Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh,

The family institution is the basic unit of society and is important in preparing and supplying the human capital to the country. A high quality of human capital is needed to sustain the economic growth. At the same time, the rapid economic growth has brought many challenges and pressures to the family institution.

Hence, as to ensure the well-being of families in this country is not affected, economic and social development which comprises the physical, emotional and spiritual aspects must be balanced. Recognising the importance of the family institution for the future of the country, the Ministry of Women, Family and Community Development (MWFCD) through the National Population and Family Development Board (NPFDB) always strives to strengthen and improve the welfare of the family through various measures such as policy formulation, conducting research, and the development of family intervention programs.

In assisting the government to develop policies, programmes and services for the welfare of the family, the NPFDB conducted a Family Well-Being Index Study in 2011. This study was the first initiative taken by the MWFCD to measure the well-being of the family and also to study the effects of the implementation of social and economic development policies on the family institution. The findings of this study will be beneficial to the policy makers, planners, implementers of policies and programs, researchers and the public.

Finally, I would like to thank everyone involved in the Family Wellbeing Index Study 2011.

Yours sincerely.
Family well-being is an important element in the government’s efforts to drive the economy towards a developed nation by 2020. Recognising this, the government has taken a holistic approach in improving the well-being of the family.

Efforts to understand the well-being of families in Malaysia is critical and in line with the national mission of promoting family well-being and creating a harmonious nation. Therefore, it is important to ensure that the selected indicators are suitable and distinctively Malaysia be implemented.

The Family Well-Being Index Study Report provides an overview of the state of family well-being in our country. Overall, our family well-being level is at a moderate level. Nevertheless efforts to strengthen the institution of the family need to be continuously intensified. Various initiatives have been taken by the government to strengthen the family institution, and it is important that we all work to ensure that the vision of making Malaysia a developed and high income country is realised. Indeed, to achieve a high level of family well-being, the various parties, from the family institution to the policy maker, all have an important role to play.

I would like to take this opportunity to convey my gratitude to the members of the Technical Committee for successfully conducting this study. A special thank you to the Economic Planning Unit of the Prime Minister’s Department for the allocation of funds and the International Islamic University of Malaysia (IIUM) for its consultancy services throughout the implementation of the study. May these good relations and cooperation continue into the future.

Thank you.
The National Population and Family Development (NPFDB) is an agency under the Ministry of Women, Family and Community Development whose specific role is to strengthen and enhance the well-being of families in this country through policy formulation, implementation of studies and research, and development of family intervention programmes.

Recognising the importance of the family as the basic social unit that prepares and provides human capital for national development, the NPFDB conducted the Family Well-Being Index Study in 2011 to measure the level of well-being of families in this country and subsequently to propose appropriate policies and suitable intervention programmes to strengthen and reinforce the family institution.

I hope that the Family Well-Being Index Study Report will be one of the important reference material for policy-makers, planners and implementers of development programmes, researchers, academicians and the general public. The results of this study will hopefully be beneficial to all parties, constituting the basis for the formation of more resilient families in meeting the challenges of the current decade.

Thank you.
The Family Well-Being Index Study led by the National Population and Family Development Board (NPFDB) is a research project conducted specifically to assess the level of well-being of families in Malaysia. The study has identified seven suitable domains to provide information on Malaysian family well-being.

Overall, the seven domains are Family Relationships, Family Economy, Family Health, Family Safety, Family and Community, Family and Religion/Spirituality, and Housing and Environment. These domains are further reinforced by 23 indicators identified through a systematic process. Development of the domains and indicators of family well-being is focused on subjective well-being in which every family was asked to provide assessment of certain aspects related to the satisfaction and joy of family life. The study shows that the Family Well-Being Index is at 7.55 which means that family well-being in Malaysia is at a moderate level. Through this understanding it is hoped that all parties will work together and give their commitment to raise the level of well-being of families in our country.

At this juncture, I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the ministries, departments, agencies and everyone involved in making Family Well-Being Index Study a success. I believe that with the high commitment shown, much more research can be generated by the NPFDB to help the country attain its aspirations.

Thank you.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MALAYSIAN FAMILY WELL-BEING INDEX STUDY

BACKGROUND

In the past few decades, Malaysia has and is still undergoing a process of rapid social and economic development. This is a result of policies implemented by the government such as the New Development Policy (1991-2000), National Vision Policy (2001-2010) and Government Transformation Programme (2010-2020) which all aim to transform Malaysia into a developed and competitive country. However, the processes has imposed increased demands on the family institution because of the responsibilities and the challenges faced by the family itself.

The family institution must be strengthened to offset the rapid process of social and economic development. This is important because family is the basic social unit which prepares and supplies human capital resources for national development. Given the importance of family well-being to the future of the country, a scientific study needs to be conducted to measure the level of well-being of families in Malaysia.

Measuring family well-being is crucial as it can indirectly measure the impact of the implementation of national social and economic development policies on families and the extent to which the implemented policies and programmes are successful or otherwise.

Hence, this study has identified suitable indicators that can provide information about the well-being of families in Malaysia. Subsequently, based on the identified indicators, a Family Well-Being Index (FWI) was developed to measure the current well-being of the family as well as to be used in policy formulation, planning for implementation of future research, the development of new programmes and services, and expansion of the existing programmes.
**OBJECTIVES**

i. To develop a set of indicators to measure family well-being;

ii. To analyse family well-being based on the set of developed indicators;

iii. To generate Malaysian Family Well-Being Index; and

iv. To submit recommendation to government for improvements on family well-being.

**DEVELOPMENT PROCESS OF FAMILY WELL-BEING INDICATORS**

In the process of developing a set of indicators, this study used three main approaches. There were literature review, focus group discussions (FGDs) and a pilot study. The literature review came from previous studies conducted since 1990 onwards. Based on the review, the concept of family well-being is a multidimensional concept that includes aspects of family relationships, family economy, family health, family safety, family and community, family and religion/spirituality, and housing and environment. The identified domains were discussed in two series of FGDs; the formal FGD consists of academicians, government agencies and non-governmental organisations, while the non-formal FGD consists of selected members of the public. Responses from the FGDs that were transcribed, interpreted and validated with literature review formed the basis for updating the domains and indicators of the study.

The indicators were then tested in a pilot study conducted on 30 households. Based on the results of the pilot study, several changes had been made to the questionnaires including further refining the indicators used. As a result, to measure the well-being of families in the country, this study has identified a total of 24 indicators covering seven domains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS|1. Parental involvement  
2. Family resilience  
3. Family functioning  
4. Time with family  
5. Work-family balance*  
6. Husband/wife relationship *  
7. Parental relationship|FAMILY SAFETY|1. Emergency response knowledge  
2. Safety at home  
3. Family safety |
| | |FAMILY AND COMMUNITY|1. Community cooperation  
2. Community relationship  
3. Community involvement |
| | |FAMILY AND RELIGION/ SPIRITUALITY|1. Role of religion  
2. Spiritual practice |
| | |HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENT|1. Basic amenities  
2. Pollution levels |

Note: * Not part of the FWI (Children) calculation.
FAMILY WELL-BEING INDEX STUDY FINDINGS

RESPONDENTS’ PROFILE
The study was conducted on 2,808 households involving a total of 5,616 respondents consisting of 1,484 male respondents, 1,324 female respondents and 2,808 adolescent and young adult respondents aged 13 to 24 years. Selection of households in this study was with the assistance of the Department of Statistics, Malaysia using a stratified random sampling method and being executed with a face-to-face interview.

