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Abstract

Families of young people with chronic illnesses are more likely to experience higher levels of stress. In turn, their ability to cope with multiple demands is likely to affect young people’s adaptation. The purpose of this study was to examine psychometric properties of the Family Resilience Assessment Scale (FRAS), an assessment tool that measures the construct of family resilience. A total of 152 young people with epilepsy, aged 13 to 16 years old, from KK Women’s and Children’s Hospital, Singapore, completed the FRAS along with Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem scale. Factor structure of the FRAS was examined. Exploratory factor analysis resulted in a 7-factor solution – Meaning making and Positive outlook; Transcendence and spirituality; Flexibility and Connectedness; Social and economic resources (community); Social and economic resources (neighbors); Clarity and Open emotional expression; Collaborative problem-solving – accounting for 83.0% of the variance. Internal consistency of the scale was high (α=0.92). Family resilience was significantly correlated with higher levels of self-esteem. Our study provides preliminary findings that suggest FRAS is a reliable and valid scale for assessing the construct of family resilience among young people with epilepsy in Singapore.
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1. Introduction

Studies have shown that young people with epilepsy are three to nine times more likely to have poorer outcomes when compared to healthy peers, young people with other medical conditions and/or their siblings [1-3]. The impact of epilepsy is not restricted to individuals but is also extended to their families. Having a child with epilepsy is likely to place additional stress and burden on families in coping with unpredictable patterns of seizure occurrence, seizure severity, and complexities of medical treatment. Thus, living with a family member affected by epilepsy is likely to have an impact on family functioning.

Preventing and reducing psychosocial problems in young people with chronic illnesses have been of interest to both researchers and practitioners [4]. As young people are situated within several systems, such as families, peers and schools, it is necessary to consider these influences on young people’s adaptation [5]. Family functioning, which plays a significant role in young people’s adaptation, has been identified as one of the modifiable processes for intervention [6, 7]. Compared to their peers, young people with epilepsy had poorer parent-child relationships, greater problems with family functioning (e.g., poorer communication between family members, lower family cohesion), higher levels of stress and conflict within their families [8]. Associations between family functioning and a range of psychosocial and health outcomes in young people with epilepsy has also been demonstrated. Poorer levels of family functioning have been shown to predict higher levels of behavioral problems [9, 10], lower self-esteem [11], social competencies [10, 12], academic achievement [13, 14], and treatment adherence [15, 16].

Overall, these findings demonstrate the influence of family functioning on young people’s outcomes. However, the number of studies that examined family influences on young people’s outcomes is lacking. Among quantitative studies that examined relationships between family factors and psychosocial outcomes, most used parent reports to measure family functioning. In addition, these studies often adopt a deficit perspective and utilize assessment measures that focus on family pathology. This is in contrast with the proliferation of literature in areas of individual and family resilience that emphasizes a strengths perspective. Alongside the proliferation of research in the area of resilience, a range of scales is available for measuring this construct [17]. However, the majority focus on identifying individual traits (e.g., personality) and intrapersonal factors (e.g., emotional
regulation) and fail to consider the influence of higher level systemic factors, such as family processes. Commonly used assessment measures, such as Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales (FACES-IV), Family Assessment Device (FAD), and Family Assessment Measure (FAM), may not be suitable for examining resilience prompting processes as they focus on family dysfunction. There are several measures for families with an explicit focus on strengths, such as Family Resource Scale and Family Support Scale [18], yet these measures identify sources of support and do not focus on specific family processes.

Therefore, with an increasing emphasis on resilience, there is a need for assessment measures to reflect the construct of family resilience, instead of dysfunction. Sixbey [19] responded to this need by developing the Family Resilience Assessment Scale (FRAS), which measures family resilience as conceptualized by Walsh [20], to aid understanding in how families deal and cope with adversity. According to Walsh [20], there are nine key processes within three domains of family functioning that promote family resilience. In the first domain of family functioning – family beliefs – processes that promote resilience include making meaning of adversity, positive outlook, and transcendence and spirituality. Processes that foster resilience in the second domain of family functioning – organizational patterns – are flexibility in a family’s structure, connectedness among family members and utilization of social and economic resources. The third dimension of family functioning – communication – involves processes that have clarity, involve open emotional expression, and facilitate collaborative problem-solving [20]. Sixbey’s family resilience measure (i.e., FRAS) has six subscales, which measured these nine family processes [19].

