinfar, A., Fox, N., & Leavitt, L. (2000). Preschool children's exposure to violence: Relation of behavior problems to parent and child reports. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 70*(1), 115–125.
- Stein, B. D., Zima, B. T., Elliott, M. N., Burnam, M. A., Shahinfar, A., Fox, N. A., & Leavitt, L. A. (2001). Violence exposure among school-age children in foster care: Relationship to distress symptoms. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 40*(5), 588–594.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Finkelhor, D., Moore, D. W., & Runyan, D. (1998). Identification of child maltreatment with the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales: Development and psychometric data for a national sample of American parents. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 22*(4), 249–270.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau (2010). *Child welfare outcomes 2006–2006. Report to Congress. Safety, permanency, well-being*. Retrieved June 27, 2012, from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/pubs/cwo06-09/cwo06-09.pdf>

APPENDIX

Scales. Following is a descriptive list of the instruments used as measures of child maltreatment in NSCAW II.

- *Conflict Tactics Scale, Parent-Child Version (CTS-PC).* The CTS-PC was developed to assess the uses of discipline and measure psychological and physical maltreatment and neglect by parents, as well as nonviolent modes of discipline. CTS-PC scales include nonviolent discipline (e.g., putting a child in “time out”), psychological aggression (e.g., shouting, yelling, or screaming at a child), physical assault, and neglect (Straus et al., 1998). There are two versions: one in which the children report their experience of disciplinary actions and one in which parents report their use of those disciplinary tactics with their child. The disciplinary actions include more than those ordinarily considered part of parental discipline and range from time-out to burning a child. CTS-PC uses an 8-point Likert-type scale (1 time, 2 times, 3 to 5 times, 6 to 10 times, 11 to 20 times, more than 20 times, not in the past 12 months, never) to measure frequency and extent to which a parent has carried out specific acts of physical and psychological aggression (Straus et al., 1998). This measure consists of three subscales that assess Nonviolent Discipline, Psychological Aggression, and Physical Assault. The Physical Assault scale can be subdivided and consists of three subscales: Minor Physical Assault (Corporal Punishment), Severe Physical Assault, and Very Severe Physical Assault. Two additional supplemental subscales measuring Neglect and Sexual Abuse (total 22 items) were available and were administered to the caregivers but not to the children of the NSCAW II dataset. In NSCAW II, parental report on the CTS-PC measures were obtained from all caregivers considered permanent by the NSCAW interviewer. This report presents findings from the Nonviolent Discipline, Psychological Aggression, and Neglect scales, as well as the Physical Assault subscales only for in-home biological and adoptive parents. Measures shown are annual prevalence estimates for each scale.
- *Maltreatment characteristics.* NSCAW II used the Limited Maltreatment Classification System (L-MCS; Barnett, Manly, & Cicchetti, 1993) to capture information about the reported maltreatment. Caseworkers were provided with a card listing types of maltreatment. The request to caseworkers was: Please look at Card 9 and tell me the type or types of abuse or neglect reported on (Report Date)?
 - 1 = “Physical Maltreatment”
 - 2 = “Sexual Maltreatment”
 - 3 = “Emotional Maltreatment”
 - 4 = “Physical Neglect (Failure to Provide)”
 - 5 = “Neglect (Lack of Supervision)”
 - 6 = “Abandonment”
 - 7 = “Moral/legal Maltreatment”
 - 8 = “Educational Maltreatment”

- 9 = “Exploitation”
- 10 = “Other”
- 11 = “Prematurity or Low Birth Weight”
- 12 = “Substance Exposure (e.g., born with drugs in system)”
- 13 = “Domestic Violence”
- 14 = “Substance-abusing Parent”
- 15 = “Voluntary Relinquishment”
- 16 = “Children in Need of Services (CHINS)”
- 17 = “Investigation Only Way to Get Services”

The card listing types of maltreatment did not include a definition of each category. NSCAW II included several new categories, added with the goal of obtaining more information from caseworkers about specific types of maltreatment. The new categories were: Prematurity or Low Birth Weight, Substance Exposure, Domestic Violence, Substance-abusing Parent, Voluntary Relinquishment, Children in Need of Services, and Investigation Only Way to Get Services. The most serious type of maltreatment was assessed by asking the caseworkers in the baseline interview, “Of the types of abuse or neglect that were reported, please look at Card 9 and tell me the type that you felt was the most serious.”

- *Violence Exposure Scale (VEX-R)*. The VEX-R was used to assess frequency of exposure to violent and criminal events in children 8 years old or older (Fox & Leavitt, 1995). The VEX-R is a 23-item child self-report measure in a cartoon format that has been previously administered to minority, inner-city children and elementary school children in Israel, and preschool and school-aged children in the United States, including children in foster care (Raviv et al., 2001; Raviv, Raviv, Shimoni, Fox, & Leavitt, 1999; Shahinfar, Fox, & Leavitt, 2000; Stein et al., 2001). Children are shown cards depicting violent and criminal acts and are asked to respond on a 4-point scale (*never, once, a few times, lots of times*) about their experiences. VEX-R inquires about being a victim or witness to 13 types of violent and criminal events.

Derived Variables. Following is a descriptive list of the variables derived for the NSCAW II Child Maltreatment Baseline Report.

- *“Other” maltreatment*: NSCAW II used the Limited Maltreatment Classification System (L-MCS; Barnett et al., 1993) to capture information about the reported maltreatment. Caseworkers were provided with a card with 17 types of maltreatments. Because of the limited number of cases in some maltreatment categories, a variable was created to represent “Other” with the following categories: abandonment, moral/legal maltreatment, educational maltreatment, exploitation, other, prematurity or low birth weight, voluntary relinquishment, children in need of services, and investigation only way to get services.

- *Re-report*: A re-report was defined as the second, third, or subsequent report that alleges a child has been maltreated and that receives an investigation or assessment by the CPS agency regardless of the disposition. To be counted as a re-report, a minimum of 24 hours must have elapsed between the index report at baseline and the subsequent re-report.
- *Recurrence*: Recurrence is defined as the second, third, or subsequent time that a child has been found to be a victim of maltreatment (substantiated or indicated) within a 6-month period following a prior determination that a child was victimized (substantiated or indicated).
- *Reunification*: This variable contains data on all children who were in out-of-home care postinvestigation, even briefly. Children were classified as having been reunified if there was at least one reunification attempt with the biological parents for any amount of time, even if they had a subsequent placement in out-of-home care.
- *Setting*. The setting variable includes six levels: in-home, formal kin care, informal kin care, foster care, group home/residential program, or other out of home. *In-home* caregivers include living situations where the primary caregiver is either a biological, adoptive, or stepmother/father. *Formal kin care* includes situations where the primary caregiver has a kin relationship to the child and where the caregiver is receiving payments from the CWS. *Informal kin care* is where the primary caregiver has a kin relationship to the child, but is not receiving payments from the CWS. *Foster care* indicates that the child primary caregiver was identified as a foster parent. *Group home/residential program* indicates that a child was currently living in a group home or residential facility. *Other out of home* includes situations where the primary caregiver was identified as “other nonrelative” and where the primary caregiver was not receiving foster parent payments.