

Meta-Analyses of the Relationships Between the Adequacy of Family Resources and Personal,
Parenting, Family and Child Well-Being and Parenting Beliefs and Practices:
Supplemental Report

Carl J. Dunst, Ph.D.

Senior Research Scientist
Orelena Hawks Puckett Institute
Asheville, North Carolina

Email: cdunst@puckett.org
ORCID: 0000-0002-3857-9869

Copyright © 2021 by Carl J. Dunst

No part of this report, including the data tables and data contained in the tables, maybe
reproduced in any form or used without the permission of the author.

Suggested Citation:

Dunst, C. J. (2021). *Meta-analyses of the relationships between the adequacy of family resources and personal, parenting, family and child well-being and parenting beliefs and practices: Supplemental report*.
<https://www.puckett.org/FRS/MetaAnalyses/SupplementalReport.pdf>

1. Introduction

This supplemental report includes detailed information about the studies included in a series of completed and planned meta-analyses of the relationships between the adequacy of family resources and outcomes of interest to the primary study investigators. The primary study participants in the meta-analyses included caregivers (mothers, fathers, grandmothers, adoptive parents, etc.) of children birth to 18 years of age residing in the caregivers' households.

The relationships between family resources and outcomes of interest were found in 67 studies for 76 independent study samples. The studies that were the focus of syntheses used the *Family Resource Scale* to measure the adequacy of family resources. One of six different versions of the *Family Resource Scale* (see below) was used to measure the adequacy of family resources. The independent variables included the total scale scores or one or more *Family Resource Scale* subscale scores. The outcome measures included 10 different dimensions of psychological health and well-being (e.g., depression, family quality of life, child behavior) and 6 different dimensions of parenting (e.g., parenting beliefs, parenting practices).

Family resources include basic resources (food, shelter, etc.), health care (medical, dental, etc.), financial resources (money to pay bills, purchase necessities, etc.), child care (babysitting, respite care, etc.), time to be with family and friends (spouse or partner, children, etc.), social supports (someone to talk to, time to socialize, etc.), time for oneself (time to rest, sleep, stay in shape, etc.), expendable income (money for entertainment, travel, etc.), and other personal and family resources. The assessment and provision or mobilization of family resources is one component of a family system intervention model that focuses on the parent, family, and child resources, supports, and strengths associated with optimal parent, family, and child functioning (Dunst, 2017).

The supplemental report includes information about the scales used to measure the adequacy of family resources (Table 1); the characteristics of the studies and study participants (Tables 2 & 3); the scales used to measure personal health and well-being, parenting beliefs and practices, family well-being, and child well-being and functioning (Table 4); results from analyses completed to date (Tables 5, 6 & 7); and the effect sizes for the relationships between adequacy of family resources and the 17 different dependent measures in each of the study samples (Appendices A-1 to A-17). The correlations between different family resource scale measures (total scale scores, basic resources subscale scores, adequacy of time resources subscale scores, financial resources subscale scores, etc.) and the different well-being and parenting measures were used as the sizes of effects for ascertaining the relationships between the adequacy of family resources and the dependent measures.

2. Family Resource Scales

Adequacy of family resources was measured using different versions of the *Family Resource Scale* (Dunst & Leet, 1985, 1987). The original version of the scale includes 30 items assessing the adequacy of basic resources (food, house or apartment, utilities, etc.), financial resources (good job, money to buy necessities, money to pay monthly bills, etc.), time to be alone or engage in desired activities (exercise, staying in shape, etc.), time to spend with family and friends (e.g., time to socialize or talk to), health care (medical care for family members, dental care), childcare (babysitting, childcare), and the availability of expendable income (money for family entertainment, travel, vacation, etc.).

The conceptual foundations of the scale are based on contentions by Maslow (1943), Garbarino and Abramowitz (1992), and others (e.g., Hartman & Laird, 1983) that a lack of family resources influences the behavior of family members who devote time and energy to obtain resources to meet family-related needs. The lack of adequate family resources is also expected to have negative effects on personal and family well-being and interfere with engagement in other kinds of parent and family activities (e.g., Dunst, Leet, & Trivette, 1988; Staerkel & Spieker, 2006). In contrast, the availability of family resources is expected to have positive effects on personal, family, and child well-being and functioning and provide parents the time and energy to carry out parenting responsibilities (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Dunst et al., 1988).

There are at least 10 different versions of the *Family Resource Scale* (Almasri, Saleh, & Dunst, 2014; Crowley, 1995; Dunst & Leet, 1985; Dunst, Leet, Vance, & Cooper, 1986; Leet & Dunst, 1988; Ompad, Palamar, Krause,

Kapadia, & Halkitis, 2018; Palermo, Ispa, Carlo, & Streit, 2017; Patwardhan, Hurley, Lambert, & Ringle, 2019; M. J. Taylor, 1999; Van Horn, Bellis, & Snyder, 2001). Six of the 10 versions of the scale have been used in studies where variations in the adequacy of family resources have been related to variations in personal, parenting, family, and/or child well-being and functioning (Dunst & Leet, 1985; Leet & Dunst, 1988; Palermo et al., 2017; Patwardhan et al., 2019; M. J. Taylor, 1999; Van Horn et al., 2001). The Dunst and Leet (1985) and Leet and Dunst (1988) versions of the scale were used in 53 studies, the Van Horn et al. (2001) version of the scale was used in nine studies, and the other three versions of the scale were each used in one study.

Table 1 shows the items included on each version of the *Family Resource Scale* for the studies in the meta-analyses. The number of scale items varies between 17 (Palermo et al., 2017) and 31 (Leet & Dunst, 1988). The particular items eliminated from the original versions of the scale (Dunst & Leet, 1985; Leet & Dunst, 1988) were based on the psychometric analyses of the scale items except for Palermo et al. (2017) who included items assessing only the adequacy of financial resources. The majority of studies in the meta-analysis assessed the relationships based on the psychometric analyses of the scale items except for Palermo et al. (2017) who included items assessing only the adequacy of financial resources.

The different versions of the scale also differ in terms of the number of subscales based on factor analysis results. The number of subscales ranges between three (M. J. Taylor, 1999) and seven (Dunst & Leet, 1987). Two versions of the scale have four subscales (Patwardhan et al., 2019; Van Horn et al., 2001). The subscales that were most often the focus of investigation were basic resources (food, shelter, utilities, etc.), time availability (time for self, family, children, etc.), and financial resources (good job, medical care, paying monthly bills, etc.). Analysis at the subscale level was confounded by the fact that different investigators, for various reasons, included different numbers of scale items for assessing the adequacy of the same kind of subscale resources. Every effort was made to categorize the subscale scores in different studies according to the item content of the subscale measures for purposes of evaluating the relationships between different types of family resources and the study outcomes.

The different versions of the scale also differ in terms of the number of subscales based on factor analysis results. The number of subscales ranges between three (M. J. Taylor, 1999) and seven (Dunst & Leet, 1987). Two versions of the scale have four subscales (Patwardhan et al., 2019; Van Horn et al., 2001). The subscales that were most often the focus of investigation were basic resources (food, shelter, utilities, etc.), time availability (time for self, family, children, etc.), and financial resources (good job, medical care, paying monthly bills, etc.). Analysis at the subscale level was confounded by the fact that different investigators, for various reasons, included different numbers of scale items for assessing the adequacy of the same kind of subscale resources. Every effort was made to categorize the subscale scores in different studies according to the item content of the subscale measures for purposes of evaluating the relationships between different types of resources and the study outcomes.

A number of investigators “created” family resource scale measures by selecting items from the Dunst and Leet (1985) version of the scale that were intended to index constructs considered important predictors of outcomes of interest (Candelaria, O’Connell, & Teti, 2006; Coleman-Reed, 2016; S. Lee et al., 2017; Raikes & Thompson, 2005). In most cases, the item content of the scale items overlapped with subscale items reported in investigations of the psychometric properties of the *Family Resource Scale* (Dunst & Leet, 1987; Patwardhan et al., 2019; M. J. Taylor, 1999; Van Horn et al., 2001).

The meta-analyses of the relationships between the adequacy of family resources and the primary study outcomes include, but are not limited to, the strengths of the relationships for the following types of family resources effects:

1. The relationships between the total *Family Resource Scale* scores and personal, family, and child psychological health and well-being.
2. The relationships between the total *Family Resource Scale* scores and parenting beliefs and practices.
3. The relationships between different types of family resources (*Family Resource Scale* subscale scores) and psychological health and well-being.
4. The relationships between the total *Family Resource Scale* scores and parent-related and child-related stress.

Table 1						
<i>Scale Items Used to Measure the Adequacy of Family Resources in the Meta-Analyses Studies</i>						
Family Resource Scale Items	Family Resource Scales					
	Dunst & Leet (1985)	Leet & Dunst (1988)	Van Horn et al. (2001)	Taylor (1999)	Patwardhan et al. (2019)	Palermo et al. (2017)
Food for two meals a day	X	X	X	X	X	X
House or apartment	X	X	X	X	X	X
Money for necessities	X	X			X	X
Clothing for your family	X	X	X	X	X	X
Heating for your residence	X	X	X	X	X	X
Plumbing/running water	X	X	X	X	X	
Money to pay bills	X	X			X	X
Good job for yourself/partner	X	X	X	X		X
Medical care for your family	X	X		X	X	X
Public assistance	X	X		X	X	X
Dependable transportation	X	X		X	X	
Time to sleep/rest	X	X	X	X	X	
Furniture for your home	X	X	X	X	X	
Time for yourself	X	X	X	X	X	
Time to be with your family	X	X	X	X	X	
Time to be with your child(ren)	X	X	X	X	X	
Time for partner or friends	X					
Time to be with spouse/partner		X	X	X	X	
Time to be with friends		X				
Telephone/access to a phone	X	X	X	X	X	
Babysitting for your child(ren)	X	X		X	X	X
Childcare or daycare	X	X		X	X	X
Money for special equipment	X	X		X	X	X
Dental care	X	X		X	X	X
Someone to talk to	X	X	X	X	X	
Time to socialize	X	X	X	X	X	
Time to keep in shape/look good	X	X	X	X	X	
Toys for your child(ren)	X	X		X	X	
Money for yourself	X	X	X	X	X	X
Money for entertainment	X	X	X	X	X	X
Money to save	X	X	X	X	X	X
Money for travel/vacation	X	X	X	X	X	X
Number of Scale Items	30	31	20	28	29	17

3. Sources of Family Resource Scale Studies

The primary sources for locating *Family Resource Scale* studies were ProQuest Central, PsycNET, PubMed, ERIC, ProQuest Theses and Dissertations, and Google Scholar. The secondary sources were JSTOR, ResearchGate, and different open-access databases (e.g., Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, CORE, Directory of Open Access Journals). Google was used to locate research reports not found in any other sources.

Citation searches of titles and authors of each version of the *Family Resource Scale* manuscript were done to locate additional research reports (Dunst & Leet, 1985, 1987; Leet & Dunst, 1988; Palermo et al., 2017; Patwardhan et al., 2019; M. J. Taylor, 1999; Van Horn et al., 2001). These were supplemented by searches of the reference sections of

all papers describing or mentioning the *Family Resource Scale* or using the scale in a quantitative or qualitative research study including the studies in the meta-analysis.

Studies in the meta-analysis were ones where investigators reported the correlations between the *Family Resource Scale* measures (total scale scores or subscale scores, or both) and the outcomes of interest to the primary study investigators. This included studies where the correlations between the independent and dependent measures were missing at random. Correlations were considered missing at random when one or more outcomes of interest in the meta-analyses were included in a primary study but the relationship between family resources and those measures was not considered relevant to the primary study investigators for theoretical, conceptual, or other reasons. Correlations were considered not missing at random where the relationships between measures were reported as not significant or the correlation coefficients between measures were not included in the research reports. These papers were not included in the meta-analysis.

4. Meta-Analyses Protocol

The protocol for coding the information included in the meta-analyses included the following information and data:

1. The citation for each study and the year of the research report.
2. The sample size of the study participants.
3. The location of the study (country).
4. The type of research report (e.g., peer-reviewed journal article, dissertation).
5. The characteristics of the study participants' children (e.g., children with identified disabilities, children with chronic health conditions, children in low SES households).
6. The primary study participants (e.g., mothers, grandmothers, adolescents) and the percent of the total study sample.
7. The mean age of the study participants.
8. The mean years of formal education completed by the study participants.
9. The percent of study participants who were married, living with a partner, or cohabitating.
10. The gender of the study participants' children and percent who were female.
11. The mean age of the study participants' children.
12. The age range of the study participants' children.
13. The version of the *Family Resource Scale* (FRS) used to measure the adequacy of family resources and the number of scale or subscale items.
14. The particular scales used to measure personal well-being, parenting-related constructs, or child behavior and the citations for the dependent measures.
15. The correlation coefficients between each FRS measure and the dependent measures in each study.
16. The sample size for each FRS-dependent scale measure.

5. Study and Study Participant Characteristics

The study characteristics of the research reports in the meta-analysis were coded according to the study sample sizes, where the studies were conducted (country), the type of research report (e.g., peer-reviewed journal article, dissertation), and the study participants. Table 2 shows these characteristics for each of the samples of study participants. The smallest and largest sample sizes were 21 and 992 respectively. The sample sizes in Table 2 are those for the number of participants whose data were used for assessing the relationships between the family resource scale measures and the outcome measures in the primary research reports. In some cases, the sample sizes differ from those reported by the primary study investigators because the actual number of participants whose data were used in the data analysis differed from that in the participant sections of the research reports. In several studies, the number of participants for different outcome measures was not the same. The sample sizes used in the meta-analysis were for the smallest number of participants for which family resource-outcome measure relationships were reported.

Most studies ($N = 61$) were conducted in the USA. A half a dozen studies were conducted in five other countries (Brazil, Canada [$N = 2$], India, Portugal, and South Africa). All of the research reports were published in English except one (Ferreira, 2014). Searches for studies conducted in countries other than the USA found few investigations that used the *Family Resource Scale* for measuring the adequacy of family resources where family resources measures were related to different personal, parenting, family, or child outcomes.

The research reports included referred journal articles, dissertations, master's theses, honors theses, conference proceedings, and unpublished research reports. No limitation was placed on the type of research report included in the meta-analysis. Most of the unpublished research reports were located through searches of Google, ResearchGate, and JSTOR.

The research reports in the meta-analysis were limited to studies of parents or other caregivers (e.g., grandparents) raising children between birth and 18 years of age and adolescents residing in the family's households. There were three different groups of study participants: Parents rearing their children, grandparents raising their grandchildren, and adolescents. The children in the studies included children with identified developmental disabilities or delays (e.g., autism, mental disorders, hearing loss), children with medical conditions (e.g., sickle cell syndromes, neural tube defects, congenital Zika syndrome), children at-risk for poor outcomes (e.g., families living in poverty, children of adolescent mothers, children at-risk for neglect or abuse), and children without any identified risk conditions.

