

# Family Resources Outcomes

## Final Data Report

(March 2021-June 2024)

Partnership for Strong Families' Family Resource Centers

The Partnership for Strong Families operates four Family Resource Centers that are the focus of this report. These include the SWAG Family Resource Center, Library Partnership Resource Center, Cone Park Library Resource Center (all in Gainesville), and the NorthStar Family Resource Center (in Lake City). As part of a broader evaluation study, a sub-group of consenting patrons agreed to complete baseline and follow-up (every 6 months) Family Resource Scale<sup>1</sup>.

All resource center patrons are given the opportunity to participate in the evaluation. Data collection efforts took place between March 2021 and June 2024. Final findings apply to the 245 individuals that consented to participate and completed (at least once) the Family Resource Scale. The Family Resource Scale is a self-report 30 item scale that has a six-factor structure/sub-scales measuring adequacy of existing resources associated with: Personal Growth and Financial Support, Necessities and Healthcare, Physical Necessities and Shelter, Intrafamily Support, Child Care, and Personal Resources. Respondents are asked to identify the level of adequacy associated with each individual resource (if applicable) as experienced by them and their family on a five-point scale where 1=Not at All Adequate, 2=Seldom Adequate, 3=Sometimes Adequate, 4=Usually Adequate, and 5=Almost Always Adequate. The average individual item scores at baseline are reported. Sub-scale scores are calculated for each patron and statistical analyses reveal whether there is any significant change in average subscale scores among a sub-set of patrons that completed follow-up measures.

## Family Resources Scale

The Family Resources Scale has well established reliability and validity and has been utilized extensively as an assessment and measurement tool in resource-based intervention practices and in evaluation/research studies of these practices to gauge the impact of the identification and mobilization of resources on a series of desired outcomes for families with children (Dunst & Leet, 1994; 1987; 1985; and Sexton and Rush, 2012). The scale is administered to adult household members that are consenting participants for the study, including those that are parents/caregivers. Although average individual item scores can be contrasted against the descriptive anchors associated with a measure of adequacy, there are no normative score threshold standards for interpreting subscale scores. Change in average scores are recommended measures for gauging change in level of adequacy for each category of family resources. The number of individual items represented by each subscale ranges from a low of two (for three subscales, including Intrafamily Support, Child Care, and Personal Resources) to a high of nine for Growth and Support resources (see table on next page).

Among the 245 consenting patrons (across all Family Resource Centers) that agreed to participate in the evaluation, all (n=245) completed in whole or part the baseline measure of the Family Resource Scale. When average individual resource items are examined at baseline, only one resource (when average score is rounded) receives a score that suggests it is “usually adequate” (18. Telephone or access to a phone) with no resource receiving a score suggesting it was “almost always adequate” On average, **resources deemed not at all adequate** include: 19. Babysitting for your child(ren), 20. Childcare/day care for your child(ren), and 21. Money to buy special equipment/ supplies for child(ren). On average, **several resources are deemed as seldom adequate**, including: 8. Good job for yourself or spouse/ partner, 10. Public assistance (SSI, AFDC, Medicaid, etc.), 17. Time to be with spouse/partner or close friend, 22. Dental care for your family, 26. Toys for your child(ren), 27. Money to buy things for self, 28. Money for family entertainment, 29. Money to save, and 30. Time and money for travel/vacation. Many **resources were deemed sometimes adequate**, including:

1. Food for two meals a day	12. Time to get enough sleep/rest
2. House or apartment	13. Furniture for your home or apartment
3. Money to buy necessities	14. Time to be by yourself
4. Clothes for your family	15. Time for family to be together
5. Heat for your house or apartment	16. Time to be with your child(ren)
6. Indoor plumbing/water	23. Someone to talk to
7. Money to pay monthly bills	24. Time to socialize
9. Medical care for your family	25. Time to keep in shape and looking nice
11. Dependable transportation (own car or provided by others)	

