

**Working Paper: Reliability of the Family Development Matrix Indicators in Child Welfare
Research and Practice**

Author Note

Brad Richardson, Ph.D., Research Scientist/Engineer and Adjunct Associate Professor, The University of Iowa School of Social Work & Research Director, National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice.

Nicole Rayman, MPH. Research Associate, The University of Iowa School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice.

Jerry Endres, MSW, Project Director for California Department of Social Services, Office of Child Abuse Prevention; Owner, Matrix Outcomes Model.

Ignacio Navarro, Ph.D., Associate Professor, California State University Monterey Bay, Department of Health, Human Services and Public Policy

Correspondents should be addressed to Brad Richardson at 100 University Research Park MTP-4, Rm 162, Iowa City, IA 52242-5000. email: brad-richardson@uiowa.edu

Abstract

Despite the widespread use of the FDM model and reports of positive results since the late 1990s, the reliability of the FDM model has not been adequately studied to test whether there is evidence supporting the contention that the approach effectively achieves reliable results in assessing improvement in family functioning. This study explores data gathered through family service agencies providing in-home services using the Family Development Matrix (FDM) that participated in an online test at two points in time. In this manner, intra-rater and inter-rater reliability were analyzed based on the only known dataset combining repeated measures of the FDM model 20 core indicators using the same case descriptions. Consensus levels for each indicator on three tests are reported.

Keywords: Reliability of the Family Development Matrix, FDM reliability, family development scales, FDM indicator reliability

RELIABILITY OF THE FAMILY DEVELOPMENT MATRIX INDICATORS IN CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

The FDM indicators have been reported to provide a way to engage families (Navarro, 2015), track family progress and support effective strengths-based practice (Richardson & Verpleogh, 2015; Endres, Navarro & Richardson, 2015). At the individual family level this approach is essentially a single subject design (cf. Thorndike, 1898); in aggregate these indicators provide agencies with outcome measures that have been used to describe results and evaluation and organizational capacity that sets agencies apart from their competition in applications for funding (Endres, 2015). Despite the widespread use of the FDM model, reports of positive outcomes and benefits of using the FDM model reported dating back to the 1990s, the FDM model has not been adequately studied. While studies are underway to test the validity of the FDM for child welfare, test its effect on family engagement and examine how implementation affects the organizations in which it is used, no systematic test of reliability of the indicators has been conducted using the 20 core indicators used by agencies providing services in partnership with the California Department of Social Services, Office of Child Abuse Prevention. This paper presents the results of the only known study of the reliability of the FDM in child welfare.

As the demand for measureable outcomes has increased, so too has the need for reliability and validity of the measures human service agencies are adopting or adapting (2010 GPRA Modernization Act). While the requirements for measurable outcomes, performance measures and even “durable outcomes,” (cf. United Way) have increased, agencies also report that valid and reliable measures have been found to be useful for informing practice, process improvements and for documenting organizational and evaluation capacity. In California, the Family Development Matrix (FDM) approach is used by more than 140 family serving agencies in 22 counties with services to date reported at more than 21,000 families.

The original FDM model was designed to measure outcomes at the family level, agency and community levels. During the 1990s there was considerable interest in the family development scales which were revised and adapted as outcomes in a variety of settings and locations throughout California, the U.S. and Canada (e.g., community action agencies, Healthy Start programs, family preservation and support programs, mentoring programs, the REACH program, family resource centers and other community based agencies). During this time there was interest in reliability of the scales which resulted in conducting a quasi-experimental design in which narrative descriptions developed from case histories were provided to volunteers who rated the cases on eleven outcome categories in use at time (Endres, Richardson and Sherman, 1999). Results obtained for inter-rater and intra-rater reliability were reported concluding that there was “generally good reliability” with some recommendations for improvement. Since 1999 there have continued to be substantial adaptations, revisions and additions to the FDM. Results of adaptations and refinements have been reported in Florida (Richardson & Graf, 2005), New

York (Richardson, Hayashi & Wells, 2014) and Ohio (Khawaji et al., 2014) in addition to California (e.g., Navarro, 2015).

A significant adaptation occurred in 2005 with the development of a “core set of 20 indicators” used throughout California among agencies serving the public child welfare system (Office of Child Abuse Prevention, OCAP). Improvements were also made in the specificity of the definitions for the categories in the set of 20 core indicators:

1. Access to Transportation
2. Child Health Insurance
3. Community Resources Knowledge
4. Health Services
5. Budgeting
6. Clothing
7. Employment
8. Child Care
9. Risk of Emotional or Sexual Abuse
10. Supervision
11. Appropriate Development
12. Nutrition
13. Family Communication Skills
14. Emotional Well-being/ Sense of Life Value
15. Nurturing
16. Parenting Skills
17. Home Environment
18. Stability of Home or Shelter
19. Support System
20. Presence of Substance Abuse

Measuring and determining reliability of Likert-type scales can be approached in a variety of ways (cf. Cronbach, 1951; Kuder & Richardson, 1937). There have been various approaches to determining reliability of Likert scales via statistical analysis. Gardner and Martin (2007) suggest aggregating data to either one extreme end or the other and equally split data points in the middle toward each extreme. They recommend performing either median or sign tests to compare across factors. It is also suggested that strict adherence to *p. values* may not be needed with Likert scales. The authors suggest that Likert scores are “lumpy” as they cluster around a small number of fixed values. Similarly, Koksai, Ertkin and Colakoglu (2014) provide further insight about the variation of individuals taking tests over multiple time periods. They suggest using different statistical analysis tools in order to test reliability of Likert scale data including Cronbach’s alpha reliability tests and t-test for difference in mean scores at each stage of data analysis. Additionally, Koksai et al. suggest that variables characteristic variables such as anxiety, familiarity and other common characteristics may influence responses.

Symeonaki, Michalopoulou, and Kazani (2015) report the prevalence of using Cronbach’s alpha reliability which is used to test the internal consistency of a set of indicators; however, the FDM

indicators are theoretically inconsistent with this methodology due to the design of the tool which is intended to measure uniquely important domains. As a practice tool, this design was intended to capture theoretically orthogonal measures to reduce the burden of collection on the practitioner and the client. In practice, the indicators are also used in conversation with the client to build on strengths (e.g., items with high scores) to support obtaining improvement on indicators agreed upon by the practitioner and client to be low, or in need of improvement (Sherman, 2015).