The research reports were quite uneven in terms of how much information investigators provided about the study participants and their children. For example, many investigators described the study participants as caregivers but never identified exactly who the caregivers were. Electronic searches of the research reports were done to determine, for example, if the caregivers were the parents of the children in the studies.

Table 3 includes selected information about the study participants and their children. The table includes for each sample the primary study participants (operationally defined as the largest percentage of study participants), the participants' ages, years of formal education completed, and marital status; and the ages and gender of the caregivers' children. The primary study participants in most studies were the mothers of children birth to 18 years of age. In half a dozen studies, it was determined that the study participants were most likely mothers based on information in the research reports. In all but one study (Anderson & Minke, 2007), the caregivers' relationships with the children were described separately as the biological, adoptive, stepparent, foster parent, or grandparent of the children. The *Others* column in Table 2 identifies the study participants when other caregivers were included in the study samples.

The mean ages of the study participants and the mean years of formal education in many cases needed to be estimated based on available information in the research reports. In those cases where marital status was reported, the percentages are those reported by the research report investigators. Participants who were living with a partner or cohabitating were included in the percentage of those considered married.

As was the case for the participant characteristics, the mean age and age range of the children in many cases were estimated based on available information in the research reports. It was best to think of the children as preschoolers, elementary age, or older adolescents for purposes of categorizing the children in the studies. Most of the children of the study participants were at-risk for different child conditions (e.g., children with disabilities or chronic medical conditions) or family conditions (e.g., low socioeconomic status or impoverished households).

The study and study participant characteristics were used as moderator variables in a number of the *Family Resource Scale* meta-analyses. A primary interest was whether child and family risk conditions moderated the size of effects for the relationships between the adequacy of family resources and personal, parent, family, and child behavior and functioning.

Study	N	Country	Source	Study Participants
Anderson & Minke (2007)	203	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children in elementary school
Armans (2014)	46	USA	Master's Thesis	Parents of children with developmental delays
Bachanas et al. (2001)	68	USA	Journal Article	Caregivers of children with and without HIV
Balakrishnan et al. (2011)	152	USA	Journal Article	Parents of low birthweight infants
Brody & Flor (1997) Sample 1	71	USA	Journal Article	Single mothers and their children
Brody & Flor (1997) Sample 2	85	USA	Journal Article	Single mothers and their children
Brody et al. (1999)	139	USA	Journal Article	Single mothers and their children
Brody et al. (2006)	172	USA	Journal Article	Parents and children at-risk for poor outcomes
Brown et al. (2000)	55	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with Sickle Cell Syndromes
Budescu et al. (2018)	115	USA	Journal Article	Parents and children in low-income families
Burrell et al. (1994)	53	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children at-risk for abuse
Candelaria et al. (2006)	103	USA	Journal Article	Parents of preterm infants
Chang & Fine (2007)	580	USA	Journal Article	Parents and children in Early Head Start (EHS) Programs
Cheesman (2011)	30	South Africa	Master's Thesis	Parents of children with ADHD or Autism
Coleman-Reed (2016)	94	USA	Dissertation	Grandparents raising grandchildren
Conrad-Hiebner et al. (2015)	133	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children at-risk for abuse or neglect
Dinehart et al. (2006)	56	USA	Journal Article	Caregivers of children prenatally exposed to cocaine
Dunst & Leet (1987)	45	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with disabilities or delays
Dunst et al. (1986)	21	USA	Journal Article	Adolescent mothers and their young children
Engelke (1991)	106	USA	Dissertation	Parents of children who were in NICUs
Ericson (1998)	94	USA	Master's Thesis	Parents of children with disabilities
Eshbaugh et al. (2006)	523	USA	Journal Article	Adolescent mothers and children in EHS Programs
Espeleta et al. (2019)	308	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children at-risk for child abuse
Farber et al. (2002)	73	USA	Research Report	Parents and children enrolled in Early Head Start Programs
Ferreira (2014)	43	Portugal	Master's Thesis	Parents of children with disabilities
Gatling (2005)	118	USA	Dissertation	Parents of children with short stature
Goodman et al. (2011)	492	USA	Journal Article	Parents of infants without disabilities or delays
Grunberg (2016)	199	USA	Master's Thesis	Parents of children who were in NICUs
Herman & Marcenko (1997)	150	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with disabilities
Hill (2010)	57	USA	Dissertation	Grandparents raising grandchildren
Hooper et al. (2009)	77	USA	Journal Article	Grandparents raising grandchildren
Johnson (2016)	36	USA	Dissertation	Parents and children in protective services programs
Kelley et al. (2000)	102	USA	Journal Article	Grandparents raising grandchildren
Kelley et al. (2011)	230	USA	Journal Article	Grandparents raising grandchildren
Kelley et al. (2013)	480	USA	Journal Article	Grandparents raising grandchildren
Kilmer et al. (2010)	100	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with emotional disturbances

Table 2, continued				
Study	N	Country	Source	Study Participants
Koroloff et al. (2001)	110	USA	Conference Proceedings	Parents of children with mental health needs
Lee et al. (2017)	90	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children without disabilities or delays
Levine (2010)	26	USA	Honors Thesis	Parents of children with Autism
Lindsey & Barry (2018)	157	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorders
Littlewood (2008)	175	USA	Dissertation	Caregivers of children in the child welfare system
Loutzenhiser (2001) Sample 1	23	Canada ^a	Dissertation	Parents and children in Head Start Programs
Loutzenhiser (2001) Sample 2	23	Canada ^a	Dissertation	Parents and children in Head Start Programs
Macias et al. (2007) Sample 1	71	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with neural tube defects
Macias et al. (2007) Sample 2	71	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with neural tube defects
Maupin et al. (2010)	151	USA	Journal Article	Parents and children in Early Head Start Programs
McWilliam (2005)	277	USA	Conference Abstract	Parents of children with disabilities and delays
Munsell et al. (2016)	99	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with emotional disturbances
Palermo et al. (2017)	714	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children in Early Head Start Programs
Paley et al. (2006)	100	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with fetal alcohol disorders
Palisano et al. (1993)	36	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with motor delays
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	300	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with behavioral problems
Persha & Rao (2002) Sample 1	51	India	Research Report	Parents of children with disabilities
Persha & Rao (2002) Sample 2	54	India	Research Report	Parents of children with disabilities
Pratt (1992)	503	USA	Dissertation	Parents of children with disabilities
Raikes & Thompson (2005)	65	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children in Early Head Start Programs
Ramos (2019)	31	USA	Honors Thesis	Parents of children with behavior difficulties
Ridings et al. (2018)	548	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children at-risk for abuse or neglect
Salzer (2005)	74	USA	Dissertation	Grandparents raising grandchildren
Seaton & Taylor (2003) Sample 1	164	USA	Journal Article	Parents and children living in impoverished neighborhoods
Seaton & Taylor (2003) Sample 2	164	USA	Journal Article	Adolescents and their parents living in impoverished areas
Smith et al. (2001)	880	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with disabilities
Sneyd (2005)	49	Canada	Master's Thesis	Parents of children with speech and language delays
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 1	70	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with intraventricular hemorrhage
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 2	45	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with neural tube defects
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 3	45	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with neural tube defects
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	992	USA	Research Report	Parents of children with disabilities
Taylor et al. (2014) Sample 1	200	USA	Journal Article	Parents of adolescents living in poverty
Taylor et al. (2014) Sample 2	200	USA	Journal Article	Adolescents and their parents living in poverty
Vohr et al. (n.d.)	100	USA	Research Report	Parents of children with hearing loss
Weigel et al. (2010)	85	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children without disabilities or delays
Whittaker et al. (2011)	114	USA	Journal Article	Parents and children living in poverty

Table 2, continued				
Study	N	Country	Source	Study Participants
Williams et al. (2019)	50	Brazil	Journal Article	Parents of children with Congenital Zika Syndrome
Wilson (2009)	151	USA	Master's Thesis	Parents of children at-risk for poor outcomes
Wohlfeiler et al. (2008) Sample 1	48	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with Myelomeningocele
Wohlfeiler et al. (2008) Sample 2	48	USA	Journal Article	Parents of children with Myelomeningocele
^a The dissertation was completed at the University of Saskatchewan but the data were collected on families in the United States.				

Table 3
Selected Characteristics of the Family Resource Scale Study Participants and Their Children

Study	Study Participants ^a			Participant Characteristics			Child Characteristics		
	Primary	Percent Primary	Other Participants	Mean Age (Years)	Mean Years of School	Percent Married ^b	Percent Female	Mean Age (Years)	Age Range (Years)
Anderson & Minke (2007)	M, SM	81	F, GP, FP	NR	14	NR	NR	8	4-10
Armans (2014)	M	72	F, SM, AP, GP	39	15	57	49	9	6-12
Bachanas et al. (2001)	M	54	F, GP, FP	NR	11	28	NR	10	6-16
Balakrishnan et al. (2011)	M	100	---	29	15	53	53	3 mo.	---
Brody & Flor (1997) Sample 1	M	100	---	28	11	0	54	8	5-12
Brody & Flor (1997) Sample 2	M	100	---	28	11	0	54	8	5-12
Brody et al. (1999)	M	100	---	NR	10	0	NR	8	6-9
Brody et al. (2006)	M	100	---	38	12	23	54	11	---
Brown et al. (2000)	M	80	F, GM, OR	NR	12	29	31	9	5-16
Budescru et al. (2018)	M ^c	NR	GM, OR	44	11	16	66	16	14-18
Burrell et al. (1994)	M	100	---	31	NR	69	46	3	<1-7
Candelaria et al. (2006)	M	100	---	27	13	46	56	1	---
Chang & Fine (2007)	AM	100	---	18	10	19	NR	14 mo.	NR
Cheesman (2011)	M	100	---	40	NR	80	63	9	6-18
Coleman-Reed (2016)	GM	94	GF	60	15	53	NR	10	1-18
Conrad-Hiebner et al. (2015)	M	87	F	33	9	71	NR	NR	NR
Dinehart et al. (2006)	M	41	F, GM, AP, FP, OR	42	11	NR	NR	1.5	1-3
Dunst & Leet (1987)	M	100	---	29	13	NR	NR	3	1-5
Dunst et al. (1986)	AM	100	---	17	9	29	NA	NA	NA
Engelke (1991)	M	100	---	26	13	57	46	6 mo.	---
Ericson (1998)	M ^c	100	---	31	13	76	NR	4	3-5
Eshbaugh et al. (2006)	AM	100	---	17	11	21	NR	1	<1-3
Espeleta et al. (2019)	M	100	---	29	10	81	NR	5	<1-10
Farber et al. (2002)	M	100	---	28	11	70	NR	2.5	---
Ferreira (2014)	M	84	F, OR	38	9	88	37	9	6-16
Gatling (2005)	M	100	---	41	16	86	NR	NR	NR
Goodman et al. (2011)	F	100	---	32	15	100	49	6 mo.	---
Grunberg (2016)	M	91	F	32	17	85	NR	2	<1-5
Herman & Marcenko (1997)	M	93	F	36	13	69	42	9	2-16

Study	Study Participants ^a			Participant Characteristics			Child Characteristics		
	Primary	Percent Primary	Other Participants	Mean Age (Years)	Mean Years of School	Percent Married ^b	Percent Female	Mean Age (Years)	Age Range (Years)
Johnson (2016)	M ^c	84	NR	30	NR	NR	NR	NR	<1-18
Hill (2010)	GM	93	GF, OR, OT	62	12	30	NR	8	<1-19
Hooper et al. (2009)	M	73	GP, OT	40	NR	NR	NR	13	10-15
Kelley et al. (2000)	GM	95	GGM	56	11	18	NR	9	<1-18
Kelley et al. (2011)	GM	96	GGM	56	11	19	47	8	2-16
Kelley et al. (2013)	GM	100	---	56	10	19	48	8	<2-16
Kilmer et al. (2010)	M ^c	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	30	11	4-17
Koroloff et al. (2001)	M	76	F, OR, OT	39	13	NR	NR	12	6-18
Lee et al. (2017)	F	58	M	45	16	100	NR	13	9-17
Levine (2010)	M ^c	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	15	2.5	2-3
Lindsey & Barry (2018)	M	74	F, OR	35	16	68	17	7	4-11
Littlewood (2008)	GM	71	OR	50	13	<10	NR	14	<1-18
Loutzenhiser (2001) Sample 1	M	100	---	NR	12	56	44	4	3-5
Loutzenhiser (2001) Sample 2	F	100	---	NR	12	56	44	4	3-5
Macias et al. (2007) Sample 1	M	93	GM, OR	39	NR	89	55	10	4-18
Macias et al. (2007) Sample 2	F	86	GF, OR	40	NR	89	55	10	4-18
Maupin et al. (2010)	M	100	---	23	10	36	49	2	1-3
McWilliam (2005)	M	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	6	<1-12
Munsell et al. (2016)	M ^c	99	NR	37	13	NR	30	10	4-17
Palermo et al. (2017)	M	100	---	24	10	52	47	2	2-3
Paley et al. (2006)	BP/AP	100	---	NR	16	62	49	9	6-12
Palisano et al. (1993)	M	100	---	30	14	NR	31	2	<1-3
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	M	91	F, OR	40	14	NR	32	11	7-15
Persha & Rao (2002) Sample 1	M	100	---	23	9	NR	61	1.5	---
Persha & Rao (2002) Sample 2	M	100	---	21	9	NR	54	1.5	---
Pratt (1992)	M	100	---	30	13	100	NR	2	<1-5
Raikes & Thompson (2005)	M	100	---	NR	12	NR	48	2	<1-3
Ramos (2019)	M	100	---	NR	16	NR	58	5	4-6
Ridings et al. (2018)	M	98	F	25	13	NR	NR	3	<1-5
Salzer (2005)	GM	95	GGM, SGM, OR	53	11	47	50	8	<1-18
Seaton & Taylor (2003) Sample 1	M	100	---	37	10	21	54	15	12-18
Seaton & Taylor (2003) Sample 2	AF	54	AM	15	10	NA	NA	NA	NA
Smith et al. (2001)	M	100	---	32	13	74	41	3	1-5
Sneyd (2005)	M	100	---	33	17	NR	31	3	1-4

Table 3, continued.									
Study	Study Participants ^a			Participant Characteristics			Child Characteristics		
	Primary	Percent Primary	Other Participants	Mean Age (Years)	Mean Years of School	Percent Married ^b	Percent Female	Mean Age (Years)	Age Range (Years)
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 1	M ^c	100	---	35	13	79	54	8	7-9
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 2	M	94	GM, OT	39	13	89	55	8	4-12
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 3	F	93	GF, OR	40	13	89	55	8	4-12
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	M	100	---	30	13	79	40	2	<1-5
Taylor et al. (2014) Sample 1	M	100	---	38	11	28	52	15	14-18
Taylor et al. (2014) Sample 2	AF	52	AM	15	10	NA	NR	NR	NR
Vohr et al. (n.d.)	M	100	---	32	15	83	35	8	6-10
Weigel et al. (2010)	M	94	F	34	17	NR	47	4	3-5
Whittaker et al. (2011)	M	100	---	26	12	16	50	2	<1-3
Williams et al. (2019)	M	92	F, GM	31	NR	NR	66	2	<1-3
Wilson (2009)	M	85	GP, OR	40	14	NR	NR	13	11-14
Wohlfeiler et al. (2008) Sample 1	M	96	GM, FM	39	NR	86	56	8	4-12
Wohlfeiler et al. (2008) Sample 2	F	90	GF	40	NR	86	56	8	4-12

^aM = Mother, F = Father, AP = Adoptive parent, SM = Stepmother, FM = Foster mother, BP = Biological parent (not specified), FP = Foster parent (not specified), AF = Adolescent female, AM = Adolescent male, GM = Grandmother, GF = Grandfather, GP = Grandparent (not specified), SGM = Stepgrandmother, GGM = Great grandmother, SGM = Step grandmother, OR = Other relatives (e.g., aunts, cousins), OT = Other nonrelatives, and NR = Not reported or could not be determined.