The FRAS, which was developed in the United States, offers promising potential utility in measuring family resilience. It provides researchers and practitioners with a tool to assess, plan and evaluate interventions designed to promote family resilience and its influence on young people’s outcomes. Therefore, it is essential for this measure to be reliable and valid when used with other populations from different cultures. However, as meanings of constructs such as family resilience are likely to vary across cultures, it begs the question of whether there is conceptual equivalence when using Western-developed measurement scales instead of developing culturally specific instruments. Several studies used FRAS as a measure of family resilience [21-27]. When reported, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for FRAS ranged between 0.76 and 0.93 [23, 25, 26]. Of these studies, only Kaya and Arici [23]
examined the factor structure of FRAS and found a four-factor structure instead of the original six-factor structure. In order to address concerns regarding FRAS’ factor structure, a more thorough analysis of its psychometric properties is warranted. Hence, the aim of this study was to examine the reliability and validity of the FRAS in Singapore, a multi-cultural population where the measure has yet to be tested.

2. Methods

2.1 Participants

Between November 2013 and August 2014, young people who met the following criteria: (i) diagnosed with epilepsy, (ii) aged between 13 and 16 years old, and (iii) attending mainstream school, were recruited from the pediatric neurology services in KK Women’s and Children’s Hospital, Singapore (KKH). KKH is an 830-bed academic healthcare institution that provides specialized pediatric and women’s healthcare services. It is one of two public hospitals in Singapore with a pediatric neurology unit providing inpatient and outpatient services, such as diagnosis and management of young people with epilepsy [28].

2.2 Procedures

SingHealth Centralised Institutional Review Board approved this study. Consent was obtained from young people and their parents. Young people completed the survey while waiting to see their physicians at KKH.

2.3 Measures

Only young people completed self-reported measures of family resilience and self-esteem. They also provided individual-level demographic data, while their parents provided family-level data, such as household income and family structure. Physicians provided clinical information on number of medications, seizure frequency, and their assessment of seizure control (i.e., whether seizures were effectively controlled by AED).

2.3.1 Family Resilience Assessment Scale (FRAS)
As mentioned, FRAS measures the construct of family resilience, specifically, processes that support a family's ability to cope successfully with adversity [19]. Although the 54-item FRAS was developed to measure nine distinct family processes as conceptualized by Walsh [20], Sixbey's original study demonstrated a six-factor solution instead [19]. These six subscales include; (i) family communication and problem solving (e.g., ‘We consult with each other about decisions’), (ii) utilizing social and economic resources (e.g., ‘We ask neighbors for help and assistance’), (iii) maintaining a positive outlook (e.g., ‘We trust things will work out even in difficult times’), (iv) family connectedness (e.g., ‘We show love and affection for family members’), (v) family spirituality (e.g., ‘We attend prayers/services at temple/mosque/church/other places of worship’), and (vi) ability to make meaning of adversity (e.g., ‘We accept that stressful events as part of life’). Respondents indicated on a 4-point Likert scale, which ranged from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 4 (Strongly agree), rating their level of agreement with statements that describe family processes. Four items were negatively phrased (33, 37, 45, and 50) and were reversed scored before summing all items to obtain a total score for family resilience. The total score range for FRAS lies between 54 and 216, with higher scores indicative of higher levels of family resilience. Similarly, subscale scores were obtained through the summation of values for items in each subscale. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for total and subscales are reported in Table 2a.

2.3.2 Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSS)

Young people’s global self-esteem was measured with Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSS) [29]. This 10-item scale evaluates global self-esteem through positive and negative perceptions of self. Examples of positive and negative worded items are, ‘On the whole, I am satisfied with myself’ and ‘At times I think I am no good at all’, respectively. Respondents rated each item on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 4 (Strongly agree). Items that reflected negative perceptions were reverse scored (3, 5, 8, 9, and 10) and all 10 items were summed to provide a total score that range between 10 and 40. Higher scores are indicative of higher levels of global self-esteem, i.e. a positive sense of one’s value as a person [29]. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was 0.90.

