



ICPSR 25941

## Florida Elder Abuse Survey in Seven Sites, 2007-2008 [United States]

Laurence G. Branch  
*University of South Florida*

Lawrence Schonfeld  
*University of South Florida*

Lisa M. Brown  
*University of South Florida*

User Guide



National Institute of Justice  
Data Resources Program

# ICPSR

P.O. Box 1248  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106  
[www.icpsr.umich.edu](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu)



# Terms of Use

The terms of use for this study can be found at:  
<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/cocoon/ICPSR/TERMS/25941.xml>

## Information about Copyrighted Content

Some instruments administered as part of this study may contain in whole or substantially in part contents from copyrighted instruments. Reproductions of the instruments are provided as documentation for the analysis of the data associated with this collection. Restrictions on "fair use" apply to all copyrighted content. More information about the reproduction of copyrighted works by educators and librarians is available from the United States Copyright Office.

### NOTICE

#### WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.



## **Bibliographic Description**

ICPSR Study No.: 25941

Title: Florida Elder Abuse Survey in Seven Sites, 2007-2008 [United States]

Principal Investigator(s): Laurence G. Branch, University of South Florida

Lawrence Schonfeld, University of South Florida

Lisa M. Brown, University of South Florida

Funding Agency: National Institute of Justice

Grant Number: 2005-MU-MU-0052

Bibliographic Citation: Branch, Laurence G., Lawrence Schonfeld, and Lisa M. Brown. Florida Elder Abuse Survey in Seven Sites, 2007-2008 [United States] [Computer file]. ICPSR25941-v1. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2010.  
doi:10.3886/ICPSR25941

## **Scope of Study**

Summary: The purpose of this project was to develop and pilot test an interviewer-administered self-report questionnaire that might be used in a subsequent national survey to scientifically establish the prevalence of second-party elder abuse or neglect. The project focused only on those living in the communities who were capable of accurately self-reporting their knowledge, attitudes, and practices. Through focus groups of adult protective services and abuse hot-line staff, questionnaire items were generated and later tested through interviews of clients of aging services in Florida. Aging services case managers screened and recruited 95 clients, aged 65 and older, with 25 clients who had reports of mistreatment within the hotline database, and 70 comparison clients (no reports of mistreatment). Groups were matched by gender and age within 10 years. The interviews were conducted over an 18-month period, of which 3 interviews were conducted in-person and 92 interviews were conducted by telephone. All interviews were conducted by trained interviewers of the research team. Twenty-six interviews were conducted in Spanish. Interviews focused on demographics; activities of daily living; 19 possible types of elder abuse or neglect within the previous year, and, for each positive response, questions about the perpetrators and their relationship to the older adult; a description of when the

mistreatment happened, how often, what the respondent did, and whether it was related to the perpetrator's anger, neglect, or carelessness.

Subject Term(s): abuse, activities of daily living, caregivers, cognitive functioning, elder abuse, family violence, living arrangements, older adults

Smallest Geographic Unit: none

Geographic Coverage: Florida, Fort Lauderdale, Gainesville, Jacksonville, Miami, Orlando, St. Petersburg, Tampa, United States

Time Period: 2007 - 2008

Date(s) of Collection: January 16, 2007 - February 17, 2008

Unit of Observation: individual

Universe: All known victims of second party elder abuse receiving home and community based services in the seven sites in Florida in 2007 and 2008.

Data Type: survey data

## Methodology

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this project was to develop and pilot test an interviewer-administered self-report questionnaire that might be used in a subsequent national survey to scientifically establish the prevalence of second-party elder abuse or neglect. Acknowledging that elder abuse and neglect can occur in institutional as well as residential settings, the project focused only on those living in the communities who were capable of accurately self-reporting their knowledge, attitudes, and practices. Accordingly, this project was funded to develop innovative self-report methods for estimating the annual incidence and prevalence of elder abuse and mistreatment (including physical abuse, psychological abuse, neglect by a second party, and exploitation) in the community.

Study Design: Based on the results of the focus groups and the field trips with the Adult Protective Service (APS) workers, a structured questionnaire amenable for computer assisted in-person or telephone interviewing was developed. The questionnaire was developed for computer-assisted interviewer administration either in person or over the telephone in either English or Spanish. Preliminary testing of the instrument was conducted with community-dwelling cognitively intact elder volunteers in the Tampa area. Aging services case managers screened and recruited 95 clients aged 65 and older, with 25 clients who had reports of mistreatment within the hotline database, and 70 comparison clients (no reports of mistreatment). Groups were matched by gender and age within 10 years.