^bIncludes participants reported as living with a partner and cohabitating.

^cBased on available information in the research report, it was assumed that the primary participants were mothers of the children in the studies.

6. Study Outcome Measures

The outcome measures of interest in the meta-analysis were the participants' (1) personal, parenting, family, and child health and well-being and (2) parenting beliefs and practices of the study participants. These outcomes were the focus of investigation based on contentions that the adequacy of family resources would be related to both the well-being and functioning of the caregivers and their family members and caregivers' competencies for carrying out parenting roles and responsibilities (Dunst & Leet, 1987; Dunst et al., 1988; Dunst, Vance, & Cooper, 1986).

The 65 studies included 85 different scales, subscales, and investigator-developed or adapted outcome measures. The 85 measures were categorized according to four types of measures (personal health and well-being, parenting well-being and practices, family health and well-being, and child health and well-being). Table 4 shows the scales used by the investigators for measuring each of the different types of well-being and parenting measures. The table also shows the number of studies that included each of the scales as outcome measures. (being and practices, family health and well-being, and child health and well-being).

The categorization was first made based on the attributional targets of the scale items (Bugental, Johnston, New, & Silvester, 1998). The targets of the personal health and well-being measures were the study participants' judgments of his or her own physical or psychological health and functioning. The targets of the parenting measures were judgments of the parents' or caregivers' parenting beliefs or practices and investigator observations and ratings of parenting practices. The targets of the family health and well-being measures were the study participants' judgments of different dimensions of family functioning. The targets of the children's health and well-being measures were the study participants' judgments of child functioning.

Each of the categories of health and well-being measures was further categorized according to the type of functioning measure (except for the child health and well-being measures where each outcome measure assessed different dimensions of child behavior functioning). The instructions and item content of each outcome measure in the studies were examined to determine the behavior or judgments that were the focus of a participant's ratings for purposes of assigning a scale or measure of a particular dimension of health and well-being. For example, each of the scales assigned to general health functioning included items measuring different dimensions of psychological health and well-being (anxiety, stress, loneliness, etc.) whereas each of the scales categorized as physical health included items measuring only physical health symptoms.

The personal health and well-being measures included six constructs (general health functioning, physical health, depression, psychological stress, psychological well-being, & personal belief appraisals). The parenting measures included six constructs (parenting beliefs, parenting stress, caregiver burden, parent and child engagement, parenting practices, & parent-child interactions). The family measures included three constructs (family stress, family routines, & family functioning). The child behavior functioning measures all assessed different types of child behavior problems or prosocial behavior.

All of the well-being and parenting measures except two types of parenting practices (parent and child engagement and parent-child interactions) were self-report scales where study participants made judgments about their own behavior or those of their family and children. The parent and child engagement and parent-child interaction measures included observational assessments and ratings of parenting practices made by the study investigators or their research staff. Any measure of parent, family, or child behavior functioning made by persons other than the study participants or the study investigators were not included in the meta-analysis (e.g., the children's teachers or childcare staff).

In a number of cases, primary investigators reported the correlations between family resources and health and well-being subscale scores or item scores. The average correlations for the subscales or items that assessed outcomes of interest were averaged to obtain the best estimates of different dimensions of personal, parenting, family, or child well-being.

Table 4		
<i>Scales and Instruments Used to Measure Personal, Parenting, Family, and Child Well-Being in the Family Resource Scale Studies</i>		
Scales	Sources	# Studies
Personal Psychological Health and Functioning Measures		
General Health Functioning		
Brief Symptom Inventory	Derogatis and Melisaratos (1983)	7
Depression Anxiety Stress Scale	Lovibond and Lovibod (1995)	1
General Health Survey-SF36 (IA)	Ware et al. (1993)	1
General Health Survey-SF12	Ware et al. (1996)	1
Health & Well-Being Index	Dunst (1986)	1
Questionnaire on Resources and Stress	Holroyd (1974, 1987)	1
Symptom Checklist-90R	Derogatis (1992)	1
Physical Health		
GHS-SF36 Physical Health Subscale	Ware et al. (1993)	2
GHS-SF12 Physical Health Subscale	Ware et al. (1996)	1
Physical Symptom Checklist (IA)	Larsen and Kasimatis (1991)	1
Depression		
CES-Depression Scale	Radloff (1977)	15
Beck Depression Inventory	Beck et al. (1961)	5
QRS-SF Depression Subscale	Friedrich et al. (1983)	1
Physical Symptom		1
GHS-SF12 Mental Health Subscale	Ware et al. (1996)	1
Perceived Stress Scale	Cohen et al. (1983)	1
Perceived Stress Index (ID)	Johnson (2016)	1
Beck Anxiety Inventory	Beck et al. (1988)	1
Life Satisfaction		
Life Orientation Test	Scheier and Carver (1985)	3
Psychological Well-Being Index	Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965)	1
Positive and Negative Affect Scale	Watson et al. (1988)	1
Satisfaction with Life Scale	Diener et al. (1985)	1
WHO Quality of Life Scale	World Health Organization (1996)	1
Personal Belief Appraisals		
Pearlin Self-Efficacy Scale	Pearlin and Schooler (1978)	3
Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale	Rosenberg (1965)	2
MSRI Self Esteem Scale (IA)	Persha and Rao (2002)	2
Family Empowerment Scale	Koren et al. (1992)	1
Hoover-Dempsey Self-Efficacy Scale	Hoover-Dempsey et al. (1992)	1
Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale	Nowicki and Duke (1974)	1
Parent Well-Being and Parenting Measures		
Parenting Beliefs		
Parenting Sense of Competence Scale	Johnston and Mash (1989)	2
Parenting Attitudes Toward Child Rearing	Easterbrooks and Goldberg (1984)	2
Maternal Beliefs Rating Scale (ID)	Persha and Rao (2003)	2
Taylor Parental Locus of Control Scale (IA)	Engelke (1991)	1
Parenting Efficacy Scale	Duke et al. (1996)	1
Parenting Role Construction Scale	Sheldon (2002)	1
Commitment to Caregiving Scale (ID)	Dunst et al. (1986)	1
Parenting Time Allocation Scale	Dunst and Trivette (1986)	1
Parenting Stress		
Parenting Stress Index-SF	Abidin (1990, 1995, 2012)	18
Parenting Stress Index	Abidin (1983, 2017)	5
Stress Index for Parents of Adolescents	Sheras et al. (1998)	1

Table 4, continued		
Scales	Sources	# Studies
Parent Well-Being and Parenting Measures, continued		
Caregiver Burden		
Caregiver Strain Questionnaire	Brannan et al. (1997)	3
Impact on Family Scale	Stein & Riessman (1980); Stein and Jessop (2003)	3
Parenting Daily Hassles Scale	Crnic and Greenberg (1990)	2
Caregiver Strain Index	Luescher et al. (1999)	2
Caregiver Strain Index	Robinson (1983)	1
Parent and Child Engagement		
Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment (HOME)	Caldwell and Bradley (1984, 2003)	6
HOME-Short Form	Sugland et al. (1995)	1
Children's Engagement Questionnaire	R.A. McWilliam (1991)	1
Parent Involvement at Home Scale (ID)	Anderson and Minke (2007)	1
Parent and Child Activities Scale (ID)	Weigel et al. (2010)	1
Parenting Practices		
PSI Parent-Child Interaction Subscale	Abidin (1990, 1995, 2012)	6
Parenting Scale	Arnold et al. (1993)	1
PFS Nurturing & Attachment Subscale	Counts et al. (2010)	1
PWS Nurturing Caregiving Subscale (IA)	Wyman et al. (1999)	1
PSI Parent Competence Subscale	Abidin (1983)	1
Interactive Behavior Questionnaire	Prinz et al. (1979)	1
Parent-Child Interactions		
Mother-Child Relationship Quality Scale (ID)	Brody and Flor (1997)	2
Three Bag Play Interaction Tasks	Love et al. (2005)	2
HOME Parental Responsiveness Subscale	Caldwell and Bradley (1984)	2
Nursing Child Assessment Teaching Scale	Barnard (1978)	1
Vigilant Parenting Practices (ID)	Brody et al. (2006)	1
Family Well-Being and Functioning Measures		
Family Stress		
Life Experiences Survey	Sarason et al. (1978)	3
Family Inventory of Life Events Scale	McCubbin and Patterson (1991)	2
Life Events Questionnaire (ID)	Persha and Rao (2002)	2
Life Events Inventory (IA)	Garmezy and Tellegen (1984)	2
Daily Hassles Scale	Kanner et al. (1981)	1
Life Events Checklist	Kilmer et al. (1988)	1
Stressful Life Events Scale (IA)	Chang and Fine (2007)	1
Family Routines		
Family Routines Inventory	Jensen et al. (1983)	6
Family Functioning		
Family Environment Scale	Moos and Moos (1994)	6
Family Assessment Device	Miller et al. (1985)	3
Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale	Olson et al. (1985)	2
Protective Factors Survey	Counts et al. (2010)	1
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	Busby et al. (1995); Spanier (1976)	2
DMQS Relationship Instability Subscale	Johnson et al. (1986)	1
PFS Family Functioning Subscale	Counts et al. (2010)	1
Conflict Tactics Scale	Straus et al. (1996)	1
Family Quality of Life		
Family Functioning Style Scale	Deal et al. (2009)	4
Beach Center Family Quality of Life Scale	Hoffman et al. (2006)	1

Table 4, continued		
Scales	Sources	# Studies
Child Behavior and Well-Being Measures		
Child Behavior Functioning		
Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL)	Achenbach (1991, 1992, 1999)	10
Behavior and Emotional Rating Scale	Epstein (2004)	2
Behavior Assessment System for Children	Reynolds and Kamphaus (2015)	3
Connors Behavior Rating Scale	Connors (1997)	2
Adolescent Problem Behavior Scale	Gold and Reimer (1975)	2
Child Problem Behavior Scale	Peterson and Zill (1986)	2
BITSEA Problem Behavior Subscale	Briggs-Gowan and Carter (2007)	1
NOTES. ID = Investigator adapted measure, ID = Investigator developed measure, GHS = General Health Survey, CES = Center for Epidemiological Studies, QRS = Questionnaire on Resources and Stress, PSI = Parenting Stress Index, PFS = Protective Factors Survey, PWS = Parental Warmth Scale, DMQS = Dimensions of Marital Quality Scale, and BITSEA = Brief Infant-Toddler Social and Emotional Assessment.		

7. Effect Size Tables

Appendices A-1 to A-16 include the effect size data that were used to meta-analyze the relationships between adequacy of family resources and the 16 different dimensions of personal, parenting, family, and child well-being and functioning shown in Table 4. Each table for each dimension includes the (a) version of the *Family Resource Scale* used to measure family resources, (b) scale or subscale adequacy of family resources measures, (c) number of scale items included in the total scale score or subscale scores, (d) scales used to measure well-being and functioning, (e) outcome measures for the different dimensions of well-being and functioning, (f) size of effect (correlation coefficient) for the relationships between the adequacy of family resources and the outcome measures, and (g) sample size for those relationships.

The data tables include the effect sizes for the relationships between the total family resource scale scores, subscale scores, and the different dimensions of personal, parenting, family, and child behavior and functioning. Analyses at the subscale level were done to illuminate any differential relationships between the adequacy of family resources and the study outcomes where indicated. Subscale analyses were also done for those outcome measures where different dimensions of the same construct are typically the focus of investigation (e.g., Abidin, 1997; Achenbach & Ruffle, 2000). The direction of the correlation coefficients was reversed where higher scores on the outcome measures indicated poorer functioning so that all personal, parenting, family, and child scores can be interpreted as positive functioning.

Investigators in some studies reported only the relationships between family resource subscale scores and the study outcome measures. In those studies, the effect sizes for relationships between total family resource scale scores and the study outcomes were estimated by the average correlation between the subscale scores and the study outcomes. This was done only in studies where three or more subscale scores were used to measure the adequacy of family resources.

8. Methods of Analysis

Meta-Essentials was used to conduct the meta-analysis (Suurmond, van Rhee, & Hak, 2017; Van Rhee, Suurmond, & Hak, 2015). The input for each family resource scale measure and outcome measure was the correlation coefficient for the relationship between the independent and dependent measures and the sample size for the measures. The correlations were converted to the Fisher-transformed statistic and transferred back to correlation coefficients for reporting purposes.

The main focus of analysis in each meta-analysis was the average size of effect for the relationship between the total family resource scale (FRS) scores or the FRS subscale scores and each of the 16 different outcome measures. These analyses include the number of effect sizes and total sample size for the average size of effect, the 95% confidence interval for the average size of effect, the *Z*-test for testing whether and how much the average size of effect differs from zero, and the *p*-value for the *Z*-test. The data analysis program also includes options for testing for publication bias, between-group comparisons, and moderator effects.

9. Results

Two meta-analyses have been completed to date for the relationships between the total FRS scores and the well-being and parenting measures. One meta-analysis includes the results for the relationships between the adequacy of family resources and personal, family, and child well-being. The other meta-analysis includes the results for the relationships between the adequacy of family resources and parenting beliefs and practices. A third meta-analysis includes the results for the relationships between the adequacy of three different types of family resources (basic resources, financial resources, and time availability) and the study participants' psychological health and well-being. Planned analyses include the analysis of the relationships between different types of family resources (financial, basic, time availability, etc.) and different dimensions of well-being (e.g., parent-related stress vs. child-related stress).

Family Resources and Personal, Family and Child Well-Being

The *Meta-Analysis of the Relationships Between the Adequacy of Family Resources and Personal, Family, and Child Well-Being* includes an evaluation of the relationships between the adequacy of family resources and eight dimensions of personal, family, and child well-being (e.g., depression, parenting stress, family quality of life, child functioning). Adequacy of family resources was expected to be related to enhanced positive well-being and attenuated negative well-being. Studies were eligible for inclusion if the *Family Resource Scale* was used to measure family resources, the total scale score was used to index the adequacy of family resources, one or more personal, family, or child well-being measures was used to assess psychological functioning, and the correlations between the adequacy of family resources and well-being were reported.