A classic test re-test approach would involve giving subjects the same test on two separate to compare results. Obtaining the same or similar results would indicate that the measures are consistent and reliability is established. The disadvantages of the test-retest method are that it takes a long time for results to be obtained and the timing of the test may also affect results (i.e., the time between tests must be long enough so that recall is not a significant factor biasing results, yet short enough so that other changes do not occur which could bias the results).

Design

To test the reliability of the 20 core indicators of the FDM used in child welfare, a study was designed within the Office of Child Abuse and Neglect project as part of the continuous quality improvement process. The design was based on the experience with the previous reliability study conducted with the Packard Foundation (Endres, Richardson and Sherman, 1999). Case “scenarios” were written to describe salient information for each of the core indicators to volunteer participants from agencies currently using the FDM in child welfare practice. The design involved the development of three (3) case scenarios written to provide information necessary to complete assessments using the 20 core indicators (Appendix C). The test information was entered into an online format. After each section, which described a worker asking probing questions of a family member and the family member responding, the script was paused for the selection of the indicator status level (category) based on the information provided. The design was intended to simulate interactions between case workers and family members during visits though for test purposes the exchanges were described to address the 20 indicators, seriatim. Three weeks following completion of the first test, a second was administered.

Study Sample

The study involved recruiting a rater panel from agencies willing to participate. Agencies arranged for all paid staff (those who use the FDM as well as those that have not) to read the scenarios and complete the FDM. For further analysis of results, staff and agency characteristic information was collected when raters completed the initial assessment. Non-identifying information was gathered on marital status, job title, education, whether or not the rater had formal training on the FDM and when that occurred, current caseload if job includes case work, years of service at the agency, years of experience in direct service and total years of experience.

Methods

Methods were adopted based on the literature reviewed and previous experience with analysis of similar scales (e.g., Life Skills Progression). The analysis plan provides a relatively powerful approach for determining the consistency of raters over time (intra-rater reliability) combined with consensus among raters at the same time (inter-rater reliability). Percentage agreement for each item was used to measure the rate of consistent responses (i.e., consensus) of raters on the same items for the same test scenarios. The highest number of similar ratings per item per scenario was used as agreement and other ratings as non-agreement. A percentage agreement of greater than 80% was considered reliable.

Results

Descriptive results are presented in the tables appended to this report. Appendix A presents the overall results on the FDM at initial and follow-up with the sample restricted to those who completed both initial and follow-up tests. Appendix B presents all responses for all scenarios.

Inter-Rater Reliability

Both tests were completed by 189 participants. Results obtained indicated that 19 of 20 indicators achieved consensus at 80 percent or above on at least one of the scenarios. For 13 of the indicators, consensus was achieved at 90 percent or above. *Support system* was the only indicator that did not achieve a consensus of 80 percent. Table 1 presents the consensus percentage (inter-rater reliability) achieved by each indicator. The average (mean) consensus percentage was $X = .91$ ($sd = .09$).

Table 1: Percentage agreement on indicators

Indicator	Consensus Achieved
1. Access To Transportation	.87
2. Child Health Insurance	.88
3. Community Resources Knowledge	.83
4. Health Services	.89
5. Budgeting	.98
6. Clothing	.90
7. Employment	.97
8. Child Care	.99
9. Risk of Emotional or Sexual Abuse	.94
10. Supervision	.87
11. Appropriate Development	.95

12. Nutrition	.99
13. Family Communication Skills	.90
14. Emotional Well-being/ Sense of Life Value	.96
15. Nurturing	.86
16. Parenting Skills	.95
17. Home Environment	.99
18. Stability of Home or Shelter	.94
19. Support System	.58
20. Presence of Abuse	.97

Intra-Rater Reliability

Tests were completed by 189 participants; however, the second test scenario was scored by 182 participants and the third by 180. Using a comparison on the consistency of results between the two tests by participants, results obtained indicated that 18 of 20 indicators achieved reliability of 80 percent or above; 9 of the indicators were at 90 percent or above. *Support system* and *Community Resource Knowledge* were the only indicators that did not achieve a test re-test reliability of 80 percent. Table 2 presents the reliability rates (intra-rater reliability) achieved by each indicator. The average (mean) percentage was $\bar{X} = .87$ ($sd = .08$).

Table 2: Percentage agreement on indicators

Indicator	Consensus Achieved
1. Access To Transportation	.83
2. Child Health Insurance	.82
3. Community Resources Knowledge	.70
4. Health Services	.83
5. Budgeting	.92
6. Clothing	.82
7. Employment	.93
8. Child Care	.98
9. Risk of Emotional or Sexual Abuse	.89
10. Supervision	.80
11. Appropriate Development	.91
12. Nutrition	.98
13. Family Communication Skills	.80
14. Emotional Well-being/ Sense of Life Value	.93
15. Nurturing	.86

16. Parenting Skills	.92
17. Home Environment	.99
18. Stability of Home or Shelter	.92
19. Support System	.65
20. Presence of Abuse	.90

Discussion

Results for inter-rater reliability were generally high with an average reliability obtained of .91. Intra-rater reliability was also high with an average reliability obtained of .87. All items obtained reliabilities of greater than .80 with two notable exceptions. In the inter-rater reliability analysis *social support* obtain a reliability score of .58. In the intra-rater reliability analysis *social support and community resource knowledge* obtained reliability scores of .65 and .70, respectively.

Examination of the categories of the *social support* indicator reveals some possible contamination effect of the *community resource knowledge*. Compound responses in the categories appear to overlap (i.e., not be mutually exclusive or orthogonal) between the two indicators and the compound nature of the indicators may have affected responses in a way similar to what has been described in questionnaire design as “double-barreled” questions. The categories presented for social support included:

1. I cannot ask for and/or do not receive support from family or friends or community resources.
2. I can ask for and receive some support from family and friends, may use community resources.
3. I can count on support of family and friends and use community resources.
4. I have an extensive support system of family, friends and community resources.

Each category of the four responses on the *social support* indicator includes more than two components for each response. For example, at status level four (4), the respondent is asked to determine that there is an extensive support system of family, friends and community resources. Support may be quite different with respect to each of the three support sources. With the inclusion of the conjunctive “and” this suggests that for some all three conditions must be met; therefore, extensive support from family, from friends and from community resources would have to be met at the highest level to obtain a “4.” Counting on support and using community resources is defines “3” which compromises clarity due to the requirement that community resources must be used to meet the criteria even though a family may be able to count on family and friends. Similarly, categories 1 and 2 are multidimensional; whether one “can ask” is at times different than whether some support may be received or not.