## Family Resource Scale

### Average Baseline Scores (and Standard Deviation) for Patrons (n= 240-245)

A. Item Scores	Growth & Support	Necessities & Health	Physical Necessities & Shelter	Intrafamily Support	Child Care	Personal Resources
1. Food for two meals a day			3.75 (1.53) Sometimes Adequate			
2. House or apartment			3.68 (1.67) Sometimes Adequate			
3. Money to buy necessities		3.10 (1.58) Sometimes Adequate				
4. Clothes for your family		3.42 (1.55) Sometimes Adequate				
5. Heat for your house or apartment			3.66 (1.71) Sometimes Adequate			
6. Indoor plumbing/water			3.71 (1.74) Sometimes Adequate			
7. Money to pay monthly bills		3.27 (1.53) Sometimes Adequate				
8. Good job for yourself or spouse/partner						2.15 (2.02) Seldom Adequate
9. Medical care for your family		3.48 (1.76) Sometimes Adequate				
10. Public assistance (SSI, AFDC, Medicaid, etc.)			2.90 (2.02) Seldom Adequate			
11. Dependable transportation (own car or provided by others)			3.34 (1.74) Sometimes Adequate			
12. Time to get enough sleep/rest						3.24 (1.54) Sometimes Adequate
13. Furniture for your home or apartment			3.41 (1.78) Sometimes Adequate			
14. Time to be by yourself	3.15 (1.58) Sometimes Adequate					
15. Time for family to be together				3.33 (1.58) Sometimes Adequate		
16. Time to be with your child(ren)				3.18 (1.92) Sometimes Adequate		
17. Time to be with spouse/partner or close friend	2.64 (1.89) Seldom Adequate					
18. Telephone or access to a phone			3.96 (1.47) Usually Adequate			
19. Babysitting for your child(ren)					1.41 (1.879) Not at All Adequate	
20. Child care/day care for your child(ren)					1.33 (1.95) Not at All Adequate	
21. Money to buy special equipment/supplies for child(ren)		1.91 (1.89) Seldom Adequate				
22. Dental care for your family		2.96 (1.82) Sometimes Adequate				
23. Someone to talk to	3.26 (1.60) Sometimes Adequate					
24. Time to socialize	3.05 (1.58) Sometimes Adequate					
25. Time to keep in shape and looking nice	3.10 (1.55) Sometimes Adequate					
26. Toys for your child(ren)		2.05 (2.05) Seldom Adequate				
27. Money to buy things for self	2.76 (1.47) Seldom Adequate					
28. Money for family entertainment	2.55 (1.62) Seldom Adequate					
29. Money to save	2.18 (1.53) Seldom Adequate					
30. Time and money for travel/vacation	1.98 (1.54) Seldom Adequate					

# Family Resources: Baseline and Follow-up Measures

Follow-up measures for the Family Resource Scale (total scores and sub-scale scores) exist for up to 154 patrons. When the baseline and follow-up average scores for each resource subscale are examined, a series of paired samples t-tests (two-sided) suggests no significant change (increase or decrease) for six family resource categories for patrons within each FRC and as an aggregate, with two exceptions. Those participants that utilized the Library Partnership RC reported statistically higher levels of intrafamily support since receiving supports and services; whereas those participants that utilized Cone Park Library Resource Center had a statistically significant reduction in level of physical necessities and shelter.

PSF Family Resource Center	Family Resource Subscales					
	Average Baseline   Follow-up Scores					
	Growth & Support	Necessities & Health	Physical Necessities & Shelter	Intrafamily Support	Childcare	Personal Resources
SWAG FRC (n=56-62)	25.90   24.07	20.63   20.48	29.89   28.93	6.98   6.48	2.92   3.45	5.77   5.52
Library Partnership RC (n=21-22)	22.53   23.52	20.91   20.41	27.68   30.36	5.91   7.36	2.09   1.95	4.46   5.05
Cone Park FRC (n=26-27)	25.37   24.19	21.00   20.81	29.63   26.82	7.33   7.78	2.70   2.89	5.48   4.89
NorthStar FRC (n=42-43)	27.33   27.31	21.48   21.05	30.37   29.32	6.42   7.17	2.35   1.65	5.14   5.40
Total (All FRCs, n=146-154)	25.73   24.93	20.98   20.69	29.66   28.88	6.74   6.85	2.60   2.64	5.36   5.31

When the average total family resource score is examined, there was no significant change (increase or decrease) between the baseline and follow-up scores (using a paired samples t-tests) for patrons within each FRC and as an aggregate.

PSF Family Resource Center	Family Resource Scale
	Total Resource Scores
	Average Baseline   Follow-up
SWAG FRC (n=52)	93.77   91.61
Library Partnership FRC (n=21)	83.19   88.05
Cone Park FRC (n=26)	91.88   88.73
NorthStar FRC (n=38)	97.89   91.71
Total (All FRCs, n=137)	92.93   90.55

A series of supplemental paired samples t-tests (one and two-sided) were conducted on individual resource items identified above at baseline to be *not at all adequate* or *seldom adequate*. Results indicated that there was no statistically significant change (increase or decrease) from baseline until the latest completion of the Family Resources Scale for any of these individual resource items.

## Gauging Representativeness of Existing Study Sample

The number of study participants (n=245) is very low in contrast with the total number of non-duplicate (verified) count of total patrons (2.0% of N=12,343) that received services across all FRCs between 2021 and 2023. Participation was voluntary. The response rate was low despite developed efforts to engage with (including the use of incentives) and inform all patrons seeking services of evaluation efforts, including participation in the collection of outcome data involving survey activities. Limited participation was influenced by a number of factors, including (but not limited to): the impact of COVID upon service delivery and in-person dissemination and engagement efforts, the fact that 48.5% (n=5,991) of total (identified) patrons sought services only once during the three year period, and general resistance/inherent concern of patrons within the communities served (corroborated through qualitative means/interviews) to participate in research/evaluation studies and/or disclosure of personal information to any third party.