Forty-four research reports met the inclusion criteria and included 50 independent samples of study participants ($N = 8183$). The studies were conducted between 1986 and 2019. Table 5 shows the average sizes of effects between the total FRS scale scores and each type of well-being. Results showed that adequacy of family resources was

Well-Being Measures	k	N	r	95% CI	Z-Test	p-value
Personal Well-Being	54	8900	.41	.37, .44	21.81	.000
General Psychological Health	13	1429	.41	.33, .48	9.96	.000
Depression	14	2837	.37	.30, .44	10.00	.000
Psychological Stress	3	204	.45	.26, .61	9.39	.000
Life Satisfaction	4	260	.47	.15, .72	4.43	.000
Parenting Stress	20	4170	.42	.37, .47	15.66	.000
Family Well-Being	20	3000	.37	.31, .42	12.88	.000
Family Stress	10	2495	.35	.26, .43	8.43	.000
Family Functioning	5	190	.35	.19, .48	5.94	.000
Family Quality of life	5	315	.46	.38, .53	14.97	.000
Child Well-Being	6	566	.35	.22, .46	6.89	.000
Child Behavior Functioning	6	566	.35	.22, .46	6.89	.000

NOTES. k = Number of studies, N = Number of study participants, *r* = Average, weighted effect size, and CI = Confidence interval.

positively related to all eight personal, family, and child well-being measures. These findings provide support for the contention that the adequacy of family resources is related to enhanced positive and attenuated negative well-being. There were no differences in the strength of the relationships between family resources and the different dimensions of well-being and neither child risk condition nor the number of family resource scale items moderated the relationships between family resources and well-being. The results are consistent with the basic tenets of different family systems models.

Family Resources and Parenting Beliefs and Practices

The *Meta-Analysis of the Relationships Between the Adequacy of Family Resources and Parenting Beliefs and Practices* includes an evaluation of the relationships between the adequacy of family resources and four parenting measures (beliefs, burden, engagement, and practices). Adequacy of family resources was hypothesized to be positively related to parenting beliefs, engagement, and practices and negatively related to parenting burden. Studies were eligible for inclusion if the *Family Resource Scale* was used to measure family resources, the total scale score was used to index the adequacy of family resources, one or more parenting belief or practices measures were used as outcome measures, and the correlations between the adequacy of family resources and the parenting measures were reported.

Twenty-eight studies met the inclusion criteria and included 30 independent samples of study participants (N = 5247). The studies were conducted between 1986 and 2019. Table 6 shows the average sizes of effects between the total FRS scores and the four parenting measures. Results showed that the adequacy of family resources was related to each of the four parenting measures as hypothesized and that child risk condition (children with identified conditions [disabilities or medical] vs. children with no identified conditions) and the number of items for computing a total family resource scale score moderated the strength of the relationships between family resources and parenting beliefs and practices. The findings are consistent with the contention that the adequacy of family resources provides parents and other primary caregivers the time to carry out parenting responsibilities in a competent manner.

Parenting Measures	k	N	r	95% CI	Z-Test	p-value
All Parenting Measures Combined	44	6754	.28	.24, .32	13.44	.000
Parenting Beliefs	11	1039	.24	.12, .35	4.35	.000
Parenting Burden	8	1102	.33	.24, .42	7.74	.000
Parent Engagement	11	1319	.27	.18, .36	6.28	.000
Parenting Practices	14	3294	.29	.23, .35	9.33	.000

NOTES. k = Number of studies, N = Number of study participants, r = Average, weighted effect size, and CI = Confidence interval.

Types of Family Resources and Psychological Health and Well-Being

The meta-analysis of the *Differential Effects of Different Types of Family Resources on Psychological Health and Well-Being* focused on the relationships between different types of family resources (basic resources, financial resources, time availability) and the study participants' psychological functioning in 14 study samples (N = 2,980 participants). The studies were conducted between 1986 and 2018. The focus of analysis included the sizes of effects between each type of family resource and the outcome measures and whether the sizes of effects between each type of family resource and health and well-being were the same or different.

Table 7 shows the results for each type of family resource. Each type of family resource was significantly related to the study participants' psychological health and well-being. There was, however, a significant between the types of family resource comparison. The size of effect for the relationship between time adequacy and the outcome

measures was larger than the sizes of effects between the other two types of family resources and the study outcomes.

Family Resources	k	N	r	95% CI	Z-Test	p-value
All Measures Combined	33	6309	.35	.23, .47	11.70	.000
Basic Resources	8	1449	.29	.17, .40	5.39	.000
Financial Resources	16	3270	.32	.25, .37	10.46	.000
Time Availability	9	1590	.49	.34, .61	6.76	.000

NOTES. k = Number of studies, N = Total number of study participants, r = Average, weighted effect size, and CI = Confidence interval.

A comparison of the sizes of effect for the three types of family resources with the effect size for the total scale score (Table 5) indicated that the time availability size of effect was larger than for the total scale score and that the sizes of effect for basic and financial resources were smaller than that for the total scale score. The pattern of results suggests that a total family resource scale score may mask the importance of specific types of resources in households with children and adolescents at-risk for poor outcomes.

10. Next Steps

Two additional meta-analyses are in the process of being completed to further explore the relationships between the adequacy of family resources and the primary study outcomes. The first is the relationship between the total *Family Resource Scale* scores and the two main subscale scores on the *Parenting Stress Index* (parental distress subscale and child-related stress subscale). The second is the relationship between the total *Family Resource Scale* scores and the two main subscale scores on the *Child Behavior Checklist* (internalizing problems and externalizing problems). The results are expected to shed light on any differential effects of the adequacy of family resources on parenting and child behavior.

11. References

- Abidin, R. R. (1983). *Parenting Stress Index* (1st ed.). Pediatric Psychology Press.
- Abidin, R. R. (1990). *Parenting Stress Index: Short Form*. Pediatric Psychology Press.
- Abidin, R. R. (1995). *Parenting Stress Index: Short Form*. Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Abidin, R. R. (1997). Parenting Stress Index: A measure of the parent-child system. In C. P. Zalaquett & J. Wood (Eds.), *Evaluating stress: A book of resources* (pp. 277-291). Scarecrow Education.
- Abidin, R. R. (2012). *Parenting Stress Index: Short form* (4th Ed.). Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Achenbach, T. M. (1991). *Manual for the Child Behavior Checklist/4-18 and 1991 Profile*. University of Vermont, Department of Psychiatry.
- Achenbach, T. M. (1992). *Manual for the Child Behavior Checklist/2-3 and 1992 Profile*. University of Vermont, Department of Psychiatry.
- Achenbach, T. M. (1999). The Child Behavior Checklist and related instruments. In M. E. Maruish (Ed.), *The use of psychological testing for treatment and planning and outcome assessment* (pp. 429-466). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Achenbach, T. M., & Ruffle, T. M. (2000). The Child Behavior Checklist and related forms for assessing behavioral/emotional problems and competencies. *Pediatrics in Review*, 21(1), 265-271. <https://doi.org/210.1542/pir.1521-1548-1265>.
- Almasri, N., Saleh, M., & Dunst, C. J. (2014). Family resources for families of children with cerebral palsy in Jordan: Psychometric properties of the Arabic Family Resources Scale. *Child, Care, Health, and Development*, 40, 354-362. <https://doi.org/310.1111/cch.12087>.
- Anderson, K. J., & Minke, K. (2007). Parent involvement in education: Toward an understanding of parents' decision making. *Journal of Educational Research*, 100(5), 311-323. <https://doi.org/310.3200/JOER.3100.3205.3311-3323>.

- Armans, M. (2014). *Examining the effects of parenting support on discipline strategies and the mediating roles of parenting stress and parental efficacy in American Indian families*. [Master's thesis, Oklahoma State University]. <https://hdl.handle.net/11244/317756>.
- Arnold, D. S., O'Leary, S. G., Wolff, L. S., & Acker, M. M. (1993). The Parenting Scale: A measure of dysfunctional parenting in discipline situations. *Psychological Assessment, 5*, 137-144. <https://doi.org/110.1037/1040-3590.1035.1032.1137>.
- Bachanas, P. J., Kullgren, K. A., Schwartz, K. S., McDaniel, J. S., Smith, J., & Nesheim, S. (2001). Psychological adjustment in caregivers of school-age children infected with HIV: Stress, coping, and family factors. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 26*, 331-342. <https://doi.org/310.1093/jpepsy/1026.1096.1331>
- Balakrishnan, A., Stephens, B. E., Burke, R. T., Yatchmink, Y., Alksninis, B. L., Tucker, R., . . . Vohr, B. R. (2011). Impact of very low birth weight infants on the family at 3 months corrected age. *Early Human Development, 87*, 31-35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2010.1009.1374>.
- Barnard, K. E. (1978). *Nursing Child Assessment Teaching Scale*. School of Nursing, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- Beck, A. T., Epstein, N. B., Brown, G. K., & Steer, R. A. (1988). An inventory for measuring clinical anxiety: Psychometric properties. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*(6), 893-897. <https://doi.org/810.1037/0022-1006X.1056.1036.1893>.
- Beck, A. T., Ward, C. H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 4*, 561-571. <https://doi.org/510.1001/archpsyc.1961.01710120031004>.
- Bradburn, N. M., & Caplovitz, D. (1965). *Reports on happiness: A pilot study of behavior related to mental health*. Adline Publishing.
- Brannan, A. M., Heflinger, C. A., & Bickman, L. (1997). The Caregiver Strain Questionnaire: Measuring the impact on the family living with a child with serious emotional disturbances. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 5*(4), 212-222. <https://doi.org/210.1177/106342669700500404>.
- Briggs-Gowan, M. J., & Carter, A. S. (2007). Applying the Infant-Toddler Social and Emotional Assessment (ITSEA) and Brief-ITSEA in early intervention. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 28*, 564-583. <https://doi.org/510.1002/imhj.20154>.
- Brody, G. H., & Flor, D. L. (1997). Maternal psychological functioning, family processes, and child adjustment in rural, single-parent African American families. *Developmental Psychology, 33*(6), 1000-1011. <https://doi.org/1010.1037/0012-1649.1033.1006.1000>.
- Brody, G. H., Flor, D. L., & Gibson, N. M. (1999). Linking maternal efficacy beliefs, developmental goals, parenting practices, and child competence in rural single-parent African American families. *Child Development, 70*, 1197-1208. <https://doi.org/1110.1111/1467-8624.00087>.
- Brody, G. H., Murry, V. M., Chen, Y.-F., Kogan, S. M., & Brown, A. C. (2006). Effects of family risk factors on dosage and efficacy of a family-centered preventive intervention for rural African Americans. *Prevention Science, 7*, 281-291. <https://doi.org/210.1007/s11121-11066-10032-11127>.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- Brown, R. T., Lambert, R., Devine, D., Baldwin, K., Casey, R., Doepke, K., . . . Eckman, J. (2000). Risk-resistance adaptation model for caregivers and their children with sickle cell syndromes. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 22*, 158-169. <https://doi.org/110.1007/BF02895780>.
- Budescu, M., Sisselman-Borgia, A., & Taylor, R. D. (2018). Perceptions of adequate personal time and wellbeing among African American families and adolescents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 27*, 1763-1773. <https://doi.org/1710.1007/s10826-10018-11014-10827>.
- Bugental, D. B., Johnston, C., New, M., & Silvester, J. (1998). Measuring parental attributions: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Journal of Family Psychology, 12*, 459-480. <https://doi.org/410.1037/0893-3200.1012.1034.1459>.
- Burrell, B., Thompson, B., & Sexton, D. (1994). Predicting child abuse potential across family types. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 18*, 1039-1049. [https://doi.org/1010.1016/0145-2134\(1094\)90130-90139](https://doi.org/1010.1016/0145-2134(1094)90130-90139).
- Busby, D. M., Christensen, C., Crane, D. R., & Larson, J. H. (1995). A revision of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale for use with distressed and nondistressed couples: Construct hierarchy and multidimensional scales. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy, 21*(3), 289-308. <https://doi.org/210.1111/j.1752-0606.1995.tb00163.x>.
- Caldwell, B. M., & Bradley, R. H. (1984). *Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment*. University of Arkansas at Little Rock.
- Caldwell, B. M., & Bradley, R. H. (2003). *Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment Infant/Toddler Version*. University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

- Candelaria, M. A., O'Connell, M. A., & Teti, D. M. (2006). Cumulative psychosocial and medical risk as predictors of early infant development and parenting stress in an African-American preterm sample. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 27*, 588-597. <https://doi.org/510.1016/j.appdev.2006.1008.1006>.
- Chang, Y., & Fine, M. A. (2007). Modeling parenting stress trajectories among low-income young mothers across the child's second and third years: Factors accounting for stability and change. *Journal of Family Psychology, 21*, 584-594. <https://doi.org/510.1037/0893-3200.1021.1034.1584>.
- Cheesman, J. (2009). *Raising an ADHD child: Relations between parental stress, child functional impairment, and subtype of the disorder*. [Honors Thesis, University of Cape Town]. https://open.uct.ac.za/bitstream/handle/11427/10245/thesis_hum_2011_cheesman_j.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.
- Cohen, S. H., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24*(4), 385-396. <https://doi.org/310.2307/2136404>.
- Coleman-Reed, F. V. (2016). *Grandparent caregivers: Factors contributing to their experience of life satisfaction*. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alabama]. https://ir.ua.edu/bitstream/handle/123456789/2801/file_1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.
- Connors, C. K. (1997). *Connor's Parent Rating Scale: Revised*. Multi-Health Systems, Inc.
- Conrad-Hiebner, A., Schoemann, A. M., Counts, J. M., & Chang, K. (2015). The development and validation of the Spanish adaptation of the Protective Factors Survey. *Children and Youth Services Review, 52*, 45-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.1003.1006>.
- Counts, J. M., Buffington, E. S., Chang-Rios, K., Rasmussen, H. N., & Preacher, K. J. (2010). The development and validation of the Protective Factors Survey: A self-report measure of protective factors against child maltreatment. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 34*, 762-772. <https://doi.org/710.1016/j.chiabu.2010.1003.1003>.
- Crnicek, K. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (1990). Minor parenting stresses with young children. *Child Development, 61*, 1628-1637. <https://doi.org/1610.2307/1130770>.
- Crowley, S. L. (1995). *Family functioning in families of children with disabilities: An intensive psychometric investigation of five family measures*. ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED381917. <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=%22family+functioning+in+families+of+children+with+disabilities%22&id=ED381917>.
- Deal, A. G., Trivette, C. M., & Dunst, C. J. (2009). *Family Functioning Style Scale: An instrument for measuring strengths and resources*. Winterberry Press.
- Derogatis, L. R. (1992). *SCL-90-R: Administration, scoring, and procedures manual-II for the Revised Rating Scale* (2nd ed.). Clinical Psychometric Research.
- Derogatis, L. R., & Melisaratos, N. (1983). The Brief Symptom Inventory: An introductory report. *Psychological Medicine, 13*(3), 595-605. <https://doi.org/510.1017/S0033291700048017>.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71-75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa15324901_15327713.
- Dinehart, L. H. B., Dice, J. L., Dobbins, D. R., Claussen, A. H., & Bono, K. E. (2006). Proximal variables in families of children prenatally exposed to cocaine and enrolled in a center- or home-based intervention. *Journal of Early Intervention, 29*, 32-46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105381510602900103>.
- Duke, H. P., Allen, K. A., & Halverson, C. F. (1996). *A new scale for measuring parents' feelings of confidence and competence: The Parenting Self-Efficacy Scale*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Georgia, Athens.
- Dunst, C. J. (1986). *Health and Well-Being Index: A short form for measuring parental health and well-being*. Winterberry Press.
- Dunst, C. J. (2017). Family systems early childhood intervention. In H. Sukkar, C. J. Dunst, & J. Kirkby (Eds.), *Early childhood intervention: Working with families of young children with special needs* (pp. 38-60). Routledge.
- Dunst, C. J., & Leet, H. E. (1985). *Family Resource Scale: Reliability and validity*. Winterberry Press.
- Dunst, C. J., & Leet, H. E. (1987). Measuring the adequacy of resources in households with young children. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 13*, 111-125. <https://doi.org/110.1111/j.1365-2214.1987.tb00528.x>.
- Dunst, C. J., Leet, H. E., & Trivette, C. M. (1988). Family resources, personal well-being, and early intervention. *Journal of Special Education, 22*, 108-116. <https://doi.org/110.1177/002246698802200112>.
- Dunst, C. J., Leet, H. E., Vance, S. D., & Cooper, C. S. (1986). *Resource Scale for Teenage Mothers*. Winterberry Press.
- Dunst, C. J., & Trivette, C. M. (1986). *Personal time commitment scale: Reliability and validity*. Winterberry Press.
- Dunst, C. J., Vance, S. D., & Cooper, C. S. (1986). A social systems perspective of adolescent pregnancy: Determinants of parent and parent-child behavior. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 7*, 34-48.