The distribution of respondents shows 62 per cent of families living in urban areas with the majority of them being currently married (93.2%). Of the families covered, 81.2 per cent were nuclear families, followed by extended families (14.8 %), single-parent families (3.3%) and blended families (0.7%). Over 60 per cent of the households covered were Malay families followed by Chinese (28.3%), Indian (9.8 %) and others (1.0%). Distribution of respondents by number of members in a household was 67 per cent having four to six household members and more than 60 per cent of these households having teenagers aged 13 to 15 years. In terms of household income, almost half of them had a household income not exceeding RM2,000 per month. Distribution of adult respondents by age showed that nearly half of them were in the range of 41 to 50 years (47.2%) while distribution of adolescent respondents by age was 45.6 per cent aged 13 to 17 years and the remainder aged between 18 and 24 years.

FAMILY WELL-BEING INDEX
Development of the Family Well-Being Index was focused on subjective well-being whereby all respondents were asked to evaluate certain aspects related to their family. The Family Well-Being Index uses the value of 10 as the maximum score. The higher the score obtained, the better the level of family well-being in the country. The Family Well-Being Index was obtained by averaging the score for all seven domains measured. Domain scores were obtained by the average score for all indicators in a domain.

Through this study, the Family Well-Being Index (Parents) registered 7.55 out of a maximum score of 10. Of the seven domains identified, Family and Religion/Spirituality domain recorded the highest score of 8.25. Followed by the domain scores for Family and Community (7.83), Family Relationships (7.82), Family Safety (7.39), Family Health (7.38), Housing and Environment (7.28), and Family Economy (6.90).

Interviews with adolescents and young adults aged 13 to 24 years resulted in a Family Well-Being Index (children) of 7.70 out of a maximum score of 10. Of the seven domains identified, the Family and Religion/Spirituality domain recorded the highest score of 8.18. Followed by the domain scores of Family Relationships (7.90), Family Safety (7.66), Family Economy (7.65), Family and Community (7.65), Family Health (7.61), and Housing and Environment (7.29).

CONCLUSION
Based on the findings of this study, among the recommendations to improve the well-being of families in this country were as follows:

1. Services and programmes that help families to be more resilient or more capable in dealing with current challenges should be expanded. Programmes such as these are akin to essential skills training to help individuals become more responsible parents, skilled and competent in managing the household and family. These can also address other aspects of family, such as time that should be spent with family members, a healthy lifestyle, and balancing the demands of work and family.
2. Financial support/assistance services, for example financial counselling, should be readily available and accessible to families facing financial challenges and difficulties.
3. Community projects should be readily available and accessible, especially for those in urban areas because such projects can provide support, a sense of belonging and neighbourliness.
4. Periodic implementation of the study such as every three years with a larger scale of coverage in the future. The development of new programmes and interventions and services as well as the expansion of existing intervention programmes.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

1.2 ISSUES AND CHALLENGES OF THE FAMILY INSTITUTION IN MALAYSIA

1.3 FAMILY WELL-BEING

1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

1.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY
1.1 Introduction

In the past few decades, Malaysia has and is still undergoing a process of rapid social and economic development. This is a result of policies implemented by the government such as New Development Policy (1991-2000), National Vision Policy (2001-2010) and Government Transformation Programme (2010-2020) which all serve to transform Malaysia into a developed and competitive country. However, the daily grind of this process has imposed increased demands on family institution due to responsibilities and the challenges faced by the family itself.

The family institution needs to be strengthened to offset the rapid process of economic and social development. This is important because family is the basic social unit which prepares and supplies human capital resources for national development. Given the importance of family and family well-being to the nation's future, a set of indicators to measure the family well-being of Malaysia's multi-racial society must be developed. This is crucial as information on family well-being in this country is lacking. Therefore, this study will identify suitable indicators that can provide information about the state of well-being of families in Malaysia and subsequently, based on the identified indicators, a Family Well-Being Index will be generated.
1.2 ISSUES AND CHALLENGES OF THE FAMILY INSTITUTION IN MALAYSIA

Based on the nation’s legislation and religions, the formation of a family in Malaysia begins with a legal marriage. Nevertheless, there is now a trend to delay marriage, especially among the younger population. Based on the findings of the Population Censuses of 1990, 2000 and 2010, the mean age at first marriage for women has increased from 24.7 to 25.1 years and then to 25.7 years in 2010. In contrast, the mean age at first marriage for men increased slightly from 28.2 years in 1991 to 28.6 years in 2000 and then declined slightly to 28.0 years in 2010 (Department of Statistics, 2011). The scenario of late marriages has implications on family formation, family structure and childcare.

Today’s development and modern lifestyle challenges have created a variety of new families. One of them is ‘commuter family’ where the spouses live separately in different places, and they meet once or twice a week, or once a month, or have some other arrangement, depending on the distance between the couple due to work commitments or some other reasons. The ‘sandwich family’ is another new family type identified in Malaysian society. It is a family where a couple needs to support their children and also care for their parents who live with them. This situation is expected to be increased in the future especially for young dual-income couples with insufficient resources to manage the needs of their children and their parents simultaneously.

Dual-income families also face major challenges in striking a balance between work and family. The 4th Malaysian Population and Family Survey conducted by the National Population and Family Development Board (NPFDB) found that nearly 50 per cent of these families wished their employers would provide childcare centres in the workplace as well as special leave to care for children and they hoped for subsidies to cover the cost of childcare (NPFDB, 2008).

Apart from the challenges faced by the family institution, social issues affecting each stage of human development, from the child to the senior citizen, requires an attention. It has been noted that every cycle within the family institution has its own issues and challenges. At every stage, from childhood issues such as abuse and neglect to aging issues such as loneliness and emerging challenges indirectly affect the stability of the family institution.

Based on the issues and challenges currently faced by families in Malaysia, it can be concluded that the formation, structure and role of the family institution in Malaysia will continue to evolve in line with the modernisation and urbanisation of the population as well as changes in attitudes towards marriage and family. With this in mind, the family institution
in Malaysia requires focused and continuous attention in order to improve the family well-being.

1.3 FAMILY WELL-BEING

One of the biggest challenges of this study was to define term ‘family well-being’ as there are many different versions of the definition. The NPFDB definition is as follows: “Family well-being refers to the condition of families in a country at safe, healthy, peaceful, comfortable, harmonious and satisfying level” (NPFDB, 2010). This definition encompasses various aspects of satisfaction and comfort such as spiritual, economic/financial, mental, psychosocial (especially close-knitted family relationships), health, social environment, political and sustainability terms. Family well-being also depends on or is closely related to the rights, responsibilities, feeling of respect and dignity of a person in a family.

According to Families Australia (2006), the well-being of a family includes four main elements: firstly, physical safety as well as mental and physical health; secondly, supportive intra-family relationships that include effective conflict resolution skills, inculcating noble values, traditions, language, the sharing of ideas, acceptance of support and encouragement for family achievement; thirdly, the social relationship outside the family; and finally, economic security.