2.3.3 Illness severity
The severity of young people’s illness has been determined based on: (i) seizure types, (ii) seizure frequency, and (iii) number of AED and its side effects [30-33]. Often, composite scores were derived from these classifications. In this study, illness severity was operationalized as the extent to which young people’s seizures were controlled by AED use: (i) No seizures, AED not required (Low); (ii) Seizures controlled with AED (Moderate); and (iii) Seizures despite AED (High).

2.4 Data analysis

2.4.1 Exploratory factor analysis

Exploratory factor analysis with principal axis factoring was conducted to examine the factor structure of FRAS. Based on existing recommendations, a reasonable absolute minimum sample size of 50 was required to yield reliable results from an exploratory factor analysis [34, 35]. Additionally, simulation studies demonstrated that sample size adequacy is partly determined by the nature of the data [35-37], thus, factor-to-variable ratio (over-determination) and communality of variables were examined to determine whether the current sample size was sufficient.

Prior to conducting an EFA, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin’s (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of sphericity were used to determine if the data was suitable for factor analysis [36]. Kaiser’s criterion (eigenvalues≥1.0), percentage of variance accounted by the number of factors, and scree plots were used to determine the number of factors to be retained [36]. In addition to orthogonal (varimax) rotation, oblique (direct oblimin) rotation method was used as family processes were hypothesized to be interrelated. Individual items were retained if its factor loading on a single factor was above 0.4, and had at least a 0.2 difference from other factors. Missing variables (n=7) were excluded listwise and the final sample used for EFA was 145.

2.4.2 Reliability and validity

Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was used to assess the internal consistency of FRAS and its subscales. A high Cronbach coefficient value (α>0.70) was indicative of a reliable measure [38]. To evaluate validity of FRAS scores, we examined associations between FRAS and theoretically relevant variables such as self-esteem and illness severity. Based on existing evidence, we hypothesized that young people with higher self-esteem report correspondingly higher levels of family resilience [39-41].
In contrast, young people who experienced greater illness severity would have significantly lower levels of family resilience [8, 10, 42-45]. Correlational analyses were performed to establish the statistical significance of relationships between measures of family resilience and young people’s self-esteem. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with post-hoc comparisons were conducted to test the hypothesis that young people with higher illness severity had lower levels of family resilience. Hochberg’s GT2 post-hoc test was used, as group sizes were different. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 21.0.

3. Results

A total of 176 young people were invited and 156 participated in this study (response rate of 88.6%). No further information is available on the twenty young people who declined participation. Scores from 152 young people (79 males, 73 females) were included in the analyses, as four questionnaires were incomplete. Clinical and demographic characteristics of this sample of young people are presented in Table 1.

3.1 Preliminary analysis

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistic was 0.85, which is above the minimum criterion of 0.5, indicating that the sample size is adequate for factor analysis. In addition, KMO values for individual items, which were greater than 0.63, were above the minimum acceptable limit of 0.5 [38]. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2=11021.51, p<0.001$), indicating that FRAS items were adequately correlated for a factor analysis to be performed.

3.2 Exploratory factor analysis

Exploratory factor analyses using principal axis factoring were conducted, and similar results were obtained from varimax and oblimin rotations. Both rotations yielded seven factors, accounting for 80.56% of the variance. There was no difference in patterns of item loadings for each rotation, i.e., individual FRAS items loaded onto the same factors. However, the seven-factor solution produced a factor with only two items (Factor 7). When allowed to correlate, through the use of direct oblimin rotation, correlation between factors ranged between -0.57 (Factor 2 and Factor 6) and 0.36 (Factor 4 and Factor 7). This provides evidence that the constructs are interrelated, with each factor measuring
a unique aspect of family resilience. As recommended by Henson and Roberts (2006), both pattern and structure matrices derived from the EFA through use of an oblique rotation method, are presented in Table 2(a) and (b).

