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**Description:** The CAP Inventory is a caretaker-report measure developed to estimate the risk of a parent physically abusing a child. The test consists of 160 questions with a total of 10 standard scales and 2 special scales (added to the measure in 1990). The 10 standard scales include a 77-item Child Abuse Scale and 3 validity scales.

There have been multiple studies that have shown that a mother’s score on the CAP inventory is predictive of the child’s long-term intelligence, socioemotional outcome and development as well as future behavior by the parent.

**Theoretical Orientation**

**Summary:** Items were selected after an extensive literature search and with input from Child Protective Services.
**Domains Assessed:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Parenting style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mood and Anxiety Symptoms (cgiver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Validity (cgiver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Interpersonal/Interaction problems (cgiver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Languages Available:** Croatian, Filipino, English, Greek, Spanish

---

**Age Range:** 18.0 - 99.0  
**# of Items:** 160  
**Time to Complete (min):** 15  
**Time to Score (min):** 15  
**Periodicity:** Unknown  
**Response Format:** Agree or Disagree

**Materials Needed:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Paper and pencil</th>
<th>Testing stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physiological equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Material Notes:**

Materials offered by PAR include (as of 6/05):

1. Manual: $35  
2. Interpretive Manual for the CAP Inventory: $24  
3. CAP Inventory Form VI Booklets (pkg/10): $19  
4. CAP Raw Score Summary Sheets (pkg/10): $5  
5. CAP Inconsistency Scale Scoring Sheets (pkg/10): $5  
6. CAP Inventory Complete Scoring Template set $59  
7. CAP Inventory Introductory Kit): $135 (Includes all items listed above.)

Pricing is based by summing Raw Score Summary Sheets and Inconsistency Scale Scoring Sheets, assuming templates and booklets are reusable.

Computer program available for scoring but can also be hand-scored. Hand-scoring templates are available.

Although the age range for the measure is 18 and older, the measure has been used with adolescents aged 14-19 (Miller, Handal, Gilner, & Cross, 1991).

**Sample Items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Sample Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mood and Anxiety Symptoms</td>
<td>Distress</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Child Abuse Potential Inventory  
NCTSN Measure Review Database  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Information Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Strength</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal/interactional Problems</td>
<td>Problems with Child and Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with Family</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes (additional scales and domains):
1. Interpersonal/interactional problems: Problems with others
2. Validity: Lie, Random Response, Inconsistency

Information Provided: (check all that apply)
- Diagnostic information DSM-III
- Diagnostic information DSM-IV
- Strengths
- Areas of concerns/risks
- Program evaluation information
- Continuous assessment
- Raw Scores

Training
- Training to Administer: (check all that apply)
  - None
  - Via manual/video
  - Prior experience psych testing & interpretation

Training to Interpret: (check all that apply)
- None
- Via manual/video
- Prior experience psych testing & interpretation

Training Notes:
Person doing the interpretation should be a trained mental health professional.

Parallel or Alternate Forms
- Parallel Forms?
  - No
- Alternate Forms:
  - No
- Forms for Different Ages:
  - No
- If so, are forms comparable:
  - No

Population Used to Develop Measure
Initial input was gathered from researchers and CPS workers, and an initial questionnaire was developed with 334 items. An initial study was conducted with a small (n=38), fairly homogeneous group of families involved with Child Protection services in North Carolina.
Based on the results from initial validity studies, the questions were trimmed to the current 160. Based on the findings from the original study, a second study was begun. It included 130 parents who were given the 160-question form. The sample included 65 abusing parents matched with 65 nonabusing parents from North Carolina and Oklahoma.

### Psychometrics

**Global Rating (scale based on Hudall Stamm, 1996):**
Psychometrically matured, used in multiple peer reviewed articles by different people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norms:</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For separate age groups:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For clinical populations:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate for men and women:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For other demographic groups:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

**Clinical Cutoffs:** Yes

Specify Cutoffs: 166, but 215 is the recommended “conservative” cutoff score, so as to have fewer false positives.

**Used in Major Studies:** Yes

Specify Studies:
Reliability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test-Retest-# days: 1</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Consistency:</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Split Half</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Rater:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel/Alternate Forms:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

The above 1-day test-retest reliabilities are for the abuse scale, control sample only.

At the 1-week test-retest: Min=.89, Max=.94, Avg=.90

At the 1-month test-retest: Min=.81, Max=.91, Avg=.83

At the 3-month test-retest: Min=.64, Max=.86, Avg=.75

Content Validity:

Items were selected after an extensive literature search and with input from Child Protective Services. Item analysis was conducted to determine items with the greatest discriminative ability. Exploratory factor analyses and stepwise regression were used to predict abuse status. Cross-validation was used to replicate findings.