- [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0355\(198621\)198627:198621<198634::AID-IMHJ2280070105>2280070103.2280070100.CO;2280070102-B](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0355(198621)198627:198621<198634::AID-IMHJ2280070105>2280070103.2280070100.CO;2280070102-B).
- Easterbrooks, M. A., & Goldberg, W. A. (1984). Toddler development in the family: Impact of father involvement and parenting characteristics. *Child Development, 55*, 740-752. <https://doi.org/710.2307/1130126>.
- Engelke, M. K. (1991). *Maternal competence in mothers of high risk infants*. (Publication No. 9123352) [Doctoral Dissertation, North Carolina State University]. ProQuest Theses and Dissertations Global.
- Epstein, M. H. (2004). *BERS-2: Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale: Examiner's manual* (2nd ed.). PRO-ED.
- Ericson, K. J. (1998). Predicting family strengths in families caring for children with disabilities [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nebraska]. *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations, 2576*. <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2576>
- Eshbaugh, E. M., Lempers, J., & Luze, G. J. (2006). Objective and self-perceived resources as predictors of depression among urban and non-urban adolescent mothers. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 35*, 839-847. <https://doi.org/810.1007/s10964-10006-19108-10968>.
- Espeleta, H. C., Beasley, L., Bohora, S., Ridings, L. E., & Silovsky, J. F. (2019). Depression in Latina mothers: Examining the roles of acculturation, enculturation, social support, and family resources. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 25*(2), 527-538. <https://doi.org/510.1037/cdp0000259>.
- Farber, M. L. Z., Timberlake, E. M., Wall, S. M., & Taylor, N. E. (2002). Early Head Start intervention with families and families' investment in children. In A. f. C. a. F. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Planning Research and Evaluation (Ed.), *Making a difference in the lives of infants and toddlers and their families: The impacts of Early Head Start: Vol. 3. Local contributions to understanding the programs and their impacts* (pp. 35-54). Editor. https://www.google.com/books/edition/Early_Head_Start_Research_Making_a_Diffe/5SrIwQxuHwAC?hl=en&gbpv=1&dq=farber+%22early+head+start+intervention%22&pg=PA35&printsec=frontcover.
- Ferreira, D. S. A. (2014). *Qualidade de vida familiar e sua relacao com o suporte social: Percecoes dos cuidadores de criancas com incpacidade [Quality of family life and its relationship with social support: Perceptions of caregivers of children with disabilities]*. https://recipp.ipp.pt/bitstream/10400.22/6757/1/DM_DianaFerreira_2014.pdf.
- Friedrich, W. N., Greenberg, M. T., & Crnic, K. (1983). A short form of the Questionnaire on Resources and Stress. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 88*, 41-48.
- Garbarino, J., & Abramowitz, R. (1992). The ecology of human development. In J. Garbarino (Ed.), *Children and families in the social environment* (2nd ed., pp. 11-33). Aldine de Gruyter.
- Garnezy, N., & Tellegen, A. (1984). Studies of stress-resistant children: Methods, variables, and preliminary findings. In F. J. Morrison, C. Lord, & D. E. Keating (Eds.), *Applied developmental psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 231-287). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-041201-3.50011-X>.
- Gatling, T. N. (2005). *A study of the resiliency characteristics and proactive behaviors of mothers who have children with short stature*. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia]. https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/gatling_tiffany_n_200508_phd.pdf.
- Gold, M., & Reimer, D. (1975). Changing patterns of delinquent behavior among Americans 13 through 16 years old. *Crime & Delinquency Literature, 7*, 483-517.
- Goodman, W. B., Crouter, A. C., Lanza, S. T., Cox, M. J., & Vernon-Feagans, L. (2011). Paternal work stress and latent profiles of father-infant parenting quality. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 73*(3), 588-604. <https://doi.org/510.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00826.x>.
- Grunberg, V. A. (2016). *Neonatal intensive care unit infants, parental stress, couple and family impact: How family resources may attenuate the stress*. [Master's Thesis, Drexel University]. <http://hdl.handle.net/1860/idea:6811>.
- Hartman, A., & Laird, J. (1983). *Family-centered social work practice*. Free Press.
- Herman, S. E., & Marcenko, M. O. (1997). Perceptions of services and resources as mediators of depression among parents of children with developmental disabilities. *Mental Retardation, 35*, 458-467. [https://doi.org/410.1352/0047-6765\(1997\)1035<0458:POSARA>1352.1350.CO;1352](https://doi.org/410.1352/0047-6765(1997)1035<0458:POSARA>1352.1350.CO;1352).
- Hill, T. L. (2010). *Child kinship care: An exploratory mixed methods study of social support, resources, and health issues of Nebraska child kinship caregivers*. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nebraska]. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/dissertations/AAI3403096>.
- Hoffman, L., Marquis, J., Poston, D., Summers, J. A., & Turnbull, A. (2006). Assessing family outcomes: Psychometric evaluation of the Beach Center Family Quality of Life Scale. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68*, 1069-1083. <https://doi.org/1010.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00314.x>.

- Holroyd, J. (1974). The Questionnaire on Resources and Stress: An instrument to measure family response to a handicapped family member. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 2, 92-94. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629\(197401\)197402:197401<197492::AID-JCOP2290020133>2290020133.2290020130.CO;2290020132-A](https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629(197401)197402:197401<197492::AID-JCOP2290020133>2290020133.2290020130.CO;2290020132-A).
- Holroyd, J. (1987). *Questionnaire on Resources and Stress: For families with chronically ill or handicapped members*. Clinical Psychology Publishing Co.
- Hooper, L. M., Burnham, J. J., & Richey, R. (2009). Select parent and family system correlates of adolescent current weight status: A pilot study. *Family Journal*, 17, 14-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480708328460>.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Bassler, O. C., & Brissie, J. S. (1992). Explorations in parent-school relations. *Journal of Educational Research*, 85, 287-294. <https://doi.org/210.1080/00220671.00221992.09941128>.
- Jensen, E. W., James, S. A., Boyce, W. T., & Hartnett, S. A. (1983). The Family Routines Inventory: Development and validation. *Social Science and Medicine*, 17, 201-211. [https://doi.org/210.1016/0277-9536\(1083\)90117-X](https://doi.org/210.1016/0277-9536(1083)90117-X).
- Johnson, D. R., White, L. K., Edwards, J. N., & Booth, A. (1986). Dimensions of marital quality: Toward methodological and conceptual refinement. *Journal of Family Issues*, 7, 31-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251386007001003>.
- Johnson, V. A. (2016). *Improving outcomes for families involved in child protective services through an enhanced understanding of residential mobility's impact on caregiver-child relationships*. (Publication No. 10111902) [Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Charlotte]. ProQuest Theses and Dissertations Global
- Johnston, C., & Mash, E. J. (1989). A measure of parenting satisfaction and efficacy. *Journal of clinical child psychology*, 18, 167-175. https://doi.org/110.1207/s15374424jccp15371802_15374428.
- Kanner, A. D., Coyne, J. C., Schaefer, C., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 4, 1-39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00844845>.
- Kelley, S. J., Whitley, D., & Campos, B. C. (2011). Behavior problems in children raised by grandmothers: The role of caregiver distress, family resources, and the home environment. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33, 2138-2145. <https://doi.org/2110.1016/j.childyouth.2011.2106.2021>.
- Kelley, S. J., Whitley, D., Sipe, T. A., & Yorker, B. C. (2000). Psychological distress in grandmother kinship care providers: The role of resources, social support, and physical health. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 24, 311-321. [https://doi.org/310.1016/S0145-2134\(1099\)00146-00145](https://doi.org/310.1016/S0145-2134(1099)00146-00145).
- Kelley, S. J., Whitley, D. M., & Campos, P. E. (2013). Psychological distress in African American grandmothers raising grandchildren: The contribution of child behavior problems, physical health, and family resources. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 36, 373-385. <https://doi.org/310.1002/nur.21542>.
- Kilmer, R. P., Cook, J. R., Munsell, E. P., & Salvador, S. K. (2010). Factors associated with positive adjustment in siblings of children with severe emotional disturbance: The role of family resources and community life. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 80, 473-481. <https://doi.org/410.1111/j.1939-0025.2010.01050.x>.
- Koren, P. E., DeChillo, N., & Friesen, B. J. (1992). Measuring empowerment in families whose children have emotional disabilities: A brief questionnaire. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 37, 305-321. <https://doi.org/310.1037/h0079106>.
- Koroloff, N., Pullmann, M., Savage, P., Guthrie, L., Rhodes, R., & Sessions, L. (2002). Caregiver resources and strain in a system of care. In J. M. G. King, J. Cook, M. D. Pullmann, & J. Simpson (Eds.), *Building on family strengths: Research and services in support of children and their families* (pp. 83-86). Portland State University, Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242160734_Caregiver_Resources_and_Strain_in_a_System_of_Care.
- Larsen, R. J., & Kasimatis, M. (1991). Day-to-day physical symptoms: Individual differences in the occurrence, duration, and emotional concomitants of minor daily illnesses. *Journal of Personality*, 59(3), 387-423. <https://doi.org/310.1111/j.1467-6494.1991.tb00254.x>.
- Lee, E. M. S., Choi, M. J., & Clarkson-Henderix, M. (2016). Examining needs of informal kinship families: Validating the Family Needs Scale. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 62, 97-104. <http://dx.doi.org/110.1016/j.childyouth.2016.1001.1021>.
- Lee, S., McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., Kelly, E. L., Buxton, O. M., & Almeida, D. M. (2017). Perceived time adequacy improves daily well-being: Day-to-day linkages and the effects of a workplace intervention. *Community, Work & Family*, 20(5), 500-522. <https://doi.org/510.1080/13668803.13662017.11365691>

- Leet, H. E., & Dunst, C. J. (1988). Family Resource Scale. In C. J. Dunst, C. M. Trivette, & A. G. Deal (Eds.), *Enabling and empowering families: Principles and guidelines for practice* (pp. 141). Brookline Books.
- Levine, G. A. (2010). *The relation between family resources, child severity and parenting stress in parents of young children with autism*. [Honors Thesis, Vanderbilt University].
<http://discoverarchive.vanderbilt.edu/bitstream/handle/1803/4026/finalgabriellelevinethesis.pdf?sequence=1>.
- Lindsey, R. A., & Barry, T. D. (2018). Protective factors against distress for caregivers of a child with autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disabilities, 48*, 1092-1107.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-10017-13372-10801>.
- Littlewood, K. A. (2008). Examining the kinship care experience: The impact of social support and family resources on caregiver health, family involvement with the child welfare system, and permanence for children. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences.*, 69(4), 1543.
<https://doi.org/1510.17615/17615rrb-17611v17603>.
- Loutzenhiser, L. (2001). *Risk, family functioning, and child competence in Head Start families*. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Saskatchewan].
<https://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/obj/s4/f2/dsk3/ftp05/NQ63895.pdf>.
- Love, J. M., Kisker, E. E., Ross, C., Raikes, H., Constantine, J., Boller, K., . . . Vogel, C. (2005). The effectiveness of Early Head Start for 3-year-old children and their parents: Lessons for policy and programs. *Developmental Psychology, 41*, 885-901. <https://doi.org/810.1037/0012-1649.1041.1036.1885>.
- Lovibond, S. H., & Lovibond, P. F. (1995). *Manual for the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales*. Australia Psychology Foundation.
- Luescher, J. L., Dede, D. E., Gitten, J. C., Fennell, E., & Maria, B. L. (1999). Parental burden, coping, and family functioning in primary caregivers of children with Joubert syndrome. *Journal of Child Neurology, 14*, 642-648. <https://doi.org/610.1177/088307389901401004>.
- Macias, M. M., Saylor, C. F., Haire, K. B., & Bell, N. L. (2007). Predictors of paternal versus maternal stress in families of children with neural tube defects. *Children's Healthcare, 36*, 99-115.
<https://doi.org/110.1080/02739610701334558>.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*, 370-396.
<https://doi.org/310.1037/h0054346>.
- Maupin, A. N., Brophy-Herb, H. E., Schiffman, R. F., & Bocknek, E. L. (2010). Low-income parental profiles of coping, resource adequacy, and public assistance receipt: Links to parenting. *Family Relations, 59*, 180-194. <https://doi.org/110.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00594.x>.
- McCubbin, H. I., & Patterson, J. M. (1991). Family Inventory of Life Events and Changes. In H. I. McCubbin & J. M. Patterson (Eds.), *Family assessment inventories for research and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 179-199). University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.
- McWilliam, R. A. (1991). *Children's engagement questionnaire*. Unpublished scale.
<https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/33656699/childrens-engagement-questionnaire-siskin-childrens-institute>.
- McWilliam, R. A. (2005). Family variables in children seeking a diagnosis. *Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 26*, 472-473.
- Miller, I. W., Epstein, N. B., Bishop, D. S., & Keitner, G. I. (1985). The McMaster Family Assessment Device: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 11*(4), 345-356.
<https://doi.org/310.1111/j.1752-0606.1985.tb00028.x>.
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & Group, T. P. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Medicine, 6*(6), e1000097.
<https://doi.org/1000010.1001371/journal.pmed.1000097>.
- Moos, R. H., & Moos, B. S. (1994). *Family Environment Scale Manual: Development, applications, research* (3rd ed.). Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Munsell, E. P., Kilmer, R. P., Vishnevsky, T., Cook, J. R., & Markley, L. M. (2016). Practical disadvantage, socioeconomic status, and psychological well-being within families of children with severe emotional disturbances. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 25*, 2832-2842. <https://doi.org/2810.1007/s10826-10016-10449-y>.
- Nowicki, S., & Duke, M. P. (1974). A locus of control scale for noncollege as well as college adults. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 38*, 136-137. <https://doi.org/110.1080/00223891.00221974.10119950>.
- Olson, D. H., Portner, J., & Lavee, Y. (1985). *Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales*. University of Minnesota, Family Social Science, St. Paul.