The results from the EFA did not support Sixbey’s six-factor structure of the FRAS. Instead, a seven-factor solution emerged from the analyses. Upon examination, it was noted that these factors and its corresponding items had closer approximation to Walsh’s family resilience framework. On this basis, it was concluded that the current seven-factor solution provided a better representation of family resilience. A summary of FRAS item classifications according to Walsh’s conceptual framework, the six-factor and seven-factor solutions yielded from Sixbey’s and this current study are presented in Table 3.

3.3 Reliability and validity

Internal consistency for the total FRAS scale was high with Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.92. As all 54 items had factor loadings greater than 0.40, they were summated according to their respective factors to form FRAS sub-scales. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of these subscales, which ranged between 0.93 and 0.97, are reported in Table 2a.

As hypothesized, there was a significant positive relationship between family resilience (i.e., FRAS total scale score) and self-esteem, \( r=0.58, p<0.001 \). Young people who reported higher levels of family resilience also had higher levels of self-esteem. One-way ANOVA revealed significant differences in young people’s family resilience across illness severity conditions, \( F(2,142)=4.84, p<0.01 \). Hochberg’s GT2 post-hoc comparisons indicated that young people who had seizures despite medication (high illness severity) had significantly lower levels of family resilience when compared to those who did not have seizures (low or moderate severity). However, there was no significant difference in average FRAS scores between young people with low and those with moderate illness severity.

4. Discussion

4.1 Factor structure of FRAS
The objective of this study was to examine the psychometric properties of FRAS. Sixbey's original FRAS six-factor structure was not replicated. Instead, a seven-factor solution emerged from the exploratory factor analysis and it reflected dimensions of family resilience put forward by Walsh’s conceptual framework [20]. These seven factors – Meaning-making and Positive outlook; Transcendence and spirituality; Flexibility and Connectedness; Resources – Community; Resources – Neighbors; Clarity and Open emotional expression; Collaborative problem-solving – accounted for approximately 83% of the total variance with factor loadings ranging from 0.40 to 0.91. The total FRAS scale also demonstrated good internal consistency, suggesting that the 54-items functioned collectively to characterize the concept of family resilience.

There are various reasons that could account for the lack of distinction between processes within Walsh’s conceptualization of specific family functioning domains, for example, items measuring family beliefs of meaning-making and positive outlook loaded onto a single factor instead of two. Thus, it may be possible that FRAS items measure a single construct instead of distinct family processes. Another reason might be that these items may not be sufficiently distinct to differentiate various concepts of family processes. For example, young people may have interpreted the statement, ‘We can work through difficulties as a family’, as an indication of their families’ ability to resolve problems instead of reflecting their family beliefs. Third, the relationship between processes belonging to the same family functioning domain may have masked distinctions, resulting in extraction of a single factor. For instance, it is possible that a positive relationship between key communication processes such as ‘Clarity’ and ‘Open emotional expression’, exists. It is likely for families, which encourage expression of emotions (e.g., ‘We can ventilate at home without upsetting someone’) would also tend to adopt processes that encourage clarity in communication between family members (e.g., ‘We can be honest and direct with each other in our family’). Concurrently, there may be a small number of families with high levels of clarity in their communication, but were less open in their expression of emotions or vice versa. This lack of heterogeneity among communication processes within families of the current sample may be one reason why a single factor was extracted instead of two.

It is of interest to note that items describing ‘Social and economic resources’ loaded onto two distinct but correlated factors. Based on further examination of these items, it is postulated that young people made a distinction between the availability of community resources (Factor 4) and the extent to which
their families actually sought and received help from their neighbors (Factor 7). Another possible reason for the distinction between factors is Asian families, such as Chinese and Indians, tend to rely either on themselves [46] or on extended family members [47], instead of their neighbors.