The interviews were conducted over an 18-month period, of which 3 interviews were conducted in-person and 92 interviews were conducted by telephone. All interviews were conducted by trained interviewers of the research team. Twenty-six interviews were conducted in Spanish.

**Sample:** A volunteer/convenience sample was utilized. In order to obtain the sample of abuse target cases, the Area Agencies on Aging (AAAs) and the local service delivery organizations identified initial lists of 530 cases of second party abuse or neglect. Of these cases, they tried but were not able to contact 83 (including 4 decedents and 1 no longer receiving services), another 352 had no record of any attempted contacts, and the remaining 95 were contacted by the agencies and considered as active cases. Of these 95 active cases, 13 (14 percent) were not able to self-report according to the agencies, 26 (27 percent) refused to give permission to be contacted, and 56 (59 percent) agreed to be contacted by the interviewers.

In order to obtain the sample of nonabuse comparison cases, initial lists of 1,103 potential matched control clients (i.e., clients receiving services but not identified as abused elders) were selected by the agencies. Of these 1,103, 2 were deceased, 2 were not able to self-report according to the agencies, 23 were no longer clients, 2 refused to give permission to be contacted, 40 were unable to be contacted, 922 had no record of any attempted contacts, and the remaining 112 were considered by the agencies as active nonabuse cases and gave permission to be contacted.

**Weight:** Not applicable.

**Sources of Information:** Trained interviewers administered the questionnaire in person or by telephone.

**Mode of Data Collection:** computer-assisted personal interview (CAPI)

face-to-face interview

telephone interview

**Description of Variables:** In addition to the cognitive screen that was administered in the first minutes of the interview, a variety of demographic questions were asked along with an assessment of respondents' independence/dependence in basic activities of daily living and instrumental activities of daily living. The questionnaire also asked a series of screening items designed to ascertain whether the respondent experienced any one of 19 specific types of elder abuse or neglect during the previous year.

Section 1 was titled internally "Cognitive Screen" (questions 1-7). This section began with two general items about self-assessed health and

self-assessed memory. The respondents were then administered a modified version of the Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE) to verify their capacity to provide consent and establish their ability to give a reliable self-report.

For those respondents who passed the cognitive screen, the questionnaire continued with Section 2, internally titled "Living Arrangements and Children" (questions 8-210). In this section, demographic information was sought, including current marital status, prior marital history, household composition, and a listing of all the living children (up to ten) and step-children (up to nine) the respondent has, the frequency of their visits in person and on the telephone, and the respondent's perception of trust of each of these individuals.

Section 3, internally titled "ADL/IADL" [Activities of Daily Living/Instrumental Activities of Daily Living] (questions 211-288) assessed the respondent's function in 6 basic ADLs including walking across a small room, bathing, dressing, eating, transferring from a bed to a chair, and toileting; and 12 ADLs including using the telephone, grocery shopping, food preparation, routine light housekeeping, occasional heavy housekeeping, laundry, managing prescription medications, taking care of finances, taking care of one's social life, making medical appointments and seeing medical personnel, personal shopping, and traveling within the community.

In Section 4, internally labeled "SES" [Socioeconomic Status](questions 289-307), the questionnaire proceeded to elicit information about power of attorney, home ownership, and 15 sources of income or services.

Section 5, internally labeled "Mistreatment" (questions 309-362) asked the respondent if he or she had ever experienced any one of 17 specific forms of abuse, and 2 items that the APS staff indicated were often correlated with elder abuse -- whether they were afraid of anyone inside or outside their home, and whether the police had come to their home.

Response Rates: Of the 56 cases of second party abuse identified by the AAAs who gave permission to be contacted by the interviewers, 5 (9 percent) were deceased by the time of contact, 15 (27 percent) failed the cognitive screen, 7 (12 percent) were not able to be contacted, 3 (5 percent) refused consent to be interviewed, and 26 (46 percent) were interviewed, for a response rate among the cases of 72 percent (26/56 -- 5 decedents + 15 who failed the cognitive screen).

Of the 112 cases of AAA clients who were not known to be victims of second party abuse who gave permission to be contacted by interviewers, 7 (6 percent) were deceased by the time of contact, 24 (21 percent) failed the cognitive screen, 2 (2 percent) were not were able to be contacted, 10 (9 percent) refused consent to be interviewed, and 69 (62



percent) were interviewed, for a response rate among the controls of 85 percent (69/112 -- 7 decedents + 24 who failed the cognitive screen).