Construct Validity: (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validity Type</th>
<th>Not known</th>
<th>Not found</th>
<th>Nonclinical Samples</th>
<th>Clinical Samples</th>
<th>Diverse Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convergent/Concurrent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal/Maturation Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to Theoretically Distinct Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factorial Validity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Miller, Handal, Gilner, & Cross (1991) found that Black adolescents aged 14-18 scored higher than the adult normative sample of the CAPI, suggesting that different cutoff scores need to be empirically established for adolescents. Adolescents’ abuse history and history of witnessing violence were associated with higher abuse potential scores.

Criterion Validity: (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures used as criterion:</th>
<th>Not known</th>
<th>Not found</th>
<th>Nonclinical Samples</th>
<th>Clinical Samples</th>
<th>Diverse Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictive Validity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdictive Validity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sensitivity Rate(s): 0.89
Specificity Rate(s): 0.96
Positive Predictive Power: 0.34
Negative Predictive Power: 

Limitations of Psychometrics and Other Comments Regarding Psychometrics:
1. To avoid misclassification, cautious use of the CAPI is recommended in a situation where target base rates of physical abuse are very low.
2. Fewer false positives occur when more conservative cutoffs are used.

Consumer Satisfaction
No information available.

Languages Other than English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Translation Quality (check all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Has been translated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Has been translated and back translated - translation appears good and valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Measure has been found to be reliable with this language group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Psychometric properties overall appear to be good for this language group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Factor structure is similar for this language group as it is for the development group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = Norms are available for this language group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 = Measure was developed for this language group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Spanish</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Filipino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Greek</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Croatian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use with Trauma Populations

| Populations for which measure has demonstrated evidence of reliability and validity: |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Yes | Physical abuse | Natural disaster | Terrorism            |
|     | Sexual abuse   | Accidents         | Immigration related trauma |
| Yes | Neglect        | Imprisonment      | Kidnapping/hostage     |
| Yes | Domestic Violence | Witness death | Traumatic loss (death) |
|     | Community violence | Assault    | Other                 |
|     | Medical trauma  | War/combat       |                       |
### Use with Diverse Populations

#### USE WITH DIVERSE POPULATIONS RATING SCALE
1. Measure is known (personal communication, conference presentation) to have been used with members of this group.
2. Studies in peer-reviewed journals have included members of this group who have completed the measure.
3. Measures have been found to be reliable with this group.
4. Psychometric properties well established with this group.
5. Norms are available for this group (or norms include a significant proportion of individuals from this group)
6. Measure was developed specifically for this group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Type</th>
<th>Degree of Usage: (check all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Developmental disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lower socio-economic status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rural populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Substance abusers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Day care employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes (including other diverse populations):
- Aggressive parents: 2
- Adolescent parents: 2
- HIV-infected mothers: 1
- Parents with histories of substance use: 1
- Stepparents: 1
- Military parents: 1
- Filipino: 1
- Greek: 1
- Basque populations: 1
- High-risk families in Spain: 1
- Battered women: 1

According to the author, the CAPI has been translated into more than 30 languages. The English and Spanish, however, have been studied and validated most frequently.

### Pros and Cons/Qualitative Impression

#### Pros:
1. Easy to use and score.
2. Demonstrated ability to screen for physical abuse risk factors in parents.
3. Has been studied and validated multiple times and is used frequently.
4. Spanish version well studied.

#### Cons:
1. According to the manual, care must be taken when utilizing this measure outside of the area of Child Protection.
2. This measure was designed as a tool to identify high-risk parents for physical abuse, and not other types of abuse.
3. It should be used only as one tool, and not as the sole predictor of abuse.
4. This measure is lengthy and takes considerable time to complete.
5. The items are face valid and many parents respond defensively. Although the validity scales help detect invalid response patterns, this still leaves the problem of having invalid...
Published References:

A PsychInfo literature search of the words "Child Abuse Potential Inventory" or "CAPI" (6/05) anywhere revealed that the measure has been referenced in 247 peer-reviewed journal articles. A sampling of these articles appears below.


Behavior Therapy, 11, 39-58.


Unpublished References:
A PsychInfo literature search (6/05) of the words "Child Abuse Potential Inventory" or "CAPI" anywhere that the measure has been referenced in 10 conferences, 45 dissertations, and 1 master's thesis (listed below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Published References:</th>
<th>247</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(based on author provided information and a PsychInfo search, not including dissertations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Unpublished References:</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(based on a PsychInfo search of unpublished doctoral dissertations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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