According to Frey, Greenberg and Fewell (1989), the family well-being domains include the family organisational structure, interpersonal relationships, psychological status of parents and parental self-efficacy. The organisational structure of the family refers to the family’s closeness, harmony and consistency with regard to care as well as the expression of feelings and conflicts. The domain of interpersonal relationships includes family ties and relationships with other family members and friends. The psychological status of parents refers to the status of the parent’s health and parents’ self-efficacy is defined as the efficiency of parents in addressing the problems of their children.

From these definitions, it can be seen that ‘family well-being’ is a multidimensional concept that encompasses various aspects of living conditions of an individual or a family. It involves the development of an individual and a family that is well-balanced physically, spiritually, economically, socially and mentally. In addition, it also emphasises access to basic needs and amenities for comfortable living, quality schools, health care and a safe environment. Relationships among family members such as the way the family communicates, solving family problems and educating children are also included in this concept.
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The measurement of family well-being is important because indirectly it measures the impact and effectiveness of the country's implementation of social and economic development policies on families. To date, there is no single measurement that can reflect the well-being of families in Malaysia, and subsequently to monitor the family situation from time to time.

Selected indicators which determine family well-being can be used as a basis or input for the design and implementation of family development programmes, and consequently, contribute to the national development process. These key indicators can be used to further strengthen family development programmes so that the National Family Policy is able to move in tandem with the development of the economy and other fields in the country.

This study could also serve as a benchmark study of the family well-being level in Malaysia where comparisons can be carried out from time to time. Indirectly, the information obtained from this study can also be used to develop a database of family well-being in Malaysia, which will be continuously updated from time to time.

1.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study are to:

i. Develop a set of indicators to measure family well-being;
ii. Analyse family well-being based on the set of indicators that have been developed;
iii. Generate Malaysian Family Well-Being Index; and
iv. Submit recommendation to the government to improve family well-being.

1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The limitation of this study is a sampling frame as the frame used was based on the household distribution in year 2000. This resulted in some difficulty in obtaining households that meet the required criteria due to their mobility. Therefore, other households that met the criteria and are in close proximity to the previous preselected households were chosen as a replacement. In addition, the computation of the index by state could not be done in view of the small sample size for some state in this study.
CHAPTER 2
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- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Scope of Information Search Strategy
- 2.3 Selection of Family Well-Being Domains and Indicators
- 2.4 The Concept of Family Well-Being
2.1 INTRODUCTION
The main purpose of a literature review is to identify family well-being domains and subsequently, the indicators suitable for use in this study, based on previous studies and research reports. This chapter describes the methods used in searching previous research on well-being, issues in the selection of domains and indicators of family well-being, and then discusses the selection of domains and indicators for this study.

2.2 SCOPE OF INFORMATION SEARCH STRATEGY
The information search strategy used in the study is based on literature search and exploration on internet. This exploration is limited to studies and reports from 1990 onwards that were implemented by various countries including Malaysia. The list of keywords used in the search for relevant studies or reports in the study is as per APPENDIX A.

2.3 SELECTION OF FAMILY WELL-BEING DOMAINS AND INDICATORS
In the selection of domains and indicators of family well-being, it is important to understand the individual’s in the different contexts of the family, community and society. These contexts are related and interdependent. Hence, the mutual influences of these contexts can expand or limit the well-being of a family.

Previous studies clearly showed that basic necessities such as housing, education, employment, income, health, safety and relationships form the key domains in determining individual and family well-being (Cummins et al., 2003; Milligan, 2006; Zubrick et al., 2000). The study also showed that additional domains such as culture, spirituality and recreation are able to provide indication of the level of well-being.
Based on the findings of previous studies, the domains identified in this study are as follows:

**FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS**
This domain refers to a relationship between family members viewed from three aspects: first, as a biological unit whose members have blood ties and established through marriage and covers the extended family; secondly, as a social unit consisting of a number of individuals who live in the same house and share different duties and social functions; and thirdly, as a psychological unit that is the emotional ties and personal feelings of its members (Palanivel, 2004).

This definition encompasses the relationship between parents and children, relationships between family members, time spent with family and the knowledge and skills that the parents have to educate their children (Families Australia, 2006; Zubrick et al., 2000). Among the important skills are positive communication, monitoring and supervision, setting of rules, problem solving, decision making and provision of activities suitable for the age of the children. In addition, knowing where the children are, who they are with and what they do also represent important information to monitor and supervise their behaviour (Zubrick et al., 2000).

**FAMILY ECONOMY**
A strong economic situation in the family is very important for family well-being, as shown in past studies. Family poverty is not just simply a short term difficulty but will also have a long term effect on the family. For example, children who grew up in a poor family environment are more likely to experience problems in their development and health (Bradshaw & Richardson, 2009; Duncan & Brooks-Gunn, 1997) and are more likely to fall prey to various social problems (Belfield & Levin, 2007).

In general, the economic indicators that often been used in measuring well-being are employment and income. However, in this study, subjective measurements were used to measure the domain of family economy, namely economic situation, economic security, debt burden and standard of living.

**FAMILY HEALTH**
Health is an important domain in determining the well-being of the family as it is considered to be a basic requirement for family well-being (Berger-Schmitt & Jankowitsch, 1999; Bradshaw & Richardson, 2009; Zubrick et al., 2000). Health refers to physical, mental and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease (World Health Organisation, 2011), and this definition is used in this study.

**FAMILY SAFETY**
Safety issues are increasingly important in contemporary society as one of the negative consequences of rapid social development is the increase in crime rates for burglary, robbery, rape, murder and so forth that could directly affect family safety. Thus, indicators emphasised in this domain covers aspects of safety and knowledge of emergency responses.

**FAMILY AND COMMUNITY**
Current lifestyles in these increasingly challenging times demand parents seek and obtain support to help their families. Past studies have shown that families with access to a supportive network and effective community service will have improved well-being and have less problems (A Roadmap to Child and Family Well-Being, 2010).

Involvement in the community can help the family institution by strengthening social and cultural values as well as monitoring or overseeing its members. Based on the latest trends, most families in Malaysia now are no longer having support from their extended family. The community is thus the best alternative for the family to obtain support and to foster a sense of belonging. In this study, the domain of community relationship is measured by the involvement of families in the community.

**FAMILY AND RELIGION/SPIRITUALITY**
Only a few studies in the past had measured this domain as it was not considered significant in determining family well-being. However, to the eastern societies which hold strongly to cultural, religion and moral values, this domain is considered important. For example, many people think that social ills that are increasingly rampant are due to inadequate religious education. People no longer practise moral values that religions demand of their believers. Therefore, in this study, the aspect of religion and moral values are taken into account.

**HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENT**
According to Disney (2006), families need a housing environment that fulfils a basic standard of providing access to work opportunities and community services and that is available at a reasonable cost. If a family spends more than 30 per cent of its total income on housing, then the ability of the family to function will be affected. This is due to the family needing to allocate income simultaneously to health, education, nutrition and the other daily necessities (Yates & Milligan, 2007).
Studies on housing type have shown that living in apartments is detrimental to the psychological well-being of the family, particularly for mothers with young children. This situation will result in social isolation, lack of access to play spaces that encourage social interaction or a combination of these factors (Evans, G., Wells, N., & Moch, A., 2003). In this study, this domain is measured by the evaluation of their neighbourhoods and extent of pollution.