For *community resource knowledge* categories “3” and “4” do not appear to be on the same continuum. While once could be aware and able to access programs and support when needed, if

not presently needed the rating could result in a score lower than “3;” while a family new to the community who is participating in a program could score at “4” while still having difficulty accessing services or having knowledge of services that are available.

While the categories of community resource knowledge and support system appear to require better definition, the clarity of the categories of the remainder of the indicators was shown to meet the threshold for reliability with high consistency and reliability of scoring on the indicators. Continued training in techniques to elicit information relevant to each indicator category is needed to maintain the high level of reliability for those indicators that obtain high reliability. Reviewing and revising those indicators showing less than acceptable reliability is also needed to ensure that categories have been operationalized adequately and that they are clear and categories are mutually exclusive.

Limitations

While the results obtained generally support the reliability of the FDM, the study relies on case scenarios written based on case examples rather than gathering data in practice using multiple practitioners. The online format and limited information provided remains an artificial situation unlike the circumstances under which the FDM is used (e.g., in homes, with families in which a relationship is either developing or has developed and where families have input into the scoring on the indicators based on the original design of the FDM approach). Laboratory results and field results are well-known for obtaining different results (e.g., the problems with mouse models are replete in the literature).

A more robust design would involve participation by multiple raters in home visits or observation by multiple raters to gather data “in vivo.” However, there are significant barriers to conducting a study in this manner, not the least of which is consistency with the model design which specifies that the indicator categories are determined in “negotiation between the worker and the family.”

Given the limitations of the artificiality of the laboratory design and the barriers to addressing these issues through improvements in research design, which could also result in artificiality as well as difficulty in achieving high standards of human subjects protections protocols, the design utilized may represent the optimum. Continued training and testing using the present methodology may aid in maintaining reliability or making improvements where indicated as found in the present study.

References

- Cronbach L (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests". *Psychometrika* 16 (3): 297–334. doi:10.1007/bf02310555.
- Endres, J.; Richardson, B. and Sherman, J. (1999). Testing the Validity and Reliability of the California Matrix Model. Institute for Community Collaborative Studies, California State University, Monterey Bay/Packard Foundation, Organizational Effectiveness Program, Grant No. 99-4830.
- Endres, J. (2015) Personal Communication.
- Gardner, H. J., & Martin, M. A. (2007). Analyzing ordinal scales in studies of virtual environments: Likert or lump it!. *Presence: Teleoperators & Virtual Environments*, 16(4), 439-446.
- Khawaja, M. S., Christenson, J., Drakos, J., Eiden, A., Ditz, A., Richardson, B., 2014 Hayashi, V., Wells, T., Jackson, T. People Working Cooperatively Whole House Demonstration Project. Portland OR: CadmusGroup.
- KÖKSAL, M., ERTEKİN, P., & ÇOLAKOĞLU, Ö.(2014). How differences among data collectors are reflected in the reliability and validity of data collected by Likert-type scales?. *Educational sciences: Theory & practice*, 14(6), 2206-2212. doi:10.12738/estp.2014.6.2028
- Kuder, G., & Richardson, M. (1937). The theory of the estimation of test reliability. *Psychometrika*, 2(3), 151–160.
- Mokkink, B., Terwee, C. Gibbons, B., Stratford, P., Alonso, J., Patrick, D., Knoll, D., Bouter, de Vet, H. (2010). Inter-rater agreement and reliability of the COSMIN (COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health status Measurement Instruments) Checklist. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 2010, 10:82. <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2288/10/82> on July 8, 2015.
- Navarro I .A, (2015). Family Engagement in “Voluntary” Child Welfare Services: Theory and Empirical Evidence from Families under Differential Response Referrals in California, *Child Welfare*, 93(3), 23-45.
- Richardson, B., Hayashi, V., Wells, T. (2014). New York Family Development Matrix: Report on the Development, Implementation and Evaluation of the Outcome Measures Tracking System. Iowa City, IA: The University of Iowa School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice.

- Richardson, Brad and Graf, Nancy (2004). Evaluation of the Family Success Center, Family Development Program (Broward County Florida). Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice.
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~nrcfcp/research/documents/BCFinalReport.pdf>
- Richardson, B; Theisen, B. & Spears, J. (2004) Network Guide to Measuring Family Development Outcomes. Des Moines: Iowa Community Action Association and Iowa City: University of Iowa School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Family Center Practice; Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Community Services.
- Richardson, B. and Wollesen, L. (2000). Monterey Life Skill Progression Reliability Assessment. Iowa City, Iowa: The University of Iowa School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice & Salinas, CA: County of Monterey Department of Health.
- Symeonaki, M., Michalopoulou, C., & Kazani, A. (2015). A fuzzy set theory solution to combining Likert items into a single overall scale (or subscales). *Quality & Quantity*, 49(2), 739-762. doi:10.1007/s11135-014-0021-z
- Sherman, J. (2015). Personal Communication.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1898). Animal intelligence: An experimental study of the associative processes in animals. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, Vol. 2, No. 4.
- Wollesen, L. and Peifer, K. (2005). Life Skills Progression (LSP): An Outcome and Intervention Planning Instrument for Use with Families at Risk. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.

Appendix A

1. Access To Transportation								
		1 No access, even for emergencies	2 No access to satisfy needs	3 Limited access	4 Consistent, dependable access	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	4 (2.1%)	16 (8.5%)	165 (87.3%)	4 (2.1%)	2.89	.42	n.s
	2nd (189)	4 (2.1%)	21 (11.1%)	162 (85.7%)	2 (1.1%)	2.85	.43	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	92 (49.7%)	72 (38.9%)	19 (10.3%)	2 (1.1%)	1.62	.71	n.s
	2nd (186)	81 (43.5%)	83 (44.6%)	22 (11.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1.68	.67	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	2 (1.1%)	7 (3.8%)	98 (53.3%)	77 (41.8%)	3.35	.61	n.s
	2nd (185)	1 (0.5%)	5 (2.7%)	107 (57.8%)	72 (38.9%)	3.35	.56	n.s