The total response rate among cases and controls was therefore 81 percent (95/168 -- 12 decedents + 39 who failed cognitive screen).

Presence of Common Scales: A subset of the Mini Mental Status Examination (MMSE) was used in the questionnaire. The 5 items included: (1) registration (i.e., repeat 3 words), (2) attention (i.e., serial subtraction of 7's from 100), (3) short-term memory (i.e., recalling 3 words immediately after they were offered), (4) delayed memory (i.e., recalling those same 3's words after an interval of approximately 2 minutes of answering other items in the questionnaire), and (5) orientation to time (i.e., giving the correct month, day, year, and day of the week).

Extent of Processing: Checked for undocumented or out-of-range codes.

## Access and Availability

Note: A list of the data formats available for this study can be found in the [summary of holdings](#). Detailed file-level information (such as record length, case count, and variable count) is listed in the [file manifest](#).

Restrictions: The data are restricted from general dissemination. Users interested in obtaining these data must complete a Restricted Data Use Agreement form and specify the reasons for the request. A copy of the Restricted Data Use Agreement form can be requested by calling 800-999-0960. Researchers can also download this form as a Portable Document Format (PDF) file from the download page associated with this dataset. Completed forms should be returned to: Director, National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Institute for Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248, or by fax: 734-647-8200.

Original ICPSR Release: 2010

Dataset(s):

- DS1: Florida Elder Abuse Survey in Seven Sites, 2007-2008 [United States]

## Publications

Final Reports and Other Publication Resources: A list of publications related to, or based on, this data collection can be accessed from the study's download page on the NACJD Web site or through the ICPSR Bibliography of Data-Related Literature at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/ICPSR/citations/index.html>. The list of citations

includes links to abstracts and publications in Portable Document Format (PDF) files or text files when available.

Final reports and other publications describing research conducted on a variety of criminal justice topics are available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS). NCJRS was established in 1972 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), an agency of the U.S. Department of Justice, to provide research findings to criminal justice professionals and researchers. NCJRS operates specialized clearinghouses that are staffed by information specialists who supply a range of reference, referral, and distribution services. Publications can be obtained from NCJRS at NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD, 20849-6000, 800-851-3420 or 301-519-5500. TTY Service for the Hearing Impaired is 877-712-9279 (toll-free) or 301-947-8374 (local). The URL for the NCJRS Web site is:

<http://www.ncjrs.org/>

## **NIJ Data Resources Program**

About the DRP: The National Institute of Justice Data Resources Program (DRP) makes datasets from NIJ-funded research and evaluation projects available to the research community and sponsors research and training activities devoted to secondary data analysis. Datasets are archived by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

The NACJD maintains a World Wide Web site with instructions for transferring files and sending messages. Criminal justice data funded by the Department of Justice are available via the Internet at this site at no charge to the user. NACJD may be contacted at NACJD/ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, 800-999-0960. The URL for the NACJD Web site is:

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/>

## Data Completeness Report

Notes: (1) Variables are individually listed only if they have greater than 5% missing data. These variables are listed under the appropriate percentage category in the order in which they appear in the data file. (2) The Data Completeness Report only captures information about system missing or other values that are declared missing. Codes that have a label implying that they are missing but that are not declared missing values are not reflected in this report. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about missing values. (3) Some variables that have 100% missing data may have been blanked by ICPSR to protect respondent confidentiality. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about blanked variables. (4) Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

**Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values**

<b>Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 95)</b>	<b>Percent of Cases with Missing Values</b>
99.5% ( 381 of 383 variables)	have 0% Missing Values
0.0% ( 0 of 383 variables)	have 0% - 1% Missing Values
0.3% ( 1 of 383 variables)	have 1% - 3% Missing Values
0.0% ( 0 of 383 variables)	have 3% - 5% Missing Values
0.3% ( 1 of 383 variables)	have 5% - 10% Missing Values
Q243_PHONINGHELPER	WHO HELPS TO USE PHONE
0.0% ( 0 of 383 variables)	9.5%
0.0% ( 0 of 383 variables)	have 10% - 20% Missing Values
0.0% ( 0 of 383 variables)	have 20% - 40% Missing Values
0.0% ( 0 of 383 variables)	have 40% - 99% Missing Values
0.0% ( 0 of 383 variables)	have 100% missing values