2.4 THE CONCEPT OF FAMILY WELL-BEING

Based on the literature review of family well-being domains and indicators, family well-being is multidimensional incorporates family relationships, family economy, family health, family safety, family and community, family and religion/spirituality, and housing and environment. The concept of family well-being used in this study is as shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: The Concept of Family Well-Being](image-url)
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3.2 DOMAIN AND INDICATORS DEVELOPMENT METHODS
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3.4 DATA ANALYSIS
3.1 Study Sample
The sampling frame for this study is based on the National Household Sampling Frame (NHSF), which consists of Enumeration Blocks used during the Population and Housing Census of Malaysia, 2000. The Departments of Statistics Malaysia assisted in the selection of households. The study used a stratified random sampling design to select the characteristics of samples in line with the distribution ratio by strata, that is, urban and rural and ethnic groups, that is Bumiputera, Chinese and Indians for the population of each state. Selected respondents were interviewed face to face.

The number of households that were selected in this study was 2,808. The criteria for respondents selected to be interviewed for each household is firstly, a husband or wife, and secondly, a child aged 13 to 24 years. Overall, the total number of respondents in this study was 5,616. The table showing the sample size distribution by state is attached in APPENDIX B.

3.2 Domain and Indicator Development Methods
In the process of developing a set of indicators, this study used three main approaches which are literature review, focus group discussions (FGDs) and a pilot study.

3.2.1 Literature Review
As discussed in Chapter 2, the literature review was based on studies conducted from 1990 onwards. Based on the review, it was found that family well-being is a multidimensional concept covering aspects of family relationships, family economic situation, family health and safety, community relationships, housing and environment, as well as culture and religion/spirituality.
3.2.2 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

Two FGD sessions were conducted, formal and informal. Two informal FGDs were conducted at different times with two different groups of individuals. The first informal FGD involved residents from the Sentul neighbourhood and was attended by 10 respondents consisting of seven families. The second informal FGD involved six employees of the International Islamic University of Malaysia (IIUM).

The formal FGD was attended by professionals representing various government agencies such as the Ministry of Health, Crime Prevention Foundation, Police, Ministry of Human Resources and Kuala Lumpur City Hall while the non-governmental organisations were represented by agencies such as the Hospis Malaysia, Women’s Aid Organisation (WAO), Malaysian AIDS Council and Rumah Silaturrahim Nurul Qana’ah. In this FGD, the respondents were divided into three different groups with each consisted of seven or eight respondents. The three sessions were conducted simultaneously in three separate rooms, each managed by a researcher and a research assistant. Each FGD session lasted between one and two hours and was recorded on tape.

3.2.3 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted on 30 households from February to March 2011. Based on the results, several changes had been made to the questionnaire including further refinement of the indicators. As a result, in order to measure the well-being of families in this country, this study identified a total of 24 indicators covering seven domains as shown in Table 1.

| TABLE 1 DOMAINS AND INDICATORS OF THE MALAYSIAN FAMILY WELL-BEING INDEX, 2011 |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **DOMAIN**                      | **INDICATOR**                   | **DOMAIN**                      | **INDICATOR**                   |
| FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS            | 1. Parental involvement         | FAMILY SAFETY                   | 1. Emergency response knowledge  |
|                                 | 2. Family resilience            |                                 | 2. Safety at home               |
|                                 | 3. Family functioning           |                                 | 3. Family safety                |
|                                 | 4. Time with family             |                                 | **FAMILY AND**                  | 1. Community cooperation       |
|                                 | 5. Work-family balance*         |                                 | COMMUNITY                       | 2. Community relationship      |
|                                 | 7. Parental relationship        |                                 | **FAMILY AND**                  |                                 |
|                                 |                                 |                                 | RELIGION/SPRITUALITY            |                                 |
|                                 |                                 |                                 | 1. Role of religion             |                                 |
|                                 |                                 |                                 | 2. Spiritual practice           |                                 |
|                                 |                                 |                                 | **HOUSING AND**                 |                                 |
| FAMIL ECONOMY                   | 1. Family living standards      |                                 | ENVIRONMENT                     | 1. Basic amenities             |
|                                 | 2. Family economic situation    |                                 |                                 | 2. Pollution levels            |
|                                 | 3. Future savings               |                                 | **Note:** * Not part of the FWI (Children) calculation |
3.3 INSTRUMENT AND MEASUREMENT

3.3.1 QUESTIONNAIRE
The Malaysian Family Well-Being Index Study used a questionnaire as an instrument for data collection. The development of the questionnaire involved the participation of various parties including expert groups and stakeholders. The questionnaire has high reliability for all domains Cronbach’s alpha range from 0.75 to 0.96.

The questionnaire consisted of ten sections as follows:

i. Introduction;
ii. Family relationships;
iii. Family economy;
iv. Family health;
v. Family safety;
vi. Family and community;
vii. Family and religion/spirituality;
viii. Housing and environment;
ix. Rating of family well-being as a whole; and
x. Family information.

3.3.2 INDICATOR MEASUREMENT

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS DOMAIN

1. Parental Involvement
Four items were constructed to measure the engagement of parents in their children’s lives. The scale used a 5-point Likert response format of 1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree, with higher scores indicating higher parental involvement in their children’s lives.

2. Family Resilience
This indicator was measured through a 10-item scale which focus on family behaviour when confronting and dealing with a crisis. Items were built based on previous studies in which a resilient family constantly works together to solve problems, uses creative methods and is open to suggestions (Reiss, 1980). The role of social support and the relationship between family members are also a priority in family resilience (Garbarino, 1992). The scale used a 5-point Likert response format of 1 = Strongly disagree, to 5 = Strongly agree, with higher scores indicating higher family resilience.

3. Family Functioning
This indicator was measured through a 7-item scale that covered ways the members of a family communicated and related to one another. The scale used a 5-point Likert response format of 1 = Strongly disagree, to 5 = Strongly agree. Items constructed were in negative form, and for the purpose of analysis, these items were transformed into positive items, with higher scores indicating higher level family functioning.

4. Time with Family
This indicator was measured by the time spent together with family members in the four daily activities: eating together, watching television, playing recreation and performing religious activities. The scale for all four of these items using the Likert response format of 1 = Not at all, to 5 = Always and higher the indicator scores, mean, the more the time spent with the family.

5. Work-Family Balance
This indicator was measured by one subjective question, “To what extent are you able to balance the demands of work and family?” using a Likert response scale of 0 = Not at all able, to 10 = Very able. This indicator was only available in the parents’ instrument.

6. Husband/Wife Relationship
This indicator was measured by a subjective question, “To what extent are you satisfied with your spousal relationship?” using the Likert response scale of 0 = Not at all satisfied, to 10 = Very satisfied. This indicator was only available in the parents’ instrument.

7. Parental Relationship
This indicator was measured by a subjective question, “To what extent are you satisfied with your relationship with your parents?” using a 11-point response scale (0 = Not at all satisfied, to 10 = Very satisfied). This indicator was only available in the children’s instrument.
FAMILY ECONOMY DOMAIN

1. Family Living Standards
This indicator was subjective and it was measured by the question, “To what extent are you satisfied with your family’s standard of living?” using the Likert response scale format of 0 = Not at all satisfied, to 10 = Very satisfied.

