Journal of Social Science for Policy Implications
June 2019, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 1-6
ISSN: 2334-2900 (Print), 2334-2919 (Online)
Copyright © The Author(s). All Rights Reserved.
Published by American Research Institute for Policy Development
DOI: 10.15640/10.15640/jsspi.v7n1a1
URL: https://doi.org/10.15640/jsspi.v7n1a1

Improving Children-Parents Visitation for Families with Substance Abuse Problems in Child Welfare

Sam Choi¹, MSW, Ph.D.

Abstract

While the most of child welfare services toward substance abusing families are focusing on parents, little is known about the impacts of such services on lives of children in child welfare. Similarly, the children-parents visitation status gained relatively less attention in the previous evaluation research in child welfare. The goal of this study is to examine the efficacy of case management in improving children-parents visitations and understand the mechanism that facilitates such visitations in child welfare. This study reported findings from the randomized trials for 856 parents with substance abuse problem who involved in public child welfare. Subsequent to temporary custody, parents were randomly assigned to either control (n=244) or experimental (n=596) condition. Parents in the control group received substance abuse services. Parents in the experimental group received traditional services plus the services of additional case management. This case management assists parents with obtaining needed treatment services and in negotiating departmental and judicial requirements associated with drug recovery and concurrent permanency planning. Chi-squares analysis and logistic regression were utilized. Of 840 parents, a total of 141 (23.2%) parents in the demonstration group experience at least one unsupervised visit of a child as compared to 43 (17.4 %) parents in the control group. The logistic regression also indicated that controlling for a variety of demographic information and types of primary drug, case management approximately increased the likelihood of unsupervised visitation by 44 %. The visitation status is known to be a critical factor in making permanency decision in child welfare. Consequently, the child welfare interventions for substance abusing families should utilize the approach that focuses on efforts to preparing children-parents visitation. The results of this study indicate that use of case management is associated with (1) higher rates of unsupervised visits and (2) increased likelihood of such visits.

1.1. Parental visitation and child welfare outcomes

Research indicated that parental visitation is a significant factor in many positive child welfare outcomes (Davis, Landsverk, Newton, & Ganger, 1996; Leathers, 2002)). Prior Studies reported the positive relationship between parental visitation and family reunification (Davis et al., 1996; Leathers, 2002). Results of these studies indicated that parental visitation significantly improved the likelihood of family reunification. For example, a study by Leathers (2002) reported that the frequency of visitation was significantly improved family reunification expectations measured by caseworkers using a sample of 230 children placed in foster care in IL. Mech (1985) found that frequency of parental visiting was associated with fewer months in foster care placement. In addition, a study by Lee (2011) reported the importance of different type of visitors (parental vs. non-parental) on permanency outcomes (reunification, adoption or legal guardianship). Lee (2011) found that parental visit had significantly higher chance of achieving permanency compared to children who had visits from extended family and/or non-family only. One study found no relationship between a frequency of parental visiting and family reunification (Gillespie, Bryne, & Workman, 1995). They investigated the effectiveness of an intensive family preservation services model on family reunification by service components. They found that a frequency of parental visiting was not significantly related to family reunification outcome. Unlike other studies, participants of this study were highly homogeneous in terms of service receipts. For example, 91% of children visited families weekly or more, with 85% having at least weekly over-night visits.

¹ Department of Social Work, Psychology and Counseling, Alabama A & M University (e-mail: sam.choi@aamu.edu)

Sam Choi 3

Further, research indicated that parental visitation had a positive impact on children mental health status. McWey, Acock and Porter (2009) studied the impact of contact with parents among children with mental health problems in child welfare. Using a subsample of the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being data, authors found that the frequent contacts by mothers was marginally associated with the lower levels of depression and significantly associated with lower externalizing problem behaviors.