- Ompad, D. C., Palamar, J. J., Krause, K. D., Kapadia, F., & Halkitis, P. N. (2018). Reliability and validity of a material resource scale and its association with depression among young men who have sex with men: The P18 cohort study. *American Journal of Men's Health, 12*(5), 1384-1397. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557988316651206>.
- Palermo, F., Ispa, J. M., Carlo, G., & Streit, C. (2017). Economic hardship during infancy and U.S. Latino preschoolers' sociobehavioral health and academic readiness. *Developmental Psychology, 54*(5), 890-902. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000476>.
- Paley, B., O'Connor, M. J., Frankel, F., & Marquardt, R. (2006). Predictors of stress in parents of children with fetal alcohol spectrum disorders. *Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 27*(5), 396-404. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004703-200610000-200600005>.
- Palisano, R. J., Chiarello, L. A., & Haley, S. M. (1993). Factors related to mother-infant interaction in infants with motor delays. *Pediatric Physical Therapy, 5*, 55-60. <https://journals.lww.com/pedpt/pages/articleviewer.aspx?year=1993&issue=00520&article=00003&type=Abstract>.
- Patwardhan, I., Hurley, K. D., Lambert, M., & Ringle, J. L. (2019). An examination of the psychometric properties and validation of the Family Resource Scale for families seeking assistance with their child's behavioral difficulties. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 37*(3), 372-381. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282918769486>.
- Pearlin, L. I., & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19*, 2-21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2136319>.
- Persha, A. J., & Rao, V. R. (2002). *Early intervention to children at risk for developmental delays*. India National Institute for the Mentally Handicapped. <http://www.niepid.nic.in/Early%20Intervention.pdf>.
- Peterson, J. L., & Zill, N. (1986). Marital disruption, parent-child relationships, and behavior problems in children. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 48*, 295-307. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352397>.
- Pratt, S. J. (1992). *The influence of social support on the stress level of parents with disabled children*. [Doctoral Dissertation, Utah State University]. *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*, 6036. <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/6036>.
- Prinz, R. J., Foster, S. L., Kent, R. N., & O'Leary, K. D. (1979). Multivariate assessment of conflict in distressed and nondistressed mother-adolescent dyads. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 12*, 691-700. <https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.1979.1912-1691>.
- Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*, 385-401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014662167700100306>.
- Raikes, H. A., & Thompson, R. A. (2005). Efficacy and social support as predictors of parenting stress among families in poverty. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 26*(3), 177-190. <https://doi.org/10.1002/imhj.20044>.
- Ramos, C. A. (2019). *The role of the autonomic nervous system in early life stress and internalizing symptoms*. [Honor Thesis, University of Houston]. <https://hdl.handle.net/10657/4285>.
- Reynolds, C. R., & Kamphaus, R. W. (2015). *Behavioral Assessment System for Children* (3rd ed.). Pearson.
- Ridings, L. E., Beasley, L. O., Bohora, S. B., Daer, J. L., Owora, A., & Silovsky, J. F. (2018). Longitudinal investigation of depression, intimate partner violence, and supports among vulnerable families. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(24), 3749-3771. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516639262>.
- Robinson, B. C. (1983). Validation of a Caregiver Strain Index. *Journal of Gerontology, 38*(3), 344-348. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronj/1038.1093.1344>.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton University Press.
- Salzer, J. S. (2005). *Grandparents raising grandchildren: A program evaluation of family well-being*. (Publication No. 3205409) [Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Commonwealth University]. ProQuest Theses and Dissertations Global.
- Sarason, I. G., Johnson, J. H., & Siegel, J. M. (1978). Assessing the impact of life changes: Development of the Life Experiences Survey. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46*, 932-946. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-1006X.1046.1035.1932>.
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology, 4*(3), 219-247. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.1034.1033.1219>.
- Seaton, E. K., & Taylor, R. D. (2003). Exploring familial processes in urban, low-income African American families. *Journal of Family Issues, 24*, 627-644. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X03024005003>.
- Sheldon, S. B. (2002). Parents' social networks and beliefs as predictors of parent involvement. *Elementary School Journal, 102*, 301-316. <https://doi.org/10.1086/499705>.

- Sheras, P. L., Abidin, R. R., & Konold, T. R. (1998). *Stress Index for Parents of Adolescents: Professional manual*. Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Smith, T. B., Oliver, M. N., & Innocenti, M. S. (2001). Parenting stress in families of children with disabilities. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 71(2), 257-261. <https://doi.org/210.1037/0002-9432.1071.1032.1257>.
- Sneyd, E. J. (2005). *An in-depth analysis of real and perceived barriers to speech and language program participation for children with speech and language delays: A question of barriers to service?* [Master's Thesis, Brock University]. <http://hdl.handle.net/10464/1389>.
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 38, 15-28.
- Spratt, E. G., Saylor, C. F., & Macias, M. M. (2007). Assessing parenting stress in multiple samples of children with special needs (CSN). *Families, Systems and Health*, 25, 435-449. <https://doi.org/410.1037/1091-7527.1025.1034.1435>.
- Staerkel, F., & Spieker, S. (2006). Unstable housing--A significant challenge for home visiting programs: An Early Head Start case example. *Journal of Family Social Work*, 10(1), 61-76. https://doi.org/10.1300/J1039v1310n1301_1304.
- Stein, R. E. K., & Jessop, D. J. (2003). The Impact on Family Scale revisited: Further psychometric data. *Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, 24, 9-16.
- Stein, R. E. K., & Riessman, C. K. (1980). The development of an Impact on Family Scale: Preliminary findings. *Medical Care*, 18(4), 465-472. <https://doi.org/410.1097/00005650-198004000-198000010>.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2). *Journal of Family Issues*, 17(3), 283-316. <https://doi.org/210.1177/019251396017003001>.
- Sugland, B. W., Zaslow, M. J., Smith, J. R., Brooks-Gunn, J., Coates, D., Blumenthal, C., . . . Bradley, R. (1995). The early childhood HOME inventory and HOME-short form in differing racial/ethnic groups: Are there differences in underlying structure, internal consistency of subscales, and patterns of prediction? *Journal of Family Issues*, 16, 632-663. <https://doi.org/610.1177/019251395016005007>.
- Suurmond, R., van Rhee, H., & Hak, T. (2017). Introduction, comparison, and validation of *Meta-Essentials*: A free and simple tool for meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 8, 537-553. <https://doi.org/510.1002/jrsm.1260>.
- Taylor, M. J. (1999). *Family support and resources in families having children with disabilities*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED434430. <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=%22family+support+and+resources+in+families%22&id=ED434430>.
- Taylor, M. J., Crowley, S. L., & White, K. R. (1993). *Measuring family support and resources: Psychometric investigation of the FSS and FRS*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED359249. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED359249.pdf>.
- Taylor, R. D., Budescu, M., & Gebre, A. (2014). Family financial pressure and maternal and adolescent socioemotional adjustment: Moderating effects of kin social support in low-income African American families. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23, 242-254. <https://doi.org/210.1007/s10826-10012-19688-10828>.
- Van Horn, M. L., Bellis, J. M., & Snyder, S. W. (2001). Family Resource Scale revised: Psychometrics and validation of a measure of family resources in a sample of low-income families. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 19, 54-68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/073428290101900104>.
- Van Rhee, H. J., Suurmond, R., & Hak, T. (2015). *User manual for Meta-Essentials: Workbooks for meta-analysis (Version 1.4)*. Erasmus Research Institute of Management, The Netherlands. www.erim.eur.nl/research-support/meta-essentials.
- Vohr, B., Jodoin-Krauzyk, J., & Tucker, R. (n.d.). *Resources: A strong predictor of impact for families of infants with hearing loss*. <https://slideplayer.com/slide/8619284/>.
- Ware, J. E., Kosinski, M., & Keller, S. D. (1996). A 12-item short-form health survey: Construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Medical Care*, 34, 220-233. <https://doi.org/210.1097/00005650-199603000-199600003>.
- Ware, J. E., Snow, K. K., Kosinski, M., & Gandek, B. (1993). *SF-36 Health Survey: Manual and interpretation guide*. The Health Institute, New England Medical Center, Boston, MA.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070. <https://doi.org/1010.1037/0022-3514.1054.1066.1063>.

- Weigel, D. J., Martin, S. S., & Bennett, K. K. (2010). Pathways to literacy: Connections between family assets and preschool children's emergent literacy skills. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 8, 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X09345518>.
- Whittaker, J. E. V., Harden, B. J., See, H. M., Meisch, A. D., & Westbrook, T. R. (2011). Family risks and protective factors: Pathways to Early Head Start toddlers' social-emotional functioning. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 26, 74-86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2010.1004.1007>.
- Williams, N. A., Villachan-Lyra, P., Marvin, C., Chaves, E., Hollist, C., Hatton-Bowers, H., & Barbosa, L. N. (2019). Anxiety and depression among caregivers of young children with Congenital Zika Syndrome in Brazil. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2019.1692252>.
- Wilson, M. H. (2009). *The associations between social support, economic strain, and parenting stress among at-risk families*. [Master's Thesis, University of Kansas]. https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/5439/Wilson_ku_0099M_10261_DATA_1.pdf?sequence=1.
- Wohlfeiler, M. M., Macias, M. M., & Saylor, C. F. (2008). Paternal correlates of cognitive and behavioral functioning in children with myelomeningocele. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, 50, 864-869. <https://doi.org/810.1111/j.1469-8749.2008.03070.x>.
- World Health Organization. (1996). *WHOQOL-BREF: Introduction, administration, scoring and generic version of the assessment*. World Health Organization.
- Wyman, P. A., Cowen, E. L., Work, W. C., Hoyt-Meyers, L. A., Magnus, K. B., & Fagen, D. B. (1999). Caregiving and developmental factors differentiating parents of young stress-affected and stress-resilient urban children: A replication and extension. *Child Development*, 70(3), 645-659. <https://doi.org/610.1111/1467-8624.00047>.
- Wyman, P. A., Cowen, E. L., Work, W. C., & Parker, G. R. (1991). Developmental and family milieu correlates of resilience in urban children who have experienced life stress. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 19, 405-426. <https://doi.org/410.1007/BF00938033>.

Appendix A-1							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scales Measures and General Psychological Health Functioning</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			General Psychological Health Scales ^b		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Bachanas et al. (2001)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Brief Symptom Inventory	Total Scale Score	.35	68
Brown et al. (2000)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Symptom Checklist-90-R	Total Scale Score	.25	55
Burrell et al. (1994)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Quest. Resources & Stress	Total Scale Score	.63	53
Dunst et al. (1986)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Health & Well-Being Index	Total Scale Score	.45	21
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Health & Well-Being Index	Total Scale Score	.56	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	8	Basic Resources	Health & Well-Being Index	Total Scale Score	.22	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	7	Financial Resources	Health & Well-Being Index	Total Scale Score	.38	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	9	Time Availability ^d	Health & Well-Being Index	Total Scale Score	.72 ^d	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	4	Time for Family	Health & Well-Being Index	Total Scale Score	.68	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	5	Extrafamily Support	Health & Well-Being Index	Total Scale Score	.75	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	2	Childcare	Health & Well-Being Index	Total Scale Score	.23	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	2	Child Resources	Health & Well-Being Index	Total Scale Score	.30	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	2	Expendable Income	Health & Well-Being Index	Total Scale Score	.48	45
Hill (2010)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	GHS-SF12	Total Scale Score	.47	57
Kelley et al. (2000)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Brief Symptom Inventory	Total Scale Score	.46	102
Kelley et al. (2011)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Brief Symptom Inventory	Total Scale Score	.45	230
Kelley et al. (2013)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Brief Symptom Inventory	Total Scale Score	.31	480
Lindsey & Barry (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Depression Anxiety Stress Scale	Total Scale Score	.51	157
Munsell et al. (2016)	DL	7	Basic Resources	Brief Symptom Inventory	Total Scale Score	.51	99
Persha & Rao (2003) S1	VH	22	Total Scale Score	Brief Symptom Inventory	Total Scale Score	.37	51
Persha & Rao (2003) S2	VH	22	Total Scale Score	Brief Symptom Inventory	Total Scale Score	.31	54
Salzer (2005)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	GHS-SF36 (IA) ^c	Total Scale Score	.11	56

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987) , LD = Leet and Dunst (1988), and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^bGHQ = General Health Survey.
^cIA = Investigator adapted.
^dAverage correlation of the effect sizes between the time for family and time for friends (extrafamily support) and the outcome measure.

Appendix A-2							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and the Physical Health Measures</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Physical Health Scales		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Kelley et al. (2000)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	General Health Survey-SF36	Physical Health Subscale	.23	102
Kelley et al. (2013)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	General Health Survey-SF36	Physical Health Subscale	.21	480
Lee et al. (2017)	VH	6	Time Availability ^b	Physical Symptom Checklist	Total Scale Score	.23	90
Littlewood (2008)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	General Health Questionnaire-SF12	Physical Health Subscale	.27	175
^a DL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987), LD = Leet and Dunst (1988), and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001). ^b Average correlation of the effect sizes for six FRS time availability scale items and the outcome measures.							