2. Child Health Insurance								
		1 No health insurance	2 Has applied for health insurance	3 Health insurance, but hard to maintain	4 Health insurance and we can afford it	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	54 (28.6%)	134 (70.9%)	3.70	.46	n.s
	2nd (189)	2 (1.1%)	1 (0.5%)	53 (28.0%)	133 (70.4%)	3.67	.54	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	1 (0.5%)	2 (1.1%)	147 (79.5%)	25 (18.9%)	3.16	.44	<.05
	2nd (186)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.6%)	131 (70.4%)	52 (28.0%)	3.26	.47	<.05
Scenario 3	Init (184)	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.2%)	21 (11.4%)	159 (86.4%)	3.84	.42	n.s
	2nd (185)	0 (0.0%)	7 (3.8%)	16 (8.6%)	162 (87.6%)	3.83	.46	n.s

3. Community Resources Knowledge								
		1 No knowledge of comm. Programs	2 Minimal knowledge and limited access	3 Aware of and can access programs when needed	4 Currently participating in community program	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	122 (64.6%)	67 (35.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.35	.47	n.s
	2nd (189)	113 (59.8%)	75 (39.7%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.40	.50	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	2 (1.1%)	153 (82.7%)	16 (8.6%)	14 (7.6%)	2.22	.59	n.s
	2nd (186)	2 (1.1%)	144 (77.4%)	18 (9.7%)	22 (11.8%)	2.32	.69	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	1 (0.5%)	10 (5.4%)	133 (72.3%)	40 (21.7%)	3.15	.52	n.s
	2nd (185)	3 (1.6%)	23 (12.4%)	115 (62.2%)	44 (23.8%)	3.08	.65	n.s

4. Health Services								
		1 Medical condition, but I don't seek medical attention	2 I often do not seek medical attention when needed	3 I seek medical attention when needed	4 I seek preventative medical attention	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	1 (0.5%)	17 (9.0%)	165 (86.8%)	7 (3.7%)	2.93	.38	n.s
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	11 (5.8%)	169 (89.4%)	9 (4.8%)	2.98	.32	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	107 (57.8%)	55 (29.7%)	22 (11.9%)	1 (0.5%)	1.55	.72	n.s
	2nd (186)	101 (54.3%)	54 (29.0%)	31 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1.62	.75	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	26 (14.1%)	157 (85.3%)	3.84	.37	n.s
	2nd (185)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	32 (17.3%)	151 (81.6%)	3.80	.45	n.s

5. Budgeting								
		1 Don't know how to budget and not aware of resources	2 Limited knowledge of budgeting and resources	3 Can plan a monthly budget and aware of resources	4 I use a monthly budget and am aware of resources	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	5 (2.6%)	181 (95.8%)	3 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1.98	.20	n.s
	2nd (189)	5 (2.6%)	179 (94.7%)	5 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	2.00	.23	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	181 (97.8%)	3 (1.6%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.02	.19	<.05
	2nd (186)	170 (91.4%)	15 (8.1%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.09	.30	<.05
Scenario 3	Init (184)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	53 (38.8%)	129 (70.1%)	3.68	.51	n.s
	2nd (185)	1 (0.5%)	3 (1.6%)	55 (29.7%)	126 (68.1%)	3.65	.54	n.s

6. Clothing								
		1 No adequate clothing for school	2 Some adequate clothing for school	3 Our clothing is mostly adequate	4 All appropriate clothing for school	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	1 (0.5%)	34 (18.0%)	124 (65.6%)	30 (15.9%)	2.96	.60	<.05
	2nd (189)	6 (3.2%)	24 (12.7%)	108 (57.1%)	51 (27.0%)	3.07	.72	<.05
Scenario 2	Init (185)	1 (0.5%)	5 (2.7%)	29 (15.7%)	150 (81.1%)	3.88	.35	n.s
	2nd (186)	0 (0.0%)	8 (4.3%)	27 (14.5%)	151 (81.2%)	3.76	.51	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.1%)	17 (9.2%)	165 (89.7%)	3.88	.35	n.s
	2nd (185)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	22 (11.9%)	163 (88.1%)	3.88	.32	n.s

7. Employment								
		1 Unemployed and have difficulty finding job	2 I have difficulty keeping a job once hired	3 I am employed	4 I am employed with potential for advancement	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	2 (1.1%)	2 (1.1%)	160 (84.6%)	25 (13.2%)	3.10	.41	n.s.
	2nd (189)	3 (1.6%)	1 (0.5%)	161 (85.2%)	24 (12.7%)	3.08	.43	n.s.
Scenario 2	Init (185)	180 (97.3%)	4 (2.2%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.03	.20	n.s.
	2nd (186)	179 (96.2%)	5 (2.7%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1.04	.26	n.s.
Scenario 3	Init (184)	163 (88.6%)	19 (10.3%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	1.13	.39	n.s.
	2nd (185)	164 (88.6%)	14 (7.6%)	4 (2.2%)	3 (1.6%)	1.16	.53	n.s.

8. Child Care								
		1 No knowledge or access to child care	2 Inconsistent or low- quality child care	3 Mostly dependable child care	4 Access to high quality child care	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	2 (1.1%)	12 (6.3%)	119 (63.0%)	56 (29.6%)	3.21	.59	n.s.
	2nd (189)	2 (1.1%)	10 (5.3%)	127 (67.2%)	50 (26.5%)	3.19	.57	n.s.
Scenario 2	Init (185)	184 (99.5%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.00	.07	n.s.
	2nd (186)	181 (97.3%)	3 (1.6%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1.03	.24	n.s.
Scenario 3	Init (184)	183 (99.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.01	.14	n.s.
	2nd (185)	183 (98.9%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.01	.10	n.s.

9. Risk of Emotional or Sexual Abuse								
		1 Child is exposed to or is witnessing abuse	2 In the past my child was exposed to or has witnessed abuse	3 In the past my child experienced abuse and received support	4 My child is safe from abuse	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	3 (1.6%)	163 (86.2%)	16 (8.5%)	7 (3.7%)	2.14	.47	<.05
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	152 (80.4%)	26 (13.8%)	11 (5.8%)	2.25	.55	<.05
Scenario 2	Init (185)	6 (3.2%)	148 (80.0%)	3 (1.6%)	28 (15.1%)	2.28	.75	n.s
	2nd (186)	6 (3.2%)	145 (78.0%)	6 (3.2%)	29 (15.6%)	2.31	.77	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	173 (94.0%)	5 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (3.3%)	1.12	.55	n.s
	2nd (185)	173 (93.5%)	8 (4.3%)	1 (0.5%)	3 (1.6%)	1.10	.44	n.s