4.2 Reliability and validity

There was low to moderate correlation between two pairs of subscales, ‘Flexibility and Connectedness’ and ‘Collaborative problem-solving’; ‘Resources – Community’ and ‘Resources – Neighbors’. These correlations suggest young people’s perceptions of family processes were related but also conceptually distinct. Furthermore, it indicates that these subscales measure different aspects of family resilience and supports the theoretical understanding of resilience as a multidimensional construct [20, 48].

It appears the dimensionality of FRAS differed across countries in which its factor structure has been examined. Kaya and Arici [23] conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to examine the factor structure of the Turkish version of FRAS. Results from their analysis did not support the original six-factor structure but demonstrated a four-factor structure instead. One reason behind this diversity could be differences in meanings of family resilience. Processes that foster resilience within families, such as receiving aid from extended families versus neighbors and communities, may be dependent on cultural contexts. Sample characteristics is another issue to consider when attempting to explain differences in dimensions of family resilience. For example, Sixbey [19] recruited participants ranging between 16 and 77 years old (mean=36.2 years). Kaya and Arici [23] recruited university students with an average age of approximately 22 years old. In contrast, the average age of young people in this study was 15 years. Participants’ age may reflect corresponding family life cycles and potential variations in family processes during each period. In turn, these differences could be reflected in the different FRAS structures.

Significant associations found between FRAS scores and measures of young people’s self-esteem and illness severity, provide support for concurrent validity. As hypothesized, there was a strong positive relationship between family resilience and self-esteem, where young people who reported higher levels of self-esteem also perceived higher levels of resilience within their families. These results are similar to findings in previous studies that examined the relationship between young
people’s self-esteem and family functioning [40, 41, 49, 50]. It is possible that these family processes supported young people’s efforts in managing illness-related demands and influenced how they viewed themselves. The significant relationship between family resilience and young people’s self-esteem underscores the importance of considering family factors when attempting to understand factors influencing psychosocial adaptation to a chronic condition such as epilepsy. Therefore, future research should continue to examine the influence of family factors on young people’s outcomes. In particular, young people’s perspectives regarding their families and its processes, as there is a lack of research in this area.

Family resilience was significantly lower among those who continued to have seizures despite AED, compared to young people who achieved seizure control. This is similar to results from existing studies that examined family functioning among young people with chronic illnesses [42-45]. For example, greater neurological impairment was associated with higher levels of conflict and less supportive family relationships within the family [45]. This contributes to the growing evidence that the demands of epilepsy is likely to have a negative effect on young people and their families. Taken together, this suggests that family processes are potential targets for interventions. Young people and their families who exhibit moderate to high distress, particularly those who fail to achieve seizure control despite medication could receive additional support services to promote positive outcomes.

Findings from this study have implications for practitioners who provide psychosocial interventions for young people with epilepsy. With empirical evidence indicating that the FRAS is a reliable and valid measure, practitioners could utilize this tool to measure and identify family processes, and in turn, provide valuable information needed to develop interventions aimed at promoting resilience. Additionally, it can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of these interventions.

4.3 Methodological considerations

The relatively small sample size (n=145) and low ratio of participants to number of variables (2.7:1) may raise concerns about the EFA factor solution, as both do not meet traditional recommendations regarding required sample sizes for factor analyses. However, there remain differing opinions on adequate or acceptable sample sizes [35-37]. Early recommendations either emphasized minimum sample size (e.g., at least 200) or a required ratio of participants to number of variables. Based on
findings from simulation studies, several authors argued that greater emphasis on high factor over-
determination and communality of variables, instead [34, 35, 37, 51]. Although large samples are
beneficial, EFA should not be ruled out on the sole basis of a small sample size [34, 35]. Item
communalities of 54 items in FRAS ranged from 0.6 to 0.9 and these values were considered to be
high [52]. With the exception of one factor, the remaining six factors had at least 4 variables with
factor loadings of 0.8, indicative of high over-determination of factors. Despite the relatively small
sample size, conditions such as high communalities among variables and high factor over-
determination were met. Therefore, we have confidence that factor solutions in this study are reliable.