1.2. Factors related to parental visitation

Prior research identified several factors related to parental visitation in child welfare including settings, parents' involvement, parents-inclusive practice principals (Leathers, 2002; Lee, 2011). Compared to other practices, inclusive practice principles improved the parental visitations. A study by Leathers (2002) found that parents who visit their children in foster homes or their own homes are likely to visit more frequently than parents who visit in agency offices, fast-food restaurant, and other settings. Parents who participated in case reviews or involved in their children's life visited significantly more times than parents who did not.

A child placement type was also related to the visitation (Lee, 2011). Compared to children in kinship care, children in group home/residential treatment or foster home had fewer visits. In addition, children in group home/residential treatment experienced significantly higher cancelations of family visit. A study by Lee also reported the low visitation rates among children placed in residential treatment (2011). Among 81 children in residential treatment, only one third of the children had parents who visited regularly and an average parent visited less than weekly.

1.3. Parental visitation and child welfare outcomes among families in substance abuse problems.

Research has yet to inform the visitation experience among families with substance abuse problems in child welfare or investigate the relationship between visitations and child welfare outcomes. One study by Leathers (2002) investigated whether the maternal mental health problem and severity of maternal substance abuse was a factor in deciding a frequency of visitation and family reunification. Leathers (2002) found that the maternal mental health problems and severity of substance abuse were not significantly related to the frequency of visitations. Prior studies on parental visitation in child welfare have made valuable contributions to the field of child welfare. Yet there is limited knowledge on visitation experiences among families with substance abuse problems in child welfare. This current study will investigate (1) the relationship between parental visitation and family reunification and (2) factors related to parental visitations for families with substance abuse problems in child welfare.

2. Methods

This study utilized a subset of data from the Illinois Title IV-E Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse (AODA) waiver demonstration (see Marsh et al., 2006 and Ryan, Marsh, Testa, & Louderman, 2006) for a detailed description of the AODA study design and methods). The major evaluation on the AODA project indicates that the recovery coach model improved reunification rates and increased access to substance abuse treatment (Ryan et al., 2006). To date, no published studies or reports from this larger AODA demonstration project focus on the relationship between Recovery Coaches and parental visitation. This current study investigates (1) the relationship between Recovery Coaches and parental visitation and (2) factors related to parental visitations for families with substance abuse problems in child welfare.

This study utilizes the subsample of AODA program including 845 parents in child welfare. Parental visitation is coming from the caseworker's TRACCS's form. The total number of supervised visit and unsupervised visit were calculated at the child level. Then the total number of visit represents the sum of supervised and unsupervised visit. Descriptive data analyses were conducted and bivariate analysis was used to examine the relationship between child and mothers' demographic information, parental visitation, and Recovery Coaches. We then developed the logistic regression.

3. Results

Of 845 caregivers in this study, 28.9% were male and 71.1% were female. The sample was 81.5% of African American, 11.4% of Caucasian, and 6.9% of Latino. Parents in this study reported to have limited resources. The majority of the sample was never married (76.4%), and was unemployed (73%).

Approximately 52% of sample had less than high school education and 30 % were TANF recipients. The majority of parents in this had a previous substance abuse treatment history (60.7%) and 17.5% had a previous mental health treatment experience.

The cocaine (36.5%) was the most frequently used primary drug of choice, followed by Opioids (25.6%), Alcohol (21.3%), and marijuana (15%). 60.7% have substance abuse treatment history. Of 854 parents, 40% had low dependency on drug while about 39% had mild dependency on drug and 22% had high dependency on drug.