Regardless, equivalency tests were conducted to aid in understanding how the study sample differs from the total population on select variables. The percentage of females represented in the study (79.8%) was significantly higher from those patrons that were not in the study (67.5%), with the percentage of males in the study (20.2%) being significantly lower than the proportion of males not in the study (31.9%). Among the three most represented race/ethnic groups, the percentage of patrons in the study versus not in the study that self-identified as Black or African American (non-Hispanic origin) (75.6% and 65.3% respectively) and White (non-Hispanic) patrons (14.0% and 21.7% respectively) were significantly different with an overrepresentation of Black patrons and underrepresentation of White patrons in the study. The observed differences in representation of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin in versus excluded from the study (6.2% and 7.3% respectively) did not differ significantly<sup>2</sup>.

Further, a series of independent samples t-tests (both equal and non-equal variances assumed) found a significant difference in the average age of patrons, where those in the study were (on average) older (Mean=47.13 years) than those not in the study (Mean=39.81 years). Finally, those in the study (see table below) also had a significantly greater average number of service requests at resource centers between 2021 and 2023 for services associated with Concrete Supports, Parental Resilience, Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development, Social Connections, and all Protective Factor categories combined. For example, on average, study participants requested 27.24 Concrete Supports and 35.58 total services between 2021 and 2023 in contrast to 3.35 and 5.11 (respectively) from non-study patrons. Study participants had accessed services and supports on an exponentially greater scale than non-participants suggesting a higher level of expressed need and greater contact and familiarity with FRC operations.



## Gauging Representativeness of Existing Study Sample

**Table 1: Average Number of Service Request Comparisons Between Patrons Enrolled in Outcome Evaluation and Other Patrons (2021-2023)**

Protective Factor Service Categories	In Study Group	Mean / Average	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T-Test Statistic (Unequal Variance Assumption)	p-value (two-sided)
Concrete Support in Times of Need	No (N=12,097)	3.35	7.132	0.065	-11.32	<.001
	Yes (N=245)	27.24	32.988	2.108		
Parental Resilience	No (N=12,097)	0.23	0.768	0.007	-7.67	<.001
	Yes (N=245)	2.47	4.552	0.29		
Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development	No (N=12,097)	0.07	0.599	0.005	-4.3	<.001
	Yes (N=245)	0.53	1.688	0.108		
Social and Emotional Competence of Children	No (N=12,097)	1.16	12.417	0.113	1.04	0.297
	Yes (N=245)	0.9	3.359	0.215		
Social Connections	No (N=12,097)	0.3	4.992	0.045	-2.58	0.01
	Yes (N=245)	4.45	25.127	1.608		
All Categories of Services Combined	No (N=12,097)	5.11	15.831	0.144	-10.07	<.001
	Yes (N=245)	35.58	47.294	3.022		

<sup>1</sup> This project is IRB approved (Advarra IRB: Children's Bureau, Protocol Number PSF-2021-CB). For more detailed information regarding the evaluation protocol and study methodology, please see Perry, R. (2021). *Family Resource Center Model Evaluation*, Protocol Number PSF-2021-CB. Tallahassee: Institute for Child and Family Services Research. For more detailed information regarding the Family Resource Scale see Winterberry Assessment Scales and Instruments (<https://www.wbpress.com/product-category/assessment-scales-and-instruments/>) and cited references, including:

Dunst, C. J., and H. E. Leet (1994). Measuring the Adequacy of Resources in Households with Young Children. In Carl J. Dunst, Carol M. Trivette, and Angela G. Deal (Eds.). *Supporting and Strengthening Families, Vol. I: Methods, Strategies, and Practices*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

Dunst, C. J., and H. E. Leet (1987). Measuring the Adequacy of Resources in Households with Young Children. *Child Care, Health, and Development*, 13, 111-125.

Dunst, C.J. and Leet, H.E. (1985). *Family Resources Scale: Reliability and Validity*. Morgantown, NC: Winterberry Press.

Sexton, S. and Rush, D. (2012). *The Family Resources Support Guide*. Morgantown, NC: Center for the Advanced Study of Excellence in Early Childhood and Family Support Practices.

<sup>2</sup> Z-score calculations for two independent proportions were used. For Black and African American population proportion comparisons  $z = -3.34$ ,  $p = .00084$ . The result is significant at  $p < .05$ . For White population proportion comparisons  $z = 2.8713$ ,  $p = .0041$ . The result is significant at  $p < .05$ . For Test for Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin population proportion comparisons  $z = 0.676$ ,  $p = .4965$ . The result is not significant at  $p < .05$ .



**This report was funded by the Children's Bureau; Administration on Children, Youth, and Families; Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, under grant # 90CA1868. The contents of this report are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Children's Bureau.**

Suggested Citation: Perry, R. (2024). *Family Resources Outcomes: Final Data Report (March 2021-June 2024) Partnership for Strong Families' Family Resource Centers*. Tallahassee: Institute for Child and Family Services Research.