4.4 Limitations of this study and future research

Existing limitations of this study should be taken into consideration. First, due to a small sample size,
only an EFA was performed. It is recognized that using subsets of the data for confirmatory factor
analyses would have provided additional evidence to either corroborate or contradict EFA findings.
However, this was not feasible due to the sample size of this study. Second, the FRAS factor
structure was derived from a clinical sample. Further research among the general population of young
people and adult population is necessary to determine if the current structure is invariant across
different populations. Third, the present study used a cross-sectional design and no assessments
were made to determine whether the seven-factor structure was constant over time. Assessments of
test-retest reliability in future studies could provide insight to the stability of this measure. Fourth, the-exclusive reliance on self-reports may give rise to common method variance, e.g., social desirability
and acquiescence. Future research could minimise such variances by obtaining data from various
sources such as their family members. Supplementing young people's views by obtaining data from
other sources such as parents, siblings or significant others, is likely to be beneficial. The
convergence or divergence of data obtained from multiple perspectives provides valuable information
of different aspects of family processes. For instance, differences in family members' perspective
regarding family processes could also suggest conflicting expectations and needs [53-55]. Left
unresolved, these differences could lead to increased stress and conflict within families.

5. Conclusion
In conclusion, these findings provide preliminary evidence that FRAS is an adequate family resilience measure for use among young people with epilepsy in Singapore. The seven-factor FRAS structure reflects the construct of family resilience as theorized by Walsh and can be used to facilitate practitioners’ assessments of and supporting families in harnessing processes that foster resilience in order to meet epilepsy-related challenges.
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Table 1. Characteristics of young people who participated in the survey ($n=152$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-level demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, mean ± SD</td>
<td>15.0 ± 1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(52.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>(48.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(62.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(24.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Arab, Burmese)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and siblings</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>(88.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents, siblings and relatives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent and siblings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent, siblings and relatives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young person’s medical information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at which young person was diagnosed with epilepsy (mean ± SD, range)</td>
<td>8.79 ± 3.94</td>
<td>(≤1-16 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years with epilepsy (mean ± SD, range)</td>
<td>6.21 ± 3.68</td>
<td>(≤1-15 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on medication</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single AED</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>(56.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple AED</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(31.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seizures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No seizures</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(62.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a month</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(23.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every three months</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single seizure episode within the past 3 months</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness severity ($n=152$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No seizures, AED not required</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seizures controlled with AED</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(50.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seizures despite AED</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family-level demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents ($n=148$; 4 did not participate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(32.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(67.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of parent (mean ± SD, range)</td>
<td>48.3 ± 4.90</td>
<td>(37-59 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment ($n=140$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>(69.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(30.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification attained ($n=146$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below secondary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (GCE ‘O’ or ‘N’ level)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE ‘A’ level / ITE</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(22.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic / other diplomas</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(13.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income (n=146)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No working person</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,999 SGD</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(11.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 – 4,999 SGD</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(41.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 – 9,999 SGD</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(22.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 SGD and above</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(24.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Percentages for ‘Ethnicity’ and ‘Household income’ do not add up to 100% due to rounding errors. n – study sample; SD – Standard deviation; NA – Not available; AED – Anti-epileptic drugs; GCE ‘O’, ‘N’ and ‘A’ levels refers to Singapore-Cambridge General Certificate of Education Ordinary, Normal and Advance level, respectively; ITE – Institute of Technical Education; SGD – Singapore Dollars.
### Table 2a: Pattern matrix of exploratory factor analysis (direct oblimin rotation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Meaning making and Positive outlook</th>
<th>Flexibility and Connectedness</th>
<th>Clarity and Open emotional expression</th>
<th>Resources - Community</th>
<th>Transcendence and spirituality</th>
<th>Collaborative problem-solving</th>
<th>Resources - Neighbors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>-.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>-.672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial eigenvalues</th>
<th>% of variance explained</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.92 12.53 8.87</td>
<td>23.92 23.21 16.43</td>
<td>0.97 0.97 0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.41 2.65 2.28</td>
<td>8.16 4.91 4.22</td>
<td>0.96 0.93 0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cronbach's alpha coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
<th>Factor 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2b: Structure matrix of exploratory factor analysis (direct oblimin rotation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
<th>Factor 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>.924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>.912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>.896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>.878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td></td>
<td>.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.427</td>
<td></td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Walsh’s framework (9 constructs)</td>
<td>Sixbey’s study (6 factors)</td>