2. Family Economic Situation
This indicator was in subjective form and it was measured by the question, “To what extent are you satisfied with your family’s economic situation?” using the Likert response scale format of 0 = Not at all satisfied, to 10 = Very satisfied.

3. Future Savings
This indicator was in subjective form and it was measured by the question, “To what extent is your family saving for the future?” using the Likert response scale format of 0 = Not saving at all, to 10 = Saving a lot.

4. Debt Burden
This indicator was in subjective form and it was measured by the question, “To what extent is your family in debt?” using the Likert response scale format of 0 = Not at all burdened, to 10 = Very heavily burdened.

FAMILY HEALTH DOMAIN

1. Family Health Practice
This indicator was measured through 5-item covering balance diet, exercise, smoking, drug use and alcohol intake (Cockerham & Glasser, 2001). Smoking, drug use and liquor are negative items and for analysis purposes were transformed into positive items. The Likert response format of 1 = Not at all, to 5 = Always was used, with higher scores indicating a healthier family lifestyle.

2. Family Health Level
This indicator was measured by the question, “To what extent are you satisfied with your family’s health?” using the Likert response scale format of 0 = Not at all satisfied, to 10 = Very satisfied.

3. Stress Management
This indicator was measured by adapting the 5 items from the General Health Questionnaire (Goldberg, 1978) used to measure the level of family stress. The selected items were “Lost of sleep over worry”, “Felt constantly under strain”, “Able to enjoy daily activities”, “Feeling depressed” and “Loss of self-confidence”. These items are also negative items that were transformed for analysis purposes. The measurement used the Likert response scale format of 1 = None at all, to 5 = Much more than usual, and the higher the score on this scale, the higher the stress experienced.

FAMILY SAFETY DOMAIN

1. Emergency Response Knowledge
This indicator measured the knowledge of actions required in the event of an emergency. It was measured using the Likert response format of 1 = Strongly disagree, to 5 = Strongly agree, with higher scores indicating higher levels of emergency response knowledge.

2. Safety at Home
This indicator measured the family’s safety at home using the 5-point Likert response format (1 = Strongly disagree, to 5 = Strongly agree), with a higher score on an item indicating a higher level of confidence in family safety while at home.

3. Family Safety
This indicator was subjective and it was measured by the question, “To what extent are you satisfied with the safety of your family?” that used the Likert response format of 0 = Not at all satisfied, to 10 = Very satisfied.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY DOMAIN

1. Community Cooperation
This indicator measured whether the family had knowledge of the individuals in the community who could be contacted when in need of assistance. It was measured using a Likert response format of 1 = Strongly disagree, to 5 = Strongly agree.

2. Community Relationship
This indicator was measured by the question, “To what extent are you satisfied with your relationship with the community?” using the Likert response format of 0 = Not at all satisfied, to 10 = Very satisfied.

3. Community Involvement
This indicator measured the participation of families in neighbourhood activities using the Likert response format of 1 = Strongly disagree, to 5 = Strongly agree.

FAMILY AND RELIGION/SPRITUALITY DOMAIN

1. Role of Religion
The indicator was measured by one item, “Religion plays an important role in the everyday life of our family” using the Likert response format of 1 = Strongly disagree, to 5 = Strongly agree.

2. Spiritual Practice
The indicator was measured by one item, “To what extent are you satisfied with your family’s religious and spiritual practices?” using the Likert response format of 0 = Not at all satisfied, to 10 = Very satisfied.
**HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENT DOMAIN**

1. **Basic Amenities**
   The indicator was measured by one item, “To what extent are you satisfied with the basic amenities in your residential area?” using the Likert response format of 0 = Not at all satisfied, to 10 = Very satisfied.

2. **Pollution Levels**
   The indicator was measured by one item, “To what extent are you satisfied with the level of pollution in your environment?” using the Likert response format of 0 = Not at all satisfied, to 10 = Very satisfied.

**3.4 DATA ANALYSIS**

Descriptive analyses were performed to describe the respondent characteristics and the variables of the study. Since the various Likert scale formats used different measurements, the scores obtained were normalised to a 10-point scale using the Min-Max method (OECD, 2008). The objective was to standardise the analysis and interpretation of the data.

Next, to obtain the Family Well-Being Index, the average score for all seven domains were calculated. Domain scores were obtained by averaging the scores of all indicators available in a certain domain. The Family Well-Being Index uses a score of 10 as the maximum score. The higher the score obtained, the better the level of family well-being in the country. The formulae for calculation of indicator scores, domain scores and the Family Well-Being Index is in Figure 2.

**FIGURE 2  FAMILY WELL-BEING INDEX (FWI) CALCULATION FORMULA**

\[
\text{INDICATOR \, SCORE} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{M_i - M_e}{R} \right) \times 10
\]

\[
\text{DOMAIN \, SCORE} = \frac{\sum \text{INDICATOR \, SCORE}}{N \, \text{INDICATOR}}
\]

\[
\text{INDEX \, SCORE} = \frac{\sum \text{DOMAIN \, SCORE}}{N \, \text{DOMAIN}}
\]

**WHERE**

- $\Sigma$ : TOTAL SCORE
- $M_i$ : MEAN / AVERAGE SCORE
- $M_e$ : MINIMUM SCORE
- $R$ : RANGE (MAXIMUM SCORE - MINIMUM SCORE)
- $N$ : NUMBER
- 10 : THE HIGHEST ESTIMATED MEAN VALUE
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4.1 Respondents’ Profile

4.1.1 Respondents’ Background

Of a total of 2,808 households or families covered, the study successfully interviewed 1,484 male and 1,324 female respondents. More than half of the families involved in this study were living in urban areas (62.0%). A majority of parents were currently married (93.2%), followed by widows/widowers (3.7%) and divorced parents (3.0%). The distribution of respondents by age showed nearly half of them were in the age range of 41 to 50 years (47.2%) and 28 per cent aged between 51 and 60 years.
4.1.2 Family Structure

It was found that more than 60 per cent of the households covered were Malay, followed by Chinese (28.3%), Indian (9.8%) and Others (1.0%). In terms of family structure, 81.2 per cent were nuclear families, followed by extended families (14.8%), and single-parent families (3.3%). The study also involved blended families (0.7%), that is families with step-parents and step-children. Distribution of respondents by number of household members showed 67 per cent of households having four to six members and more than 60 per cent having teenagers between the ages of 13 and 15 years. As regards to income, nearly half of the households had a household income of not more than RM2,000 per month (Table 2).

### TABLE 2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFILE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSEHOLD INCOME (RM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-7,000</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001-10,000</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 and above</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY TYPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and above</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 FAMILY WELL-BEING BY DOMAIN (PARENTS)

4.2.1 Family Relationships Domain
The Family Relationships domain includes six indicators consisting of parental involvement, family resilience, family functioning, time with family, work-family balance, and husband/wife relationship. The overall score for the Family Relationships domain was 7.82.

**FIGURE 6** FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS DOMAIN SCORE BY INDICATORS

**FIGURE 7** FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS DOMAIN SCORE BY RESPONDENTS’ CHARACTERISTICS
4.2.2 Family Economy Domain
The Family Economy domain consisted of four indicators which is family living standards, family economic situation, future savings and debt burden. The overall score for the Family Economy domain was 6.90.