10. Supervision								
		1 Child is seldom supervised by trusted adult	2 Child is sometimes supervised by trusted adult	3 Child is usually supervised by trusted adult	4 Child is always supervised by trusted adult	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	0 (0.0%)	5 (2.6%)	29 (15.3%)	155 (82.0%)	3.79	.46	n.s
	2nd (189)	2 (1.1%)	1 (0.5%)	25 (13.2%)	161 (85.2%)	3.82	.46	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	6 (3.2%)	10 (5.4%)	9 (4.9%)	160 (86.5%)	3.74	.70	n.s
	2nd (186)	3 (1.6%)	14 (7.5%)	21 (11.3%)	148 (79.6%)	3.68	.68	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	4 (2.2%)	24 (13.0%)	39 (21.2%)	117 (63.6%)	3.46	.80	n.s
	2nd (185)	9 (4.9%)	16 (8.6%)	56 (30.3%)	104 (56.2%)	3.37	.83	n.s

11. Appropriate Development								
		1 Child has serious developmental delays	2 Child has some developmental delays	3 Child is meeting developmental skills in most areas	4 Child is meeting developmental skills	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	0 (0.0%)	7 (3.7%)	23 (12.2%)	159 (84.1%)	3.80	.48	n.s
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	7 (3.7%)	21 (11.1%)	161 (85.2%)	3.81	.47	n.s
n.s Scenario 2	Init (185)	103 (55.7%)	77 (41.6%)	4 (2.2%)	1 (0.5%)	1.47	.57	n.s
	2nd (186)	98 (52.7%)	80 (43.0%)	8 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.51	.58	n.s
n.s Scenario 3	Init (184)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	11 (6.0%)	172 (93.5%)	3.92	.27	n.s
	2nd (185)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	8 (4.3%)	176 (95.1%)	3.94	.24	n.s

12. Nutrition								
		1 Child does not receive proper nutrition for his/her age	2 Child receives limited amounts of proper nutrition	3 Child receives nutritious foods at least once a day	4 Child receives nutritious foods throughout day	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (188)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.1%)	185 (98.4%)	3.97	.24	n.s
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	188 (99.5%)	3.99	.07	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	10 (5.4%)	3 (1.6%)	12 (6.5%)	160 (86.5%)	3.74	.74	n.s
	2nd (186)	6 (3.2%)	2 (1.1%)	10 (5.4%)	168 (90.3%)	3.82	.59	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	2 (1.1%)	4 (2.2%)	10 (5.4%)	168 (91.3%)	3.86	.47	n.s
	2nd (185)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.6%)	10 (5.4%)	172 (93.0%)	3.91	.33	n.s

13. Family Communication Skills								
		1 Communication is abusive or cut off	2 Communication is strained	3 Family often communicates respectfully	4 Family communicates openly and respectfully	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	19 (10.1%)	170 (89.9%)	3.89	.30	n.s
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	25 (13.2%)	164 (86.8%)	3.86	.33	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	147 (79.5%)	38 (20.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.20	.40	<.01
	2nd (186)	132 (71.0%)	52 (28.0%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1.30	.48	<.01
Scenario 3	Init (184)	152 (82.6%)	31 (16.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	1.18	.42	n.s
	2nd (185)	149 (80.5%)	35 (18.9%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.20	.41	n.s

14. Emotional Well-being/ Sense of Life Value								
		1 I feel so hopeless it affects my family	2 I often feel unhappy about life; it affects my family	3 I have some disappointments, but it does not affect my family	4 I am happy with my life situation	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	181 (95.8%)	8 (4.2%)	3.04	.20	n.s
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	179 (94.7%)	10 (5.3%)	3.05	.22	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	119 (64.3%)	64 (34.6%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.1%)	1.37	.54	n.s
	2nd (186)	110 (59.1%)	75 (40.3%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.41	.50	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	31 (16.8%)	146 (79.3%)	6 (3.3%)	1 (0.5%)	1.87	.45	n.s
	2nd (185)	32 (17.3%)	145 (78.4%)	7 (3.8%)	1 (0.5%)	1.87	.46	n.s

15. Nurturing								
		1 Unable to support child emotionally or physically	2 At times I have difficulty supporting my child emotionally	3 I am learning to empathize with my child emotionally	4 I respond to my child's emotional and physical needs	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	0 (0.0%)	50 (26.5%)	30 (15.9%)	109 (57.7%)	3.31	.86	<.01
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	30 (15.9%)	31 (16.4%)	128 (67.7%)	3.51	.75	<.01
Scenario 2	Init (185)	86 (46.5%)	94 (50.8%)	5 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1.56	.54	n.s
	2nd (186)	82 (44.1%)	93 (50.0%)	10 (5.4%)	1 (0.5%)	1.62	.61	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	4 (2.2%)	1 (0.5%)	20 (10.9%)	159 (86.4%)	3.81	.54	n.s
	2nd (185)	2 (1.1%)	1 (0.5%)	23 (12.4%)	159 (85.9%)	3.83	.46	n.s

16. Parenting Skills								
		1 I am not confident to parent children	2 I am inconsistent in parenting behavior	3 I am often confident in parenting children	4 I am very confident in my parenting skills	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	146 (77.2%)	41 (21.7%)	3.20	.45	n.s
	2nd (189)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	142 (75.1%)	46 (24.3%)	3.23	.45	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	176 (95.1%)	9 (4.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.04	.21	n.s
	2nd (186)	176 (94.6%)	10 (5.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.05	.22	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	147 (79.9%)	19 (10.3%)	16 (8.7%)	1 (1.1%)	1.30	.67	<.05
	2nd (185)	135 (73.0%)	25 (13.5%)	18 (9.7%)	7 (3.8%)	1.44	.81	<.05

17. Home Environment								
		1 Home is dangerous, unsafe, or unsanitary	2 Home has some areas that are unsafe	3 Home is usually safe and well-maintained	4 Home is safe, healthy, and well-maintained	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (188)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.1%)	186 (98.9%)	3.98	.10	n.s
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.1%)	187 (98.9%)	3.98	.10	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	185 (100%)	4.00	.00	<.05
	2nd (186)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	3 (1.6%)	181 (97.3%)	3.95	.29	<.05
Scenario 3	Init (184)	23 (12.5%)	151 (82.1%)	5 (2.7%)	5 (2.7%)	1.95	.96	<.01
	2nd (185)	45 (24.3%)	131 (70.8%)	5 (2.7%)	4 (2.2%)	1.82	.57	<.01