Table 1. Caregiver Characteristics

	Control Group	Demonstration Group		
	N (% within group)	N (% within group)		
Overall	245 (100)	600 (100)		
Gender				
Male	74 (30.2)	171 (28.5)		
Female	171 (69.8)	429 (71.5)		
Race	,	, ,		
African American	204 (83.3)	485 (80.8)		
Caucasian	29 (11.8)	68 (11.3)		
Hispanic	12 (4.9)	47 (7.8)		
Marital Status				
Married	19 (7.8)	57 (9.5)		
Never Married	182 (74.3)	464 (77.3)		
Others	44 (15.4)	79 (18.3)		
Employment				
Unemployed	178 (72.7)	439 (73.2)		
Education		, ,		
< High School	121 (49.4)	317 (52.8)		
High School /GED	77 (31.4)	197 (32.8)		
> High School	19 (7.8)	35 (5.8)		
Previous Treatment History				
Substance Abuse	146 (59.6)	367 (61.2)		
Mental Health	39 (15.9)	109 (18.2)		
Living Situation		, ,		
Alone	46 (18.8)	102 (17.0)		
Family	134 (54.7)	316 (52.7)		
Friend	43 (17.6)	122 (20.3)		
Homeless	12 (4.9)	28 (4.7)		
Institute/Shelter	6 (2.4)	20 (3.3)		
TANF	65 (26.3)	192 (32.0)		
No Income	115 (46.9)	263 (43.8)		
Medical Problem	80 (32.7)	175 (29.2)		
Legal Problem	28 (11.4)	81 (13.5)		
Type of Substance Abuse				
Alcohol	57 (23.3)	123 (20.5)		
Cocaine	87 (35.5)	222 (37.0)		
Marijuana	34 (13.9)	93 (15.5)		
Opioids	63 (25.7)	154 (25.7)		
Level of Dependency on Drug				
Low	99 (40.4)	239 (39.8)		
Mild	88 (35.9)	238 (39.7)		
High	58 (23.7)	123 (20.5)		

Sam Choi 5

As shown in Table 2, 24% had at least one unsupervised visitation while 76% had no unsupervised visitation. For the unsupervised visitation, a total of 157 (26.2%) caregivers in the demonstration group experience at least one unsupervised visit of a child as compared to 46 (18.8%) caregivers in the control group. This difference is statistically significant ($X^2 = 5.207$, df = 1, p= .026). Table 3 shows the frequency of supervised visitation. Approximately 28% of parents did not have supervised visitation a given month.

Table 2. Unsupervised Visitation

	Control Group	Demonstration Group	Totals
Yes	46 (18.8)	157 (26.2)	203 (24.0)
No	199 (81.2)	443 (73.8)	642 (76.0)
Total	245 (100)	600 (100)	845 (100)

The final model of the logistic regression (see Table 4) indicates that caregivers in the demonstration group are 1.6 times more likely to have at least one unsupervised visitation than those who are in the control group. In addition, the model suggests that caregivers with mental health problem are less likely to have at least one unsupervised visitation than those who without any mental health problems.

Table 4. Logistic Regression

Variables	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	Coefficient	SE	Exp	Coefficient	SE	Exp	Coeffic	SE	Exp
			(B)			(B)	ient		(B)
Female	0.317	0.196	1.373	0.266	0.200	1.314	0.263	0.263	1.301
No Income	-0.214	0.178	0.807	-0.228	0.178	0.796	-0.214	-0.214	0.808
African American	0.117	0.263	1.125	0.099	0.264	1.104	0.098	0.098	1.103
Hispanic	0.405	0.382	1.500	0.423	0.383	1.527	0.386	0.386	1.472
Unemployed	-0.166	0.209	0.847	-0.195	0.210	0.823	-0.201	-0.201	0.818
Less than High School									
Education	-0.141	0.168	0.868	-0.143	0.168	0.867	-0.154	-0.154	0.857
Married	0.050	0.283	1.051	0.060	0.284	1.062	0.044	0.044	1.045
							-		
Mental Health Problem	-1.103**	0.483	0.332	-1.084**	0.484	0.338	1.145**	-1.145	0.318
Medical Problem	0.003	0.179	1.003	0.008	0.179	1.008	0.025	0.025	1.026
Low Dependency on Primary									
Drug				-0.333	0.259	0.717	-0.203	0.228	0.816
Mild Dependency on Primary									
Drug				0.058	0.225	1.059	0.050	0.216	1.052
Case Management							0.446	0.190	1.561
	-1.18	0,303	0.307	-1.057	0.361	0.347	-1.365	0.389	0.255
Constant									
	13.072, 9			20,807, 12			20,807, 12 **		
Model Chi-Square, df									
	13.072, 9			5.718, 1			5.718, 1 ***		
Block Chi-Squre, df									

^{*} ϱ < 0.1 ** ϱ < 0.05 *** ϱ < 0.01

4. Discussion

Visitation is commonly a requirement for parents seeking to reacquire the custody of children in care of the child welfare system and thus visitation may represent aimportant step toward reunification.