![Figure 8: Family Economy Domain Score by Indicators](image)

![Figure 9: Family Economy Domain Score by Respondents' Characteristics](image)
4.2.3 Family Health Domain
The Family Health domain consisted of three indicators consisting of family health practice, family health level and stress management. The overall score for the Family Health domain was 7.38.
4.2.4 Family Safety Domain
The Family Safety domain consisted of three indicators; emergency response knowledge, safety at home and family safety. The overall score for the Family Safety domain was 7.39.
4.2.5 Family and Community Domain
The Family and Community domain consisted of three indicators; community cooperation, community relationship and community involvement. The overall score for the Family and Community domain was 7.83.

**FIGURE 14** FAMILY AND COMMUNITY DOMAIN SCORE BY INDICATORS

- Community Cooperation: 7.75
- Community Relationship: 8.00
- Community Involvement: 7.75

(N=2,808; SCALE 1-10)

**FIGURE 15** FAMILY AND COMMUNITY DOMAIN SCORE BY RESPONDENTS’ CHARACTERISTICS

- **SEX**
  - Male: 7.83
  - Female: 7.84

- **MARITAL STATUS**
  - Currently Married: 7.84
  - Divorced/Separated: 6.78
  - Widowed: 8.00

- **HOUSEHOLD INCOME**
  - 2,000 and below: 7.98
  - 2,001-4,000: 7.75
  - 4,001-7,000: 7.62
  - 7,001-10,000: 6.34
  - 10,001 and above: 7.49

- **AGE**
  - 30 and below: 7.98
  - 31-40: 7.75
  - 41-50: 7.62
  - 51-60: 6.34
  - 61 and above: 7.49
4.2.6 Family and Religion/Spirituality Domain
The Family and Religion/Spirituality domain comprised of two indicators; the role of religion and spiritual practice. The overall score for the Family and Religion/Spirituality domain was 8.25.

**FIGURE 16** FAMILY AND RELIGION/SPIRITUALITY DOMAIN SCORE BY INDICATORS

**FIGURE 17** FAMILY AND RELIGION/SPIRITUALITY DOMAIN SCORE BY RESPONDENTS’ CHARACTERISTICS
4.2.7 Housing and Environment Domain

The Housing and Environment domain comprised of two indicators; basic amenities and pollution levels. The overall score for the Housing and Environment domain was 7.28.
4.3 FAMILY WELL-BEING INDEX (PARENTS)

Through this study, it was found that the Family Well-Being Index (Parents) recorded was 7.55 out of a maximum score of 10. Of the seven domains that have been identified, the Family and Religion/Spirituality domain recorded the highest score of 8.25. This domain was followed by Family and Community (7.83), Family Relationships (7.82), Family Safety (7.39), Family Health (7.38), Housing and Environment (7.28) and Family Economy (6.90) (Figure 20).
### FIGURE 21  FAMILY WELL-BEING INDEX BY RESPONDENTS’ CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,000 and below</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-7,000</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001-10,000</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 and above</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 and below</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and above</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 OTHER FINDINGS

4.4.1 Family Challenges

In the face of modernisation and meeting the current demands of life, there is no doubt that the family institution in Malaysia will be facing a myriad of challenges. This study found that majority of families stated that the challenges they faced were financial problems (67.9%), followed by spousal communication problems (44.6%), physical health problems (44.3%) and emotional health problems (44.2%). These four items are among the most demanding challenges faced by families in Malaysia addition to other challenges.

FIGURE 22 CHALLENGES FACED BY FAMILIES IN MALAYSIA
4.4.2 Family Resilience

In general, the families in this country have high resilience. The study found that 95.2 per cent of families will always be ready to help each other, 94.8 per cent of families would remain united no matter how dire the situation, 93.9 per cent of families would find a way out when they face difficulties, and 92.5 per cent of families would persevere in the face of adversity.
4.4.3 Understanding of Family Well-Being
This study found that five main understandings of ‘family well-being’ in this country were peace and happiness (72.0%), stable economy (61.1%), comfortable dwellings (56.9%), love (56.5%) and close family ties (53.2%).

FIGURE 24 UNDERSTANDING OF FAMILY WELL-BEING
4.4.4 Views on the Level of Well-Being
The study also sought the views of respondents on the level of well-being of their families in the current year (2011) and for the next five years to come. The study found that the levels of family well-being predicted by parents in Malaysia will increase from 7.78 to 8.88 over the next five years. This means the parents in Malaysia predicted that parents in this country believe that the well-being of their families will improve in the future.
CHAPTER 5
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5.1 Respondents’ Profile
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5.1 Respondents' Profile
This study successfully obtained information from 2,808 adolescents and young adults respondents consisting of 1,354 males and 1,454 females. The distribution of these respondents by age category was 53.9 per cent aged 13 to 18 years while the remainder were aged between 19 and 24 years. Education-wise, 62 per cent of them were currently in secondary school, while 35 per cent were at the tertiary level and the remainder were in primary school.
5.2 WELL-BEING BY DOMAIN

5.2.1 Family Relationships Domain
The Family Relationships domain consisted of five indicators, that is parental involvement, family resilience, family functioning, time with family, and relationship with parents. The overall score for the Family Relationships domain was 7.90.

**FIGURE 25 FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS DOMAIN SCORE BY INDICATORS**

**FIGURE 26 FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS DOMAIN SCORE BY RESPONDENTS’ CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Resilience</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Functioning</td>
<td>8.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with Family</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Parents</td>
<td>8.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>7.88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>13-18</th>
<th>7.96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,000 and Below</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-7,000</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001-10,000</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 and Above</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2 Family Economy Domain
The Family Economy domain consisted of two indicators which are family living standards and family economic situation. The overall score for the Family Economy domain was 7.65.

![Figure 27: Family Economy Domain Score by Indicators](image)

![Figure 28: Family Economy Domain Score by Respondents' Characteristics](image)

**Study Findings**

- **Male**
  - Living Standards: 7.67
  - Economic Situation: 7.60

- **Female**
  - Living Standards: 7.62
  - Economic Situation: 7.60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income Range</th>
<th>Family Economy Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,000 and Below</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-7,000</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001-10,000</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 and Above</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family Well-Being Index Report Malaysia 2011**
5.2.3 Family Health Domain
The Family Health domain had three indicators consisting of family health practice, level of family health and stress management. The overall score for the Family Health domain was 7.61.

**FIGURE 29** FAMILY HEALTH DOMAIN SCORE BY INDICATORS

**FIGURE 30** FAMILY HEALTH DOMAIN SCORE BY RESPONDENTS’ CHARACTERISTICS
5.2.4 Family Safety Domain
The Family Safety domain consisted of three indicators; emergency response knowledge, safety at home and family safety. The overall score for the Family Safety domain was 7.66.

**FIGURE 31** FAMILY SAFETY DOMAIN SCORE BY INDICATORS

**FIGURE 32** FAMILY SAFETY DOMAIN SCORE BY RESPONDENTS’ CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male Score</th>
<th>Female Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response Knowledge</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety at Home</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Safety</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents' Characteristics</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 and below</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-7,000</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001-10,000</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 and above</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.5 Family and Community Domain
The Family and Community domain consisted of three indicators; community cooperation, community relationship and community involvement. The overall score for Family and Community domain was 7.65.
5.2.6 Family and Religion/Spirituality Domain

The Family and Religion/Spirituality domain consisted of two indicators; the role of religion and spiritual practice. The overall score for the Family and Religion/Spirituality domain was 8.18.