18. Stability of Home or Shelter								
		1 I am looking for a home or shelter and soon to be in one	2 I live in a home or shelter	3 I've lived in a home for 6 months	4 I've lived in a home for 1 year	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	0 (0.0%)	31 (16.4%)	1 (0.5%)	157 (83.1%)	3.66	.74	<.01
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	21 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	168 (88.9%)	3.77	.63	<.01
Scenario 2	Init (185)	0 (0.0%)	11 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	174 (94.1%)	3.88	.47	n.s
	2nd (186)	0 (0.0%)	9 (4.8%)	0 (0.0%)	177 (95.2%)	3.90	.43	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	77 (41.8%)	23 (12.5%)	81 (44.0%)	3 (1.6%)	2.05	.96	<.05
	2nd (185)	63 (34.1%)	14 (7.6%)	107 (57.8%)	1 (0.5%)	2.24	.93	<.05

19. Support System								
		1 I cannot ask for or receive support from family	2 Can ask for and receive some support	3 Can count on support from family or friends	4 Extensive support system available	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	0 (0.0%)	10 (5.3%)	110 (58.2%)	69 (36.5%)	3.31	.56	<.05
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	11 (5.8%)	89 (47.1%)	89 (47.1%)	3.41	.60	<.05
Scenario 2	Init (185)	88 (47.6%)	95 (51.4%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1.53	.52	<.05
	2nd (186)	74 (39.8%)	107 (57.5%)	5 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1.62	.53	<.05
Scenario 3	Init (184)	1 (0.5%)	103 (56.0%)	71 (38.6%)	9 (4.9%)	2.47	.60	n.s
	2nd (185)	2 (1.1%)	112 (60.5%)	58 (31.4%)	13 (7.0%)	2.44	.64	n.s

20. Presence of Abuse								
		1 Household members abuse illegal or prescription drugs	2 Household members acknowledge substance misuse	3 No substance abuse, or, maybe	4 No history of substance abuse	Mean	Std Dev	P
Scenario 1	Init (189)	0 (0.0%)	8 (4.2%)	181 (95.8%)	0 (0.0%)	2.95	.20	n.s
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	14 (7.4%)	173 (91.5%)	2 (1.1%)	2.93	.28	n.s
Scenario 2	Init (185)	37 (20.0%)	27 (14.6%)	115 (62.2%)	6 (3.2%)	2.48	.84	n.s
	2nd (186)	33 (17.7%)	33 (17.7%)	114 (61.3%)	6 (3.2%)	2.50	.82	n.s
Scenario 3	Init (184)	178 (96.7%)	5 (2.7%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.03	.21	<.01
	2nd (185)	166 (89.7%)	15 (8.1%)	4 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1.12	.39	<.01

Appendix B

1. Access To Transportation							
		1 No access, even for emergencies	2 No access to satisfy needs	3 Limited access	4 Consistent, dependable access	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	6 (1.9%)	29 (9.1%)	276 (86.5%)	8 (2.5%)	2.89	.42
	2nd (189)	4 (1.3%)	21 (11.1%)	162 (85.7%)	2 (1.1%)	2.85	.43
Scenario 2	Init (307)	148 (48.2%)	118 (38.4%)	39 (12.7%)	2 (0.7%)	1.65	.72
	2nd (186)	81 (43.5%)	83 (44.6%)	22 (11.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1.68	.67
Scenario 3	Init (299)	2 (0.7%)	12 (4.0%)	158 (52.8%)	127 (42.5%)	3.37	.59
	2nd (185)	1 (0.5%)	5 (2.7%)	107 (57.8%)	72 (38.9%)	3.35	.56

2. Child Health Insurance							
		1 No health insurance	2 Has applied for health insurance	3 Health insurance, but hard to maintain	4 Health insurance and we can afford it	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	2 (0.6%)	3 (0.9%)	99 (31%)	215 (67.4%)	3.65	.53
	2nd (189)	2 (1.1%)	1 (0.5%)	53 (28%)	133 (70.4%)	3.67	.54
Scenario 2	Init (307)	2 (0.7%)	6 (2.0%)	244 (79.5%)	55 (17.9%)	3.14	.45
	2nd (186)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.6%)	131 (70.4%)	52 (28.0%)	3.26	.47
Scenario 3	Init (299)	2 (0.7%)	9 (3.0%)	32 (10.7%)	256 (85.6%)	3.81	.50
	2nd (185)	0 (0.0%)	7 (3.8%)	16 (5.0%)	162 (87.6%)	3.83	.46

3. Community Resources Knowledge							
		1 No knowledge of comm. Programs	2 Minimal knowledge and limited access	3 Aware of and can access programs when needed	4 Currently participating in community program	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	206 (64.6%)	113 (35.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.35	.47
	2nd (189)	113 (59.8%)	75 (39.7%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.40	.50
Scenario 2	Init (307)	3 (1.0%)	249 (81.1%)	29 (9.4%)	26 (8.5%)	2.25	.61
	2nd (186)	2 (1.1%)	144 (77.4%)	18 (9.7%)	22 (11.8%)	2.32	.69
Scenario 3	Init (299)	2 (0.7%)	21 (7.0%)	207 (69.2%)	69 (23.1%)	3.14	.55
	2nd (185)	3 (1.6%)	23 (12.4%)	115 (62.2%)	44 (23.8%)	3.08	.65

4. Health Services							
		1 Medical condition, but I don't seek medical attention	2 I often do not seek medical attention when needed	3 I seek medical attention when needed	4 I seek preventative medical attention	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	2 (0.6%)	32 (10.0%)	273 (85.6%)	12 (3.8%)	2.92	.39
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	11 (5.8%)	169 (89.4%)	9 (4.8%)	2.98	.32
Scenario 2	Init (307)	166 (54.1%)	106 (34.5%)	34 (11.1%)	1 (0.3%)	1.57	.69
	2nd (186)	101 (54.3%)	54 (29.0%)	31 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1.62	.75
Scenario 3	Init (299)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	50 (16.7%)	248 (82.9%)	3.82	.38
	2nd (185)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	32 (17.3%)	151 (81.6%)	3.80	.45

5. Budgeting							
		1 Don't know how to budget and not aware of resources	2 Limited knowledge of budgeting and resources	3 Can plan a monthly budget and aware of resources	4 I use a monthly budget and am aware of resources	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	10 (3.1%)	303 (95.0%)	6 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1.98	.22
	2nd (189)	5 (2.6%)	179 (94.7%)	5 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	2.00	.23
Scenario 2	Init (307)	297 (96.7%)	9 (2.9%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.03	.20
	2nd (186)	170 (91.4%)	15 (8.1%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.09	.30
Scenario 3	Init (299)	1 (0.3%)	4 (1.3%)	97 (32.4%)	197 (65.9%)	3.63	.52
	2nd (185)	1 (0.5%)	3 (1.6%)	55 (29.7%)	126 (68.1%)	3.65	.54