In addition, the prior study indicated that child-parents visitation is one of key factors in child welfare outcomes (Davis et al., 1996; McWey, Acock, & Porter, 2009). Despite its significance, this study found that only few caregivers had visitations with their children. Approximately 28% of parents did not have supervised visitation a given month while only 29% of parents experienced one supervised visitation. Few parents (6.9%) had more than 5 visits a month. Prior studies identified several barriers to visitations.

According to McWeky, Acock, and Porter (2010), the visitation practices vary by settings in child welfare. Often, many states are not specific in regards to planning, implementing, and regulating visitation and therefore may cause sporadic and sometimes unstable visitation environments (Hess, 2003). Furthermore, parents who struggled with substance abuse and mental health difficulties were also less likely to visit their children in foster care (Leathers, 2002). Visitation may also be inconsistent due to unstable living environments, transportation restrictions, or because social workers are overwhelmed with caseloads (Gillespie, Byrne, and Workman, 1995). Some parents, such as some with children in the residential treatment facility, do not want to get involved in the out-of-home care process. Some of those parents also struggled with personal and systematic conflicts such as a lack of responsibility, legal issues, strained relationships, transportation conflicts, and the influence of authority figures (Lee, 2011). If child welfare policy continuously values a child connection with biological parents, it is vital for policy makers actively engage in developing the visitation policy and providing necessary infrastructure for the visitation.

The results of this study indicate that use of Recovery Coaches are associated with (1) higher rates of unsupervised visits and (2) increased likelihood of such visits. Yet this study was not able to determine what aspects of recovery coaches accounted for success in improving visitation. As in other types of case management strategies, recovery coaches performed multiple tasks. Future studies should explicitly examine which aspects of case management may related to visitations. Because the visitation status has been found to be a important factor of positive permanency outcomes, the needs of systematic identification of factors related to successful visitation and special interventions to promote both supervised and unsupervised visitations for substance abusing families are important.

Acknowledgements

This research was completed with support from the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services and the Children and Family Research Center at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

References

- Davis, I.P., Landsverk, J., Newton, R., Ganger, W. (1996). Parental visiting and foster care reunification. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 18 (4-5), 363-382.
- Gillespie, J.M., Byrne, B., Workman, L.J. (1995). An intensive reunification program for children in foster care. *Children and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 12 (3)* 213-238.
- Hess, P. (1988). Case and context: Determinants of planned visit frequency in foster family care. *Child Welfare*, 67(4), 311-326
- Leathers, S.J. (2002). Parental visiting and family reunification: could inclusive practice make a difference? *Child Welfare, 81 (4),* 595-616.
- Lawder, E., Poulin, J., & Andrews, R. (1986). A study of 185 foster children five years after placement. *Child Welfare*, 65, 457-473
- Lee, L.J. (2011). Adult visitation and permanency for children following residential treatment. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33, 1288-1297.
- Marsh, J., Ryan, J. P., Choi, S., & Testa, M. (2006). Integrated services for families with multiple problems: Obstacles to family reunification. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 28, 1074–1087.
- McWey, L.M., Acock, A., Porter, B.E. (2010). The impact of continued contact with biological parents upon the mental health of children in foster care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 32, 1338-1345.
- Mech, E. (1985). Parental visiting and foster placement. Child Welfare, 64(1), 67-72.
- Proch, K. & Howard, J. (1986). Parental visiting of children in foster care: A study of casework practice. *Social Work*, 31, 178-181
- Ryan, J. P., Marsh, J., Testa, M. F., & Louderman, R. (2006). Integrating substance abuse treatment and child welfare services: Findings from the Illinois AODA waiver demonstration. *Social Work Research*, *30*, 95–107.