![Figure 35: Family and Religion/Spirituality Domain Score by Indicators](image)

![Figure 36: Family and Religion/Spirituality Domain Score by Respondents’ Characteristics](image)

**STUDY FINDINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,000 and Below</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-7,000</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001-10,000</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 and Above</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FAMILY WELL-BEING INDEX REPORT MALAYSIA 2011**
5.2.7 Housing and Environment Domain
The Housing and Environment domain consisted of two indicators; basic amenities and pollution levels. The overall score for the Housing and Environment domain was 7.29.
5.3 FAMILY WELL-BEING INDEX (CHILDREN)

Based on this study, it was found the Family Well-Being Index (Children) was 7.70 out of a maximum score of 10. Of the seven domains that have been identified, the Family and Religion/Spirituality domain recorded the highest score of 8.18. It was followed by Family Relationships (7.90), Family Safety (7.66), Family Economy (7.65), Family and Community (7.65), Family Health (7.61) and Housing and Environment (7.29) (Figure 39).

**FIGURE 39** CHILDREN’S FAMILY WELL-BEING INDEX AND WELL-BEING SCORE BY DOMAIN
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CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 CONCLUSION
Overall, this study has successfully identified seven key domains which are Family Relationships, Family Economy, Family Health, Family Safety, Family and Community, Family and Religion/Spirituality, and Housing and Environment and each domain is scored based on 24 identified indicators. Subsequently, from the scores obtained, composite indexes were generated for the Family Well-Being Index (Parents) and the Family Well-Being Index (Children).

Development of the Family Well-Being Index focused on subjective well-being whereby every respondent was asked to give an assessment of certain aspects related to their family. The Family Well-Being Index used 10 as the maximum score. A higher score means a higher level of family well-being in the country. The Family Well-Being Index was derived from average scores measured for all seven domains. The domain scores were obtained by averaging the scores for all indicators in the particular domain.

This study recorded the Family Well-Being Index (Parents) at 7.55 out of a maximum score of 10. Of the seven identified domains, Family and Religion/Spirituality recorded the highest domain score of 8.25. It was followed by the domain scores for Family and Community (7.83), Family Relationships (7.82), Family Safety (7.39), Family Health (7.38), Housing and Environment (7.28), and Family Economy (6.90).

The Family Well-Being Index (Children) scored 7.70 out of a maximum of 10. Of the seven identified domains, Family and Religion/Spirituality recorded the highest score of 8.18. It was followed by the domains of Family Relationships (7.90), Family Safety (7.66), Family Economy (7.62), Family and Community (7.65), Family Health (7.61), and Housing and Environment (7.29). However, only the Family Well-Being Index (Parents) was used to represent the Malaysian Family Well-Being Index.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS
The Family Well-Being Index was developed as one of the mechanisms to measure the well-being of a family. This study represents the first initiative to measure the well-being of families in the country. The indicators that had been developed need to be tested and improved from time to time to ensure that they are always relevant to the current situation and challenges.
The Family Well-Being Index shows that the well-being of families in Malaysia is currently at a moderate level and has yet to reach a level that we can be proud of. Therefore, more efforts and attention is required to provide more focus on certain aspects of family life that may have a negative impact on family well-being.

Based on these findings, recommendations to improve the well-being of families in this country are as follows:

**6.2.1 Programmes to Improve Family Well-Being**

1. Implement family support programmes emphasise family relationship, specifically in the aspect of balancing the demands of work and family. Amongst the key elements that need to be emphasised are balancing the demands of work and family are skills for effective communication, problem solving skills and time management in the family. This study also recommends that services and programmes which help families to be more resilient or enhances their skills to deal with the challenges faced should be expanded. Such programmes will also enable individuals to become more responsible and better parents in managing the household and family. Apart from that, education on the elements that improve spousal relationships as well as awareness of good family functioning should also be increased.

2. Continuation of the national agenda to improve the standard of living of the family, particularly that of the low income families. Family financial management programme should be extended to enable families to manage their financial resources more efficiently, as a preparation for the future especially in emergency situations. Subsequently, support services or financial assistance, such as financial counselling, should be readily available and accessible to families facing financial difficulties.

3. Intensify family health promotion activities that emphasise the importance of healthier lifestyles for the whole family. In addition, programmes and skills for stress management that are more effective need to be intensified too.

4. Advocacy programmes to increase knowledge among family members on emergency response. In addition, government efforts to reduce crime should be intensified to ensure a more higher level of safety.

5. Empower communities as a catalyst for the family support system through programmes focusing on the cooperation and participation of the family in community activities should be intensified.

6. Nurture and practise the importance of religious/spiritual practices and moral values in the family. Parents should be a model for other family members in emphasising spiritual practices as a protective factor for the development of a strong family institution.

7. Encourage the stakeholders in developing and implementing awareness programmes on the importance of preserving and conserving the environment. The family can serve as the first institution in educating the younger generation to have a sense of responsibility in the preservation and conservation of the environment.

**6.2.2 Policies**

1. To ensure the National Family Policy (NFP) and the plan of action (POA) introduced in 2010 are executed by all parties. The NFP and its POA are proactive initiatives taken by the Malaysian Government that aim to develop a resilient family institution with a high level of well-being. The NFP recognises the family unit as an essential unit in the development of a society and nation that is strong, developed and progressive. The support of all parties is important to ensure that the NFP and its POA which emphasises the ‘family perspective’ and ‘family first concept’ are implemented so that the family institution is strengthened and fortified to play its role fully. Through the implementation of the NFP, family-friendly policies need to be formulated and policies that are not family friendly be reviewed in order to help families balance the demands of work and family, particularly young families.

2. The Family Well-Being Index can be taken into consideration as an input for national planning and development. Apart from that, the generated Family Well-Being Index should be used as an alternative to measure the success of government programmes implemented besides the using of existing economic indicators (GDP or GNI).

**6.2.3 Research and Development**

1. The NPFDB will continuously test, evaluate and update the indicators of family well-being.

2. Continue conducting the Family Well-Being Index Study once every two to three years.

3. Test the calculation of the index for international comparison.

4. Increase research related to the institution of marriage and family as an input for the development of new evidence based programmes to improve the level of family well-being in Malaysia.
Conclusion and Recommendations
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Najib: Vital to be happy

We need an ‘A’ in happiness index, says PM

Najib says the main aim of the “1Malaysia” campaign and the “New Identity” programme is to ensure that all racial and religious groups in the country come together.

“Let’s make Malaysia the best place to live,” Najib said, adding that there were several initiatives taken by the government to achieve this goal. He said that the government had also undertaken several initiatives to improve the quality of life of the people, including the “1Malaysia” campaign and the “New Identity” programme.

Najib said that the government had also undertaken several initiatives to improve the quality of life of the people, including the “1Malaysia” campaign and the “New Identity” programme. He said that the government had also undertaken several initiatives to improve the quality of life of the people, including the “1Malaysia” campaign and the “New Identity” programme.
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Indeks Kesejahteraan Keluarga dijangka meningkat kepada 8.0 menjelang 2020

FIA beri impak positif

Jelajah Keluarga Bahagia dapat sambutan hebat
PM: Indeks kesejahteraan keluarga Malaysia perlu diperbaiki

Katakan ketika ini tahap kesejahteraan keluarga negara ini berada pada 3,55 daripada skala 10 dan banyak lagi usaha perlu dibuat bagi memperbaikkan institusi keluarga.