<td>Current study (7 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We accept stressful events as a part of life</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>AMM</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>We accept that problems occur unexpectedly</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>AMM</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>We are able to work through pain and come to an understanding</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>We can deal with family differences in accepting a loss</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>We can work through difficulties as a family</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>We learn from each other’s mistakes</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>We believe we can handle our problems</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>We can solve major problems</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>We can survive if another problem comes up</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>We define problems positively to solve them</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>We feel we are strong in facing big problems</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>We have the strength to solve our problems</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>We trust things will work out even in difficult times</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>MMPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>We attend prayers/services at temple/mosque/church/other places of worship</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>We have faith in Buddha/Deities&gt;Allah/God/Hindu gods/Others</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>We participate in temple/mosque/church/other religious activities</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>We seek advice from religious advisors</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our family is flexible and can deal with unexpected events</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>FLCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We are adaptable to demands placed on us as a family</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>FLCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>We are open to new ways of doing things in our family</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>FLCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The things we do for each other make us feel a part of the family</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>AMM</td>
<td>FLCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>We are understood by other family members</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>FLCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>We feel good giving time and energy to our family</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>FLCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>We show love and affection for family members</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>FLCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>We feel taken for granted by family members*</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>FLCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>We seldom listen to family members concerns or problems*</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>FLCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Our friends value us and who we are</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>R-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>We ask neighbors for help and assistance</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>USER</td>
<td>R-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>We can depend upon people in this community</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>USER</td>
<td>R-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>We feel people in this community are willing to help in an emergency</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>USER</td>
<td>R-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>We feel secure living in this community</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>USER</td>
<td>R-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>We know there is community help if there is trouble</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>USER</td>
<td>R-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>We know we are important to our friends</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>USER</td>
<td>R-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>We receive gifts and favors from neighbors</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>USER</td>
<td>R-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>We think this is a good community to raise children</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>USER</td>
<td>R-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>We think we should not get too involved with people in this community*</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>R-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We can ask for clarification if we do not understand each other</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>COEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>We can be honest and direct with each other in our family</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>COEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>In our family, we can question or clarify when we do not understand the communications between family members</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>COEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>We can talk about the way we communicate in our family</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>COEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>We mean what we say to each other in our family</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>COEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>We understand communication from other family members</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>COEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>We work to make sure family members are not emotionally or physically hurt</td>
<td>OEE</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>FLCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>We can ventilate at home without upsetting someone</td>
<td>OEE</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>COEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>We feel free to express our opinions</td>
<td>OEE</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>COEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>We tell each other how much we care for one another</td>
<td>OEE</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>COEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>We keep our feelings to ourselves</td>
<td>OEE</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>COEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>We all have input into major family decisions</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>We can compromise when problems come up</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>We check with each other about decisions</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>We discuss problems and feel good about the solutions</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>We discuss things until we reach a resolution</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>We share responsibility in the family</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>We try new ways of working with problems</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>FCPS</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MM=Making meaning of adversity; PO=Positive outlook; TS=Transcendence and spirituality; Fl=Flexibility; Co=Connectedness; SER=Social and economic resources; Cl=Clarity; OEE=Open emotional expression; CPS=Collaborative problem-solving.

2 AMM=Ability to make meaning of adversity (3 items); FCPS=family communication and problem-solving (27 items); MPO=Maintaining a positive outlook (6 items); FS=Family spirituality (4 items); FC=Family connectedness (6 items); Utilizing social and economic resources (8 items).

3 MMPO=Meaning making and Positive outlook (13 items); TS=Transcendence and spirituality (4 items); FLCO=Flexibility and Connectedness (10 items); R-C=Resources – Community (8 items); R-N=Resources - Neighbors (2 items); COEE=Clarity and Open emotional expression (10 items); CPS=Collaborative problem-solving (7items). *Reverse scored.