Appendix A-3							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Participant Depression</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scales ^a			Depression Scales ^b		r	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Brody et al. (1997) S1	DL	17	Financial Resources	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.41	71
Brody et al. (1997) S2	DL	17	Financial Resources	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.30	85
Brody et al. (2006)	DL	6 ^c	Financial Resources	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.37	172
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	18	Total Scale Score ^d	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.27 ^d	115
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	6	Time for Self	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.34	115
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	5	Financial Resources	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.33	115
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	7	Basic Resources	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.14	115
Candelaria et al. (2006)	DL	22	Total Scale Score	Beck Depression Inventory	Total Scale Score	.37	103
Chang & Fine (2007)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.16	580
Cheesman (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.69	30
Eshbaugh et al. (2006)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.32	523
Espeleta et al. (2019)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.35	308
Herman & Marcenko (1997)	DL	18	Total Scale Score ^d	QRS-SF	Depression Subscale	.41 ^d	150
Herman & Marcenko (1997)	DL	9	Time Adequacy	QRS-SF	Depression Subscale	.63	150
Herman & Marcenko (1997)	DL	7	Financial Resources	QRS-SF	Depression Subscale	.39	150
Herman & Marcenko (1997)	DL	1	Childcare	QRS-SF	Depression Subscale	.20	150
Loutzenhiser (2001) S1	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Beck Depression Inventory	Total Scale Score	.50	23
Loutzenhiser (2001) S2	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Beck Depression Inventory	Total Scale Score	.50	23
Palermo et al. (2017)	PA	17	Financial Resources	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.14	714
Ridings et al. (2018)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Beck Depression Inventory	Total Scale Score	.46	548
Salzer (2005)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.36	56
Seaton & Taylor (2003)	DL	7	Financial Resources	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.18	164
Taylor et al. (2014) S1	DL	7	Financial Resources	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.32	200
Taylor et al. (2014) S2	DL	7	Financial Resources	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.14	200
Whittaker et al. (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CES-Depression Scale	Total Scale Score	.34	114
Williams et al. (2019)	VH	22	Total Scale Score	Beck Depression Inventory	Total Scale Score	.55	50

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987), LD = Leet and Dunst (1988), PA = Palermo et al. (2017), and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^bCES = Center for Epidemiological Studies and QRS-SF = Questionnaire on Resources and Stress-Short Form.
^cMoney for Necessities subscale.
^dAverage correlation of the effect sizes between the FRS subscale scores and the outcome measures.

Appendix A-4								
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Participant Psychological Stress</i>								
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Psychological Stress Scales ^b			<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure			
Gatling (2005)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Perceived Stress Scale	Total Stress Score	.50	118	
Johnson (2016)	VH	20	Total Scale Score ^c	Perceived Stress (IDM)	Stress Score	.42 ^c	36	
Johnson (2016)	VH	7	Basic Resources	Perceived Stress (IDM)	Stress Score	.41	36	
Johnson (2016)	VH	5	Financial Resources	Perceived Stress (IDM)	Stress Score	.60	36	
Johnson (2016)	VH	8	Time Availability ^d	Perceived Stress (IDM)	Stress Score	.33 ^d	36	
Johnson (2016)	VH	6	Time for Family	Perceived Stress (IDM)	Stress Score	.25	36	
Johnson (2016)	VH	2	Time for Self	Perceived Stress (IDM)	Stress Score	.41	36	
Littlewood (2008)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	General GHS-SF12	Mental Health Subscale	.32	175	
Williams et al. (2019)	VH	22	Total Scale Score	Beck Anxiety Inventory	Total Anxiety Score	.36	50	

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987) and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^bIDM = Investigator developed measure and GHS = General Health Survey.
^cAverage correlation of the effect sizes between the FRS subscale scores and the outcome measures.
^dAverage correlation of the effects sizes between the time for family and time for oneself subscale scores and the outcome measures.

Appendix A-5							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Participant Life Satisfaction</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Life Satisfaction Scales ^b		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	18	Total Scale Score ^c	Life Orientation Test	Life Optimism Score	.26 ^c	115
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	6	Time for Self	Life Orientation Test	Life Optimism Score	.35	115
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	5	Financial Resources	Life Orientation Test	Life Optimism Score	.29	115
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	7	Basic Resources	Life Orientation Test	Life Optimism Score	.14	115
Cheesman (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	WHO QoL Scale	Quality of Life Score	.66	30
Coleman-Reed (2016)	VH	17	Total Scale Score	Satisfaction w Life Scale	Life Satisfaction Score	.48	94
Dunst et al. (1986)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Psych. Well-Being Index	Total Well-Being Score	.61	21
Dunst et al. (1986)	DL	10	Basic Resources	Psych. Well-Being Index	Total Well-Being Score	.45	21
Dunst et al. (1986)	DL	8	Financial Resources	Psych. Well-Being Index	Total Well-Being Score	.40	21
Dunst et al. (1986)	DL	10	Time Availability	Psych. Well-Being Index	Total Well-Being Score	.68	21
Lee et al. (2017)	VH	6	Time Availability	PANAS	Total Scale Score	.25*	90
Seaton & Taylor (2003)	DL	7	Financial Resources	Life Orientation Test	Life Optimism Score	.24	164
Taylor et al. (2014)	DL	7	Financial Resources	Life Orientation Test	Life Optimism Score	.27	200

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987) and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^bWHO = World Health Organization, QoL = Quality of Life, and PANAS =Positive and Negative Affect Scales.
^cAverage correlation of the effects sizes between the FRS subscale scores and the outcome measures.

Appendix A-6							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Participants' Personal Belief Appraisals</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Personal Belief Scales ^b		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Anderson & Minke (2007)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Hoover-Dempsey Efficacy Scale	Self-Efficacy Score	.25	203
Brody et al. (1997) S1 ^c	DL	17	Financial Resources	Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale	Self Esteem Score	.45	71
Brody et al. (1997) S2	DL	17	Financial Resources	Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale	Self-Esteem Score	.24	85
Chang & Fine (2007)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Pearlin Self-Efficacy Scale	Mastery Subscale	.26	580
Dunst et al. (1986)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Norwicki-Strickland LOC Scale	Total Scale Score	.07	21
Palermo et al. (2017)	PA	17	Financial Resources	Pearlin Self-Efficacy Scale	Self-Efficacy Score	.21	714
Persha & Rao (2003) S1	VH	22	Total Scale Score	MSRI Self Esteem Scale	Self Esteem Score	.28	51
Persha & Rao (2003) S2	VH	22	Total Scale Score	MSRI Self Esteem Scale	Self Esteem Score	.14	54
Raikes & Thompson (2005)	RT	5	Social Support ^d	Pearlin Self-Efficacy Scale	Total Scale Score	.00	65
Salzer (2005)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Family Empowerment Scale	Total Scale Score	.25	56

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987), PA = Palermo et al. (2017), RT = Raikes and Thompson (2005), and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^bLOC = Locus of Control and MSRI = Maternal Self-Rating Inventory.
^cS = Sample.
^dInvestigator created subscale for measuring intrafamily and extrafamily social support (someone to talk to, babysitting, childcare, time to spend with friends, and time to spend with spouse or partner).

Appendix A-7							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Parenting Belief Appraisals</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scales ^a			Parenting Belief Scales ^b		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Anderson & Minke (2007)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Role Construction Scale	Total Scale Score	.27	203
Armans (2014)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSOC Scale	Total Scale Score	.29	46
Armans (2014)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSOC Scale	Self-Efficacy Subscale	.19	46
Armans (2014)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSOC Scale	Satisfaction Subscale	.31	46
Brody et al. (1999)	DL	17	Total Scale Score ^d	Parenting Efficacy Scale	Total Scale Score	.16 ^d	139
Brody et al. (1999)	DL	10	Basic Resources	Parenting Efficacy Scale	Total Scale Score	.21	139
Brody et al. (1999)	DL	3	Financial Resources	Parenting Efficacy Scale	Total Scale Score	.17	139
Brody et al. (1999)	DL	4	Expendable Income	Parenting Efficacy Scale	Total Scale Score	.09	139
Candelaia et al. (2006)	DL	22	Total Scale Score	PATCRS	Parent Warmth Subscale	.09	103
Dunst et al. (1986)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Childcare Commitment	Total Scale Score	.54	21
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Time Allocation Scale	Total Scale Score	.63	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	8	Basic Resources	Time Allocation Scale	Total Scale Score	.49	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	7	Financial Resources	Time Allocation Scale	Total Scale Score	.37	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	9	Time Availability ^e	Time Allocation Scale	Total Scale Score	.58 ^e	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	4	Time for Family	Time Allocation Scale	Total Scale Score	.61	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	5	Extrafamily Support	Time Allocation Scale	Total Scale Score	.54	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	2	Childcare	Time Allocation Scale	Total Scale Score	.53	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	2	Child Resources	Time Allocation Scale	Total Scale Score	.37	45
Dunst & Leet (1987)	DL	2	Expendable Income	Time Allocation Scale	Total Scale Score	.55	45
Engelke (1991)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting LOC Scale	Total Scale Score	.31	106
Lindsey & Berry (2018)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSOC Scale	Self-Efficacy Subscale	.08	157
Persha & Rao (2003) S1 ^c	VH	22	Total Scale Score	Maternal Rating Scale	Total Scale Score	.28	51
Persha & Rao (2003) S2	VH	22	Total Scale Score	Maternal Rating Scale	Total Scale Score	.14	54
Whittaker et al. (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PATCRS	Parent Warmth Subscale	.12	114

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987) and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^bPSOC = Parenting Sense of Competence and PATCRS = Parenting Attitudes Toward Child Rearing Scale.
^cS = Sample.
^dAverage correlation of the effect sizes between the FRS subscale scores and the outcome measure.
^eAverage correlation of the effect sizes between the time for family and time for friends (extrafamily support) and the outcome measures.

Appendix A-8							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Parenting Stress</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Parenting Stress Scales ^b		r	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Armans (2018)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.29	46
Armans (2018)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.31	46
Armans (2018)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.22	46
Burrell et al. (1994)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.41	53
Burrell et al. (1994)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.60	53
Chang & Fine (2007)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.30	580
Cheesman (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.64	30
Cheesman (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.81	30
Cheesman (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.28	30
Ericson (1998)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.54	94
Grunberg (2016)	VH	21	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.40	199
Levine (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.64	26
Levine (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.66	26
Levine (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.57	26
Levine (2010)	DL	8	Time Availability	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.67	26
Levine (2010)	DL	8	Time Availability	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.70	26
Levine (2010)	DL	8	Time Availability	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.57	26
Levine (2010)	DL	8	Financial Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.61	26
Levine (2010)	DL	8	Financial Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.62	26
Levine (2010)	DL	8	Financial Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.56	26
Levine (2010)	DL	4	Child Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.32	26
Levine (2010)	DL	4	Child Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.23	26
Levine (2010)	DL	4	Child Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.37	26
Levine (2010)	DL	10	Basic Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.28	26
Levine (2010)	DL	10	Basic Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.04	26
Levine (2010)	DL	10	Basic Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.44	26
Macias et al. (2007) Sample 1	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.50	71
Macias et al. (2007) Sample 1	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.57	71
Macias et al. (2007) Sample 1	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.34	71
Macias et al. (2007) Sample 2	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.33	71
Macias et al. (2007) Sample 2	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.44	71
Macias et al. (2007) Sample 2	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.19	71
Palermo et al. (2017)	PA	17	Financial Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.19	714
Paley et al. (2006)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.19	100
Paley et al. (2006)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.47	100

Appendix A-8, continued.							
Study	Scale	Items	Measure	Parenting Stress Scales ^b		<i>r</i>	N
				Scale	Measure		
Persha & Rao (2003) Sample 1	VH	22	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.56	51
Persha & Rao (2003) Sample 2	VH	22	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.15	54
Pratt (1992)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.42	503
Pratt (1992)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.45	503
Pratt (1992)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress	.28	503
Raikes & Thompson (2005)	RT	5	Social Support ^c	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	-.02	65
Smith et al. (2001)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.38	880
Smith et al. (2001)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.45	880
Smith et al. (2001)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.23	880
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 1	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.54	70
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 1	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.55	70
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 2	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.37	45
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 2	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.50	45
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 3	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.55	45
Spratt et al. (2007) Sample 3	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.58	45
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	28	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.43	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	9	Time Availability	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.51	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	9	Basic Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.20	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	13	Financial Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.34	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	28	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.46	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	9	Time Availability	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.30	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	9	Basic Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.29	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	13	Financial Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.37	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	28	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.28	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	9	Time Availability	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.47	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	9	Basic Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.30	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	13	Financial Resources	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.22	990
Vohr et al. (n.d.)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.59	100
Vohr et al. (n.d.)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Parental Distress Subscale	.62	100
Vohr et al. (n.d.)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Child-Related Stress Subscale	.36	100
Whittaker et al. (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.36	114
Williams et al. (2019)	VH	22	Total Scale Score	Parenting Stress Index	Total Scale Score	.47	50
Wilson (2009)	LD	24	Total Scale Score ^d	SIPA	Total Scale Score	.38	151

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987), LD = Leet and Dunst (1988), PA = Palermo et al. (2017), RT = Raikes & Thompson (2005), and TY = Taylor (1999).
^bSIPA = Stress Index for Parents of Adolescents.

^cInvestigator created subscale for measuring intrafamily and extrafamily social support (someone to talk to, babysitting, childcare, time to spend with friends, and time to spend with spouse or partner).

^dSeven of the Leet and Dunst (1985, 1988) scale items were not considered appropriate for the study participants and were deleted from the version of the scale used by the investigators.

Appendix A-9							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Caregiving Burden</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scales ^a			Caregiving Burden Scales		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Balakrishnan et al. (2011)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Impact on Family Scale	Disability Subscale	.44	152
Dinehart et al. (2006)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Daily Hassles	Total Scale Score	.23	56
Grunberg (2016)	VH	21	Total Scale Score	Impact on Family Scale	Total Scale Score	.24	199
Kilmer et al. (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Caregiver Strain Index	Total Scale Score	.34	100
Koroloff et al. (2001)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Caregiver Strain Questionnaire	Total Scale Score	.44	110
Munsell et al. (2016)	DL	7	Basic Resources	Caregiver Strain Questionnaire	Total Scale Score	.23	99
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	PT	28	Total Scale Score ^b	Caregiver Strain Questionnaire	Total Scale Score	.20 ^b	300
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	PT	10	Basic Resources	Caregiver Strain Questionnaire	Total Scale Score	.13	300
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	PT	13	Money & Time	Caregiver Strain Questionnaire	Total Scale Score	.23	300
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	PT	2	Time for Family	Caregiver Strain Questionnaire	Total Scale Score	.26	300
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	PT	3	Medical Care ^a	Caregiver Strain Questionnaire	Total Scale Score	.16	300
Vohr et al. (n.d.)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Impact on Family Scale	Total Scale Score	.48	100
Weigel et al. (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Parenting Daily Hassles	Total Scale Score	.30	85

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987), LD = Leet and Dunst (1988), PT = Patwardhan et al. (2019), and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^bAverage correlation of the effect sizes between the FRS subscales and the outcome measures.

Appendix A-10							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Parenting Engagement of Children in Learning Activities</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Parenting Engagement Scales ^b		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Anderson & Minke (2007)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PIH (ID)	Child Engagement	.11	203
Dinehart et al. (2006)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	HOME	Total Scale Score	.28	56
Engelke (1991)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	HOME	Total Scale Score	.26	106
Kelley et al. (2011)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	HOME	Total Scale Score	.17	230
Maupin et al. (2010)	VH	7	Basic Resources	HOME	Total Scale Score	.17	151
Maupin et al. (2010)	VH	4	Financial Resources	HOME	Total Scale Score	.03	151
McWilliam (2005)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CEQ	Child Engagement	.36	277
Persha & Rao (2003) Sample 1	VH	22	Total Scale Score	HOME	Total Scale Score	.32	51
Persha & Rao (2003) Sample 2	VH	22	Total Scale Score	HOME	Total Scale Score	.54	54
Weigel et al. (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PCA (ID)	Child Engagement	.32	85

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987), LD = Leet and Dunst (1988), and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^bPIH = Parent Involvement at Home Scale, HOME = Home Observation of the Environment Scale, CEQ = Children's Engagement Questionnaire, PCA = Parent and Child Activities Scale, and ID = Investigator developed.

