



## Conceptualization of Filipino family wellbeing

Joanna Bantang ✉ jrbantang@up.edu.ph  
*University of the Philippines, the Philippines*

Florenda Gabriel ✉ fsgabriel1@up.edu.ph  
*University of the Philippines, the Philippines*

Consuelo Chua ✉ cielo3chua@gmail.com  
*University of the Philippines, the Philippines*

Aurora Llige ✉ asllige@up.edu.ph  
*University of the Philippines, the Philippines*

### Abstract

*The definition of family wellbeing should be sensitive to the characteristics of a specific culture or population. Several studies have examined the conceptualization of family wellbeing among Western cultures. Yet, very little studies exist, if any, among Southeast Asian cultures. This qualitative study aimed to develop a conceptualization of Filipino Family Wellbeing. In-depth interviews were conducted among mothers or fathers of 63 Filipino families from low, middle, and high-income groups. The families came from different parts of Metro Manila (the capital city of the Philippines) and nearby rural areas. During the in-depth interviews, the respondents were asked to determine their definitions and descriptions of family wellbeing, identify the experiences that they associated with family wellbeing, and describe the characteristics of families with family wellbeing. The interview transcripts were analyzed using thematic analysis. To enhance the credibility of the study findings, interview transcripts were analyzed by at least three members of the research team. Eight dimensions of Filipino Family Wellbeing emerged from the analysis—Resource Adequacy, Comfortable Lifestyle, Financial Security and Stability, Good Family Relationships, Good Parenting, Good Health, Virtuous Family, and Family Satisfaction and Contentment. Specific indicators for each family wellbeing dimension were also identified based on the interview codes. A comparison of the research outcomes with existing literature showed that the Filipinos' concept of family wellbeing is similar in various ways with the conceptualizations of other populations. However, some indicators of Filipino family wellbeing were distinct from those found in other countries, such as the strong emphasis on providing the wants of children and leading a virtuous family life. Based on the peculiarities of the Filipinos' definition of family wellbeing, the study recommends the development of a family wellbeing measure that is suitable for Filipino families.*

**KEYWORDS:** FILIPINO FAMILIES; FAMILY WELLBEING; QUALITY OF LIFE; FAMILY FUNCTIONING; CONCEPTUALIZATION

## Introduction

The family is considered as the primary social institution for providing basic needs and care for its members. Family functioning is essential to a person's well-being and is considered the foundation of a good society. Everyone will agree that "families that function well support societies, and families with effective quality of life are seen as social resource" (Isaacs et al., 2007, p. 178). Given the critical role of the family, proper attention should be given to ensure its well-being.

Collective well-being is composed of the shared interest and characteristics of individuals in community, ethnic, and cultural groups (King, 2007). This includes family well-being since it refers to both the well-being of its individual members and the relationship among them (Fahey, Keilthy, & Polek, 2012). Well-being includes how families are able to operate as members of the society (Braun & Bauer, 1997), as well as the ways they behave and socialize with others (Huppert, 2005 as cited in Camfield, Streuli, & Woodhead, 2009; Gough & McGregor, 2007).

While family wellbeing (FWB) plays a critical role in individual wellbeing, a clear and consistent conceptualization of family wellbeing is quite elusive (McGregor, 2020). There have been several initiatives to conceptualize family wellbeing, but most of these have Western origins (e.g., Baldwin, 1996; Isaacs et al., 2007; McGregor, 2020; Poston et.al, 2003). The dimensions of well-being, both objective and subjective, vary depending on personal, cultural, social, and geographic characteristics (Deiner & Scollon, 2014; Wish, 1986). This fluid nature of well-being entails the development of conceptualizations that are sensitive to the characteristics of a specific population, suggesting that Western conceptualizations of FWB are not necessarily applicable to non-Western countries. In fact, McGregor (2020) emphasized the need for future FWB conceptualizations to focus on other non-Western regions including Asia and Africa. In so doing, FWB conceptualizations could target the real meaning of family wellbeing for specific populations, which could lead to more meaningful programs and metrics that address salient dimensions of family living.

Similar to other Southeast Asian countries, studies on the conceptualization of family wellbeing in the Philippines is still at its early stage. The study of SyCip et al. (2000) is probably the most encompassing local study in the Philippines on well-being (translated to *magandang buhay*), but this study focused on individual wellbeing. At the family level, a conceptualization of Filipino wellbeing has not been located in literature. Although individual wellbeing and family wellbeing are related, these are two different concepts that merit separate conceptualizations. In fact, McGregor (2020) underscored the need to distinguish individual from family wellbeing "to ensure proper comprehension, and application in practice, education, policy, and research." (p. 3)

The Philippines, being a developing country, is home to 4,740,000 poor families (Mapa, 2021). Given this, home economists and social development practitioners face a great challenge in developing applicable programs and interventions that can effectively improve Filipino families' quality of life. A good starting point to address this challenge is to offer a clear conceptualization of FWB for Filipino families. Through this, programs and interventions could be more tailored to address the families' wellbeing needs. The desire to uplift the wellbeing of Filipino families, alongside the growing importance attributed to family well-being in different contexts, and the dearth of local understanding of Filipino FWB gave impetus to this study. This research sought to elucidate the Filipino perspective on the concept of family well-being. Using the study of Poston et.al. (2003) as an inspiration, this study aimed to develop a conceptualization of Filipino family wellbeing. Specifically, it aimed to determine the dimensions and indicators of family well-being based on the perspective of Filipino family members.

## **Methods and Materials**

### **Participants**

The study followed a qualitative research design in developing a conceptualization of Filipino FWB. The study participants included mothers (10) or fathers (53) of 63 Filipino families. Thirty-five of the families resided in different areas of Metro Manila, the capital of the Philippines, while 28 came from nearby rural areas including Bataan, Bulacan, Pampanga, and Rizal. Among the families, 19 were low-income, 32 were middle-income, and 12 were high-income. The participants' family size ranged from three to 12 members, with most families having less than six members. The number of children of the respondents ranged from zero to 10, with the majority having one to three children. The families belonged to different stages in the family life cycle. The occupation of the respondents was also varied. Most high-income participants were professionals or are business-owners while those from the low-income bracket were mostly skilled laborers, caretakers, housewives, or self-employed.

The families were purposively selected based on the following inclusion criteria: the family should 1) have at least one parent; 2) belong to either one of the three income levels; 3) have at least one child, and 4) have parents who are not more than 60 years old. The definition of a family by the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA) was used in selecting participants. PSA defines a family as "a group of persons usually living together and composed of the head and other persons related to the head by blood, marriage or adoption. It includes both the nuclear and extended family" (Philippines, Statistics Authority, 2003). On the other hand, family income level was determined using the study of Albert et.al (2018) as a guide, with corresponding adjustments for inflation and the number of family members.

The families were recruited by approaching them