6. Clothing							
		1 No adequate clothing for school	2 Some adequate clothing for school	3 Our clothing is mostly adequate	4 All appropriate clothing for school	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	2 (0.6%)	58 (18.2%)	206 (64.6%)	53 (16.6%)	2.97	.61
	2nd (189)	6 (3.2%)	24 (12.7%)	108 (57.1%)	51 (27.0%)	3.07	.72
Scenario 2	Init (307)	3 (1.0%)	16 (5.2%)	54 (17.6%)	234 (76.6%)	3.69	.61
	2nd (186)	0 (0.0%)	8 (4.3%)	27 (14.5%)	151 (81.2%)	3.76	.51
Scenario 3	Init (299)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.0%)	43 (14.4%)	253 (84.6%)	3.83	.39
	2nd (185)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	22 (11.9%)	163 (88.1%)	3.88	.32

7. Employment							
		1 Unemployed and have difficulty finding job	2 I have difficulty keeping a job once hired	3 I am employed	4 I am employed with potential for advancement	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	2 (0.6%)	3 (0.9%)	259 (81.2%)	55 (17.2%)	3.15	.42
	2nd (189)	3 (1.6%)	1 (0.5%)	161 (85.2%)	24 (12.7%)	3.08	.43
Scenario 2	Init (307)	292 (95.1%)	11 (3.6%)	3 (1.0%)	1 (0.3%)	1.06	.31
	2nd (186)	179 (96.2%)	5 (2.7%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1.04	.26
Scenario 3	Init (299)	257 (86.0%)	35 (11.7%)	1 (0.3%)	6 (2.0%)	1.18	.52
	2nd (185)	164 (88.6%)	14 (7.6%)	4 (2.2%)	3 (1.6%)	1.16	.53

8. Child Care							
		1 No knowledge or access to child care	2 Inconsistent or low-quality child care	3 Mostly dependable child care	4 Access to high quality child care	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	5 (1.6%)	29 (9.1%)	201 (63.0%)	84 (26.3%)	3.14	.63
	2nd (189)	2 (1.1%)	10 (5.3%)	127 (67.2%)	50 (26.5%)	3.19	.57
Scenario 2	Init (307)	304 (99.0%)	3 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.00	.09
	2nd (186)	181 (97.3%)	3 (1.6%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1.03	.24
Scenario 3	Init (299)	295 (98.7%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.02	.20
	2nd (185)	183 (98.9%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.10	.10

9. Risk of Emotional or Sexual Abuse							
		1 Child is exposed to or is witnessing abuse	2 In the past my child was exposed to or has witnessed abuse	3 In the past my child experienced abuse and received support	4 My child is safe from abuse	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	7 (2.2%)	271 (85.0%)	28 (8.8%)	13 (4.1%)	2.14	.50
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	152 (80.4%)	26 (13.8%)	11 (5.8%)	2.25	.55
Scenario 2	Init (307)	11 (3.6%)	248 (80.8%)	6 (2.0%)	42 (13.7%)	2.25	.73
	2nd (186)	6 (3.2%)	145 (78.0%)	6 (3.2%)	29 (15.6%)	2.31	.77
Scenario 3	Init (299)	278 (93.0%)	11 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (3.3%)	1.13	.56
	2nd (185)	173 (93.5%)	8 (4.3%)	1 (0.5%)	3 (1.6%)	1.10	.44

10. Supervision							
		1 Child is seldom supervised by trusted adult	2 Child is sometimes supervised by trusted adult	3 Child is usually supervised by trusted adult	4 Child is always supervised by trusted adult	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	2 (0.6%)	9 (2.8%)	62 (19.4%)	246 (77.1%)	3.73	.54
	2nd (189)	2 (1.1%)	1 (0.5%)	25 (13.2%)	161 (85.2%)	3.82	.46
Scenario 2	Init (307)	17 (5.5%)	27 (8.85)	16 (5.3%)	247 (80.5%)	3.60	.86
	2nd (186)	3 (1.6%)	14 (7.5%)	21 (11.3%)	148 (79.6%)	3.68	.68
Scenario 3	Init (299)	12 (4.0%)	42 (14.0%)	76 (25.4%)	169 (56.5%)	3.34	.86
	2nd (185)	9 (4.9%)	16 (8.6%)	56 (30.3%)	104 (56.2%)	3.37	.24

11. Appropriate Development							
		1 Child has serious developmental delays	2 Child has some developmental delays	3 Child is meeting developmental skills in most areas	4 Child is meeting developmental skills	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	1 (0.3%)	11 (3.4%)	40 (12.5%)	167 (83.7%)	3.79	.50
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	7 (3.7%)	21 (11.1%)	161 (85.2%)	3.81	.47
Scenario 2	Init (307)	165 (53.7%)	131 (42.7%)	8 (2.6%)	3 (1.0%)	1.50	.60
	2nd (186)	98 (52.7%)	80 (43.0%)	8 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.51	.58
Scenario 3	Init (299)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.7%)	15 (5.0%)	281 (94.0%)	3.92	.31
	2nd (185)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	8 (4.3%)	176 (95.1%)	3.94	.24

12. Nutrition							
		1 Child does not receive proper nutrition for his/her age	2 Child receives limited amounts of proper nutrition	3 Child receives nutritious foods at least once a day	4 Child receives nutritious foods throughout day	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (317)	3 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (3.5%)	303 (95.6%)	3.93	.34
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	188 (99.5%)	3.99	.07
Scenario 2	Init (307)	17 (5.5%)	13 (4.2%)	24 (7.8%)	253 (82.4%)	3.67	.79
	2nd (186)	6 (3.2%)	2 (1.1%)	10 (5.4%)	168 (90.3%)	3.82	.59
Scenario 3	Init (299)	2 (0.7%)	7 (2.3%)	19 (6.4%)	271 (90.6%)	3.86	.44
	2nd (185)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.6%)	10 (5.4%)	172 (93.0%)	3.91	.33