Appendix A-11							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Parenting Practices</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Parenting Practices Scales ^b		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measures		
Armans (2018)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PS	Total Scale Score	.50	46
Conrad-Hieber et al. (2015)	DL	19 ^c	Total Scale Score	PFS	Nurturing & Attachment Subscale	.30	133
Conrad-Hieber et al. (2015)	DL	10	Growth	PFS	Nurturing & Attachment Subscale	.37	133
Conrad-Hieber et al. (2015)	DL	7	Basic Resources	PFS	Nurturing & Attachment Subscale	.19	133
Conrad-Hieber et al. (2015)	DL	2	Time for Self/Family	PFS	Nurturing & Attachment Subscale	.35	133
Engelke (1991)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSI	Parent Competence Subscale	.27	106
Kilmer et al. (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PWS	Nurturing Caregiving Subscale	.23	100
Levine (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale	.44	26
Levine (2010)	DL	8	Time Availability	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale	.47	26
Levine (2010)	DL	8	Financial Resources	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale	.41	26
Levine (2010)	DL	4	Child Resources	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale	.15	26
Levine (2010)	DL	10	Basic Resources	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale	.19	26
Macais et al. (2007) Sample 1	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale	.35	71
Macais et al. (2007) Sample 2	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale	.26	71
Pratt (1992)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale	.45	503
Smith et al. (2001)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale	.22	880
Sneyd (2005)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSS	Permissiveness Subscale	.06	49
Sneyd (2005)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSS	Authoritarian Subscale	.24	49
Taylor et al. (1993)	TY	28	Total Scale Score	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale ^d	.24	990
Taylor et al. (1993)	TY	9	Time Availability	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale ^d	.21	990
Taylor et al. (1993)	TY	9	Basic Resources	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale ^d	.15	990
Taylor et al. (1993)	TY	13	Financial Resources	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale ^d	.17	990
Vohr et al. (n.d.)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	PSI	P-C Interaction Subscale ^e	.33	100

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987) and Taylor (1999).

^bPS = Parenting Scale, PDS = Protective Factors Survey, PSI = Parenting Stress Index, PWS = Parental Warmth Scale, PSS = Parenting Styles Scale, and P-C = Parent-Child Interaction.

^cAverage correlation of the effect sizes between the FRS subscale scores and the outcome measure.

^dEstimated from the correlations among the parent-child dimensions measures of the Parenting Stress Index.

Appendix A-12							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Parent and Child Interactions</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Parent-Child Interaction Scales ^b		<i>r</i>	N
	Version	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Brody & Flor (1997) Sample 1	DL	17	Financial Resources	M-C Interaction Ratings	Relationship Quality	.21	71
Brody & Flor (1997) Sample 2	DL	17	Financial Resources	M-C Interaction Ratings	Relationship Quality	.15	85
Brody et al. (1999)	DL	17	Financial Resources	M-C Interaction Ratings	Relationship Quality	.16	139
Brody et al. (2006)	DL	6	Financial Resources	Vigilant Parenting Index	Parenting Style	.32	172
Maupin et al. (2010)	VH	7	Basic Resources	3 Bag Play Tasks	Parenting Style	.12	151
Maupin et al. (2010)	VH	4	Financial Resources	3 Bag Play Tasks	Parenting Style	-.07	151
Palermo et al. (1993)	PA	17	Financial Resources	3 Bag Play Tasks	Parenting Style	.10	714
Palisano et al. (1993)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	NCATE	Total Scale Score	.36	36
Whittaker et al. (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	HOME	Parental Responsivity	.10	114

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987), PA = Palermo et al. (2017), and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^bM-C = Mother-Child, NCATE = Nursing Child Assessment Teaching Scale, and HOME = Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment Scale.

Appendix A-13							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Family Stress</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Family Stress Scales		r	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Bachanas et al. (2001)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Daily Hassles Scale	Total Scale Score	.30	68
Candelaria et al. (2006)	DL	22	Total Scale Score	Life Events Questionnaire	Total Scale Score	.39	103
Chang & Fine (2007)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Stressful Life Events Scale	Total Scale Score	.18	580
Kilmer et al. (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Life Events Checklist	Total Scale Score	.38	100
Loutzenhiser (2001) Sample 1	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Life Events Inventory	Total Scale Score	.57	23
Loutzenhiser (2001) Sample 2	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Life Events Inventory	Total Scale Score	.57	23
Persha & Rao (2003) Sample 1	VH	22	Total Scale Score	Life Events Questionnaire	Total Scale Score	.48	51
Persha & Rao (2003) Sample 2	VH	22	Total Scale Score	Life Events Questionnaire	Total Scale Score	.16	54
Pratt (1992)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	Family Inventory of Life Events	Total Scale Score	.35	503
Taylor (1999;Taylor et al. 1993)	TY	28	Total Scale Score	Family Inventory of Life Events	Total Scale Score	.39	990
Taylor (1999;Taylor et al. 1993)	TY	9	Time Availability	Family Inventory of Life Events	Total Scale Score	.41	990
Taylor (1999;Taylor et al. 1993)	TY	9	Basic Resources	Family Inventory of Life Events	Total Scale Score	.21	990
Taylor (1999;Taylor et al. 1993)	TY	13	Financial Resources	Family Inventory of Life Events	Total Scale Score	.34	990

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987), LD = Leet and Dunst (1988), TY = Taylor (1999), and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).

Appendix A-14							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Family Routines</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Family Routines Scales		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Brody et al. (1997) Sample 1	DL	17	Financial Resources	Family Routines Inventory	Total Scale Score	.17	71
Brody et al. (1997) Sample 2	DL	17	Financial Resources	Family Routines Inventory	Total Scale Score	.25	85
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	18	Total Scale Score ^b	Family Routines Inventory	Total Scale Score	.06 ^b	115
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	6	Time for Self	Family Routines Inventory	Total Scale Score	.14	115
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	5	Financial Resources	Family Routines Inventory	Total Scale Score	.00	115
Budescu et al. (2018)	VH	7	Basic Resources	Family Routines Inventory	Total Scale Score	.03	115
Dinehart et al. (2006)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Family Routines Inventory	Total Scale Score	.40	56
Seaton & Taylor (2003)	DL	7	Financial Resources	Family Routines Inventory	Total Scale Score	.14	164
Weigel et al. (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Family Routines Inventory	Total Scale Score	.33	85

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987) and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^bAverage correlation of the effect sizes between the FRS subscale scores and the outcome measures.

Appendix A-15							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Family Functioning</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Family Functioning Scales ^b		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Chang & Fine (2007)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	FES	Family Conflict Subscale	.08	580
Conrad-Hiebner et al. (2015)	DL	19	Total Scale Score ^c	PFS	Family Functioning Subscale	.30 ^c	133
Conrad-Hiebner et al. (2015)	DL	10	Growth/Support	PFS	Family Functioning Subscale	.38	133
Conrad-Hiebner et al. (2015)	DL	7	Basic Resources	PFS	Family Functioning Subscale	.22	133
Conrad-Hiebner et al. (2015)	DL	2	Time for Family/Child	PFS	Family Functioning Subscale	.29	133
Dunst et al. (1986)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	FES	Total Scale Score	-.04	13
Dunst et al. (1986)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	FES	Family Organization Subscale	.21	13
Goodman et al. (2011)	VH	7	Adequacy of Time	DMQS	Relationship Instability Subscale	.16	492
Grunberg (2016)	VH	21	Total Scale Score	DAS	Total Scale Score	.41	100
Hooper et al. (2009)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	FES	Family Cohesion Subscale	.08	77
Hooper et al. (2009)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	FES	Family Conflict Subscale	.15	77
Kilmer et al. (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	FES	Family Relationship Subscale	.36	100
Loutzenhiser (2011) Sample 1	LD	31	Total Scale Score	FAD	Total Scale Score	.29	23
Loutzenhiser (2011) Sample 2	LD	31	Total Scale Score	FAD	Total Scale Score	.38	23
Munsell et al. (2016)	DL	7	Basic Resources	FES	Family Relationship Subscale	.41	99
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	PT	28	Total Scale Score ^c	FAD	General Functioning Subscale	.24 ^c	300
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	PT	10	Basic Resources	FAD	General Functioning Subscale	.20	300
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	PT	13	Time for Self/Money	FAD	General Functioning Subscale	.24	300
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	PT	2	Time for Family	FAD	General Functioning Subscale	.39	300
Patwardhan et al. (2019)	PT	3	Essential Care	FAD	General Functioning Subscale	.12	300
Ramos (2019)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CTS	Total Scale Score	.25	31
Sneyd (2005)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	FES	Family Cohesion Subscale	.24	49
Sneyd (2005)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	FES	Family Organization Subscale	.40	49
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	28	Total Scale Score	FACES	Cohesion Subscale	.39	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	9	Time Availability	FACES	Cohesion Subscale	.41	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	9	Basic Resources	FACES	Cohesion Subscale	.21	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	13	Financial Resources	FACES	Cohesion Subscale	.34	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	28	Total Scale Score	FACES	Adaptability Subscale	.05	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	9	Time Availability	FACES	Adaptability Subscale	.04	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	9	Basic Resources	FACES	Adaptability Subscale	.05	990
Taylor (1999; Taylor et al., 1993)	TY	13	Financial Resources	FACES	Adaptability Subscale	.04	900
Whittaker et al. (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	FACES	Cohesion Subscale	.26	114

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987), LD = Leet and Dunst (1988), PT = Patwardhan et al. (2019), TY = Taylor (1999), and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^bFES = Family Environment Scale, PFS = Protective Factors Survey, DMQS = Dimensions of Marital Quality Scale, DAS = Dyadic Adjustment Scale, FAD = Family Assessment Device, CTS = Conflict Tactics Scale, and FACES = Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale.

^cAverage correlation of the effect sizes between the FRS subscale scores and the outcome measure.

Appendix A-16							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Family Quality of Life</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Family Quality of Life Scales ^b		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Ericson (1998)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	FFSS	Total Scale Score	.46	94
Farber et al. (2002)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	FFSS	Total Scale Score	.38	73
Ferreira (2014)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	BCFQoLS	Total Scale Score	.55	43
Ferreira (2014)	DL	9	Growth & Support	BCFQoLS	Total Scale Score	.57	43
Ferreira (2014)	DL	7	Basic Resources	BCFQoLS	Total Scale Score	.39	43
Ferreira (2014)	DL	8	Physical Resources	BCFQoLS	Total Scale Score	.48	43
Ferreira (2014)	DL	2	Time for Family	BCFQoLS	Total Scale Score	.53	43
Ferreira (2014)	DL	2	Childcare	BCFQoLS	Total Scale Score	.42	43
Ferreira (2014)	DL	2	Time for Self	BCFQoLS	Total Scale Score	.38	43
Persha & Rao (2003) Sample 1	VH	22	Total Scale Score	FFSS	Total Scale Score	.46	51
Persha & Rao (2003) Sample 2	VH	22	Total Scale Score	FFSS	Total Scale Score	.49	54

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987), LD = Leet and Dunst (1988), and VH = Van Horn et al. (2001).
^b FFSS = Family Functioning Style Scale and BCFQoLS = Beach Center Family Quality of Life Scale.

Appendix A-17							
<i>Effect Sizes for the Relationships Between the Family Resource Scale Measures and Child Behavior and Well-Being</i>							
Study	Family Resource Scale ^a			Child Behavior and Well-Being Scales ^b		<i>r</i>	N
	Scale	Items	Measure	Scale	Measure		
Bachanas et al. (2001)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Externalizing Problems Subscale	.02	68
Bachanas et al. (2001)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Internalizing Problems Subscale	.12	68
Brown et al. (2000)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Externalizing Problems Subscale	.21	55
Brown et al. (2000)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Internalizing Problems Subscale	-.05	55
Cheesman (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Total Scale Score	.59	30
Cheesman (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Externalizing Problems Subscale	.41	30
Cheesman (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Internalizing Problems Subscale	.21	30
Kelley et al. (2011)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Total Scale Score	.26	230
Kelley et al. (2011)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Externalizing Problems Subscale	.23	230
Kelley et al. (2011)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Internalizing Problems Subscale	.25	230
Kelley et al. (2013)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Externalizing Problems Subscale	.21	480
Kelley et al. (2013)	LD	31	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Internalizing Problems Subscale	.18	480
Kilmer et al. (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	BERS	Total Scale Score	.36	100
Kilmer et al. (2010)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Connors	Oppositional Behavior Subscale	.07	100
Korloff et al. (2001)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	BERS	Total Scale Score	.44	110
Lindsey & Barry (2018)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	BASC	Externalizing Problems Subscale	.05	157
Lindsey & Barry (2018)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	BASC	Internalizing Problems Subscale	.10	157
Munsell et al. (2016)	DL	7	Basic Resources	BERS	Total Scale Score	.20	99
Palermo et al. (2017)	PA	17	Financial Resources	CBPS	Aggressive Behavior Subscale	.07	714
Palermo et al. (2017)	PA	17	Financial Resources	CBPS	Hyperactive Behavior Subscale	.06	714
Seaton & Taylor (2003)	DL	7	Financial Resources	CBPS	Total Scale Score	.01	164
Sneyd (2005)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Connors	Oppositional Behavior Subscale	.27	49
Sneyd (2005)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	Connors	Inattentive Behavior Subscale	.46	49
Taylor et al. (2014)	DL	7	Financial Resources	APBS	Total Scale Score	.14	200
Whittaker et al. (2011)	DL	30	Total Scale Score	BITSEA	Problem Behavior Subscale	.18	114
Wohlfeiler et al. (2008) Sample 1	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Total Scale Score	.25	48
Wohlfeiler et al. (2008) Sample 1	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Externalizing Problems Subscale	.15	48
Wohlfeiler et al. (2008) Sample 1	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Internalizing Problems Subscale	.29	48
Wohlfeiler et al. (2008) Sample 2	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Total Scale Score	.30	48
Wohlfeiler et al. (2008) Sample 2	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Externalizing Problems Subscale	.15	48
Wohlfeiler et al. (2008) Sample 2	DL	30	Total Scale Score	CBCL	Internalizing Problems Subscale	.32	48

^aDL = Dunst and Leet (1985, 1987), LD = Leet and Dunst (1988), and PA = Palermo et al. (2017).
^bCBCL =Child Behavior Checklist, BERS = Behavior and Emotional Rating Scale, BASC = Behavior Assessment System for Children, CBPS = Child Problem Behavior Scale, and BITSEA = Brief Infant-Toddler Social and Emotional Assessment Scale.