Ataslanggengnaswab berjenayah adalah untuk menentukan hak dan wajib atau memilih model paling sesuai diperluas untuk semua negara-M kota

Najib (Foto) kata bersempak pada Majalah Bulan Keluarga Kebangsaan Malaysia di sini, hari ini.

Kalkulator Pinjaman Rumah

Majalah.my/pinjaman-rumah

Bank Islam Malaysia
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Bankwang

Bank Rakyat

Bank MBS

Bank Panas

Bankwab

Bankwab

Tunai hadir, laten beliau, Datuk Seri Rosmah Mansor, dan Menteri Besar Dato' Sri Ahmad Zahid Hamidi.

Najib berkenaan terus kesejahteraan keluarga bukan berangsur kepada penduduk perkampung tetapi perlu ditambah dalam dimensi yang lain merangkum aspek kebudayaan dalam mengukur kesejahteraan dan kebahagiaan.


AtasSebagai komite berkuasa ia akan disambut setiap tahun dan setiap majalah digantung menggantikan sambutan itu dan kenaikan akan memberi perincian cukup bagi tujuan itu,katanya.

Dalam usaha memperbaikkan institusi keluarga, kenaikan juga memperolehkan dasar keluarga negara, ciri bermain, subsidii perpajakan anak, tuai in tempat kerja dan dasar rumah pertama.

Najib berkenaan terus kesejahteraan perkampung tetapi perlu ditambah dalam dimensi yang lain merangkum aspek kebudayaan dalam mengukur kesejahteraan dan kebahagiaan.

Ketika kenaikan yang paling kecil dalam unit sesuai tetapi tetap dalam usaha mencapai kemakmuran dan kesejahteraan keluarga, Najib menambah.
Tingkatkan Indeks Kesejahteraan

PENGARUHAN

Dari berbagai penelitian, ditemukan bahwa tingkat kesejahteraan individu dan keluarga di negara berkembang seperti Malaysia, Cina, dan India memiliki pengaruh yang signifikan terhadap tingkat kesejahteraan keluarga. Penelitian tersebut menunjukkan bahwa tingkat pendidikan, kesehatan, dan ekonomi adalah faktor utama yang mempengaruhi kesejahteraan keluarga.

KESIMPULAN

Dalam penelitian ini, ditemukan bahwa tingkat kesejahteraan individu dan keluarga di negara berkembang seperti Malaysia, Cina, dan India memiliki pengaruh yang signifikan terhadap tingkat kesejahteraan keluarga. Penelitian tersebut menunjukkan bahwa tingkat pendidikan, kesehatan, dan ekonomi adalah faktor utama yang mempengaruhi kesejahteraan keluarga.
DANAL NEGERI

KUALA LUMPUR 29 Julai - Tahap kesejahteraan keluarga di negara ini masih belum memuaskan apabila kajian oleh Lembaga Pendidikan dan Pembangunan Keluarga Negara (LPPKN) mendapati ia hanya berada pada tahap sederhana.

Ketua Pengarah LPPKN, Dr. Siti Norlailah Ismail berkata, berdasarkan kajian pertama yang dibuat pada 2011 itu mendapati tahap kesejahteraan dalam sebilah ekonomi mendapati skor paling rendah manakala dari segi agama dan kerohanian pula menastat sederhana.

"Melalui hasil kajian ini, kita harap penyeimbahan dapat diarahkan oleh pihak-pihak berkaitan bagi menyumbang kesejahteraan keluarga terutama sebilah ekonomi keluarga yang menekankan kelembahan terhadap Tabung Masa Depan."

"Justeru, kita sarankan agar aspek kewangan keluarga perlu dimantapkan dengan dana yang mengalur keluarga, termasuk dengan bantuan pihak majikan," katanya pada talkshow kepada media berhubung kajian Indeks Kesejahteraan Keluarga Malaysia 2011, di pejabatnya di sini hari ini.

Kajian itu dibahagikan kepada tujuh kategori iaitu dari sebilah ekonomi, agama dan kerohanian, hubungan kekeluargaan, kesihatan, keselamatan, komuniti dan persekitaran dengan skor satu adalah paling rendah dan 10 tertinggi dengan purata markah keseluruhannya berada pada tahap tujuh.

Katanya, kajian itu telah dilaksana kan ke atas 2,808 buah isi rumah yang melibatkan sesungguhnya 5,616 orang responden iaitu masing-masing 1,484 lelaki, wanita (1,524) dan remaja berusia 13 hingga 24 tahun sebanyak 2,808 orang.

Dr. Siti Norlailah Ismail berkata, Dasar Keluarga Negara perlu diguna pelakai oleh semua agensi terlibat untuk membantu individu menjadi ibu bapa yang lebih bertanggungjawab, berempat dan masap dalam menguruskan rumah tangga serta keluarga. - UTUSAN ONLINE
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## APPENDIX A

Relevant Keywords Used in Literature and Web Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Well-Being</th>
<th>Social Cultural Indicators/ Social Indicators</th>
<th>Subjective Well-Being</th>
<th>Well-Being Index in Malaysia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood well-being</td>
<td>Health indicators for New Zealanders</td>
<td>Subjective well-being rating</td>
<td>New Malaysian Quality of Life Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child well-being</td>
<td>Poverty and child well-being in China</td>
<td>Gender differences in subjective well-being</td>
<td>Family functioning and child well-being amongst urban Malay female single parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and youth well-being</td>
<td>Indicators of cultural well-being</td>
<td>National policy</td>
<td>Income, health and well-being around the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child well-being and income inequality</td>
<td>Convention on the rights of the child: UNICEF</td>
<td>Women’s role and well-being</td>
<td>Personal Well-Being Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family stability</td>
<td>Social and personal well-being module</td>
<td>Subjective economic well-being</td>
<td>Initiative for sustainable development indicators in Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure and child well-being</td>
<td>Social indicators and sustainability measurement</td>
<td>Subjective well-being: three decades of progress</td>
<td>Well-being of Nyawaig Traditional Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies on fragile families and child well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subjective well-being in adult Swedish population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and child well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australian Unity well-being index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of national well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being effect indicator matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td>Family Well-Being Indicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Paper: Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life indicators: monographs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected quality of life indicators</td>
<td>Economic well-being</td>
<td>Child poverty and family income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life of the Malaysian urban middle class</td>
<td>Child poverty report</td>
<td>Family flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The well-being of Native American children</td>
<td>National family well-being symposium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace and happiness</td>
<td>District monitoring of child and family well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Universal childcare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Index of spiritual well-being</td>
<td>Family and community relations, children and family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of life and social indicators</td>
<td>Family well-being checklist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child and family well-being indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Older Americans 2008: Key indicators of well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthening aboriginal families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family well-being indicator measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in well-being from childhood to adolescence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Index of culture and well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Population, health and human well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overtime work and well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX B
Number of Households Selected by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johor</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>Perlis</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedah</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Sabah</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaka</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Sarawak</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelantan</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Selangor</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negeri Sembilan</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Terengganu</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perak</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahang</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Penang</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,808</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>