13. Family Communication Skills							
		1 Communication is abusive or cut off	2 Communication is strained	3 Family often communicates respectfully	4 Family communicates openly and respectfully	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	39 (12.2%)	279 (87.5%)	3.86	.36
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	25 (13.2%)	164 (86.8%)	3.86	.33
Scenario 2	Init (307)	246 (80.1%)	59 (19.2%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	1.20	.43
	2nd (186)	132 (71.0%)	52 (28.0%)	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1.30	.48
Scenario 3	Init (299)	252 (84.3%)	46 (15.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	1.16	.39
	2nd (185)	149 (80.5%)	35 (18.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	1.20	.41

14. Emotional Well-being/ Sense of Life Value							
		1 I feel so hopeless it affects my family	2 I often feel unhappy about life; it affects my family	3 I have some disappointments, but it does not affect my family	4 I am happy with my life situation	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	305 (95.6%)	12 (3.8%)	3.02	.22
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	179 (94.7%)	10 (5.3%)	3.05	.22
Scenario 2	Init (307)	204 (66.4%)	99 (32.2%)	2 (0.7%)	2 (0.7%)	1.35	.53
	2nd (186)	110 (59.1%)	75 (40.3%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.41	.50
Scenario 3	Init (299)	60 (20.1%)	299 (76.6%)	9 (3.0%)	1 (0.3%)	1.83	.46
	2nd (185)	32 (17/3%)	145 (78.4%)	7 (3.8%)	1 (0.5%)	1.87	.46

15. Nurturing							
		1 Unable to support child emotionally or physically	2 At times I have difficulty supporting my child emotionally	3 I am learning to empathize with my child emotionally	4 I respond to my child's emotional and physical needs	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	0 (0.0%)	82 (25.7%)	55 (17.2%)	182 (57.1%)	3.31	.85
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	30 (15.9%)	31 (16.4%)	128 (67.7%)	3.51	.75
Scenario 2	Init (307)	136 (44.3%)	158 (51.5%)	13 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.59	.57
	2nd (186)	82 (44.1%)	93 (50.0%)	10 (5.4%)	1 (0.5%)	1.62	.61
Scenario 3	Init (299)	4 (1.3%)	4 (1.3%)	37 (12.4%)	254 (84.9%)	3.80	.51
	2nd (185)	2 (1.1%)	1 (0.5%)	23 (12.4%)	159 (85.9%)	3.83	.46

16. Parenting Skills							
		1 I am not confident to parent children	2 I am inconsistent in parenting behavior	3 I am often confident in parenting children	4 I am very confident in my parenting skills	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.9%)	243 (76.2%)	72 (22.6%)	3.21	.45
	2nd (189)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	142 (75.1%)	46 (24.3%)	3.23	.45
Scenario 2	Init (307)	289 (94.1%)	14 (4.6%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (1.0%)	1.08	.37
	2nd (186)	176 (94.6%)	10 (5.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.05	.22
Scenario 3	Init (299)	227 (75.9%)	42 (14.0%)	28 (9.4%)	2 (0.7%)	1.34	.67
	2nd (185)	135 (73.0%)	25 (13.5%)	18 (9.7%)	7 (3.8%)	1.44	.81

17. Home Environment							
		1 Home is dangerous, unsafe, or unsanitary	2 Home has some areas that are unsafe	3 Home is usually safe and well-maintained	4 Home is safe, healthy, and well-maintained	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (317)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	8 (2.5%)	308 (97.2%)	3.96	.19
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (11.1%)	168 (88.9%)	3.98	.10
Scenario 2	Init (307)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	8 (2.6%)	297 (96.7%)	3.95	.25
	2nd (186)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	3 (1.6%)	181 (97.3%)	3.95	.29
Scenario 3	Init (299)	35 (11.7%)	248 (82.9%)	8 (2.7%)	8 (2.7%)	1.96	.50
	2nd (185)	45 (24.3%)	131 (70.8%)	5 (2.7%)	4 (2.2%)	1.82	.57

18. Stability of Home or Shelter							
		1 I am looking for a home or shelter and soon to be in one	2 I live in a home or shelter	3 I've lived in a home for 6 months	4 I've lived in a home for 1 year	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	0 (0.0%)	57 (17.9%)	6 (1.9%)	256 (80.3%)	3.62	.77
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	21 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	168 (88.9%)	3.77	.63
Scenario 2	Init (307)	0 (0.0%)	23 (7.5%)	3 (1.0%)	281 (91.5%)	3.84	.53
	2nd (186)	0 (0.0%)	9 (4.8%)	0 (0.0%)	177 (95.2%)	3.90	.43
Scenario 3	Init (299)	114 (38.1%)	42 (14.0%)	137 (45.8%)	6 (2.0%)	2.11	.95
	2nd (185)	63 (34.1%)	14 (7.6%)	107 (57.8)	1 (0.5%)	2.24	.93

19. Support System							
		1 I cannot ask for or receive support from family	2 Can ask for and receive some support	3 Can count on support from family or friends	4 Extensive support system available	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	0 (0.0%)	21 (6.6%)	180 (56.4%)	118 (37.0%)	3.30	.58
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	11 (5.8%)	89 (47.1%)	89 (47.1%)	3.41	.60
Scenario 2	Init (307)	148 (48.2%)	154 (50.2%)	5 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1.53	.53
	2nd (186)	74 (39.8%)	107 (57.5%)	5 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1.62	.53
Scenario 3	Init (299)	2 (0.7%)	169 (56.5%)	115 (38.5%)	13 (4.3%)	2.46	.59
	2nd (185)	2 (1.1%)	112 (60.5%)	58 (31.4%)	13 (7.0%)	2.44	.64

20. Presence of Abuse							
		1 Household members abuse illegal or prescription drugs	2 Household members acknowledge substance misuse	3 No substance abuse, or, maybe	4 No history of substance abuse	Mean	Std Dev
Scenario 1	Init (319)	0 (0.0%)	17 (5.3%)	300 (94.0%)	2 (0.6%)	2.95	.23
	2nd (189)	0 (0.0%)	14 (7.4%)	173 (91.5%)	2 (1.1%)	2.93	.28
Scenario 2	Init (307)	58 (18.9%)	62 (20.2%)	173 (56.4%)	14 (4.6%)	2.46	.84
	2nd (186)	33 (17.7%)	33 (17.7%)	114 (61.3%)	6 (3.2%)	2.50	.82
Scenario 3	Init (299)	287 (96.0%)	9 (3.0%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.7%)	1.05	.31
	2nd (185)	166 (89.7%)	15 (8.1%)	4 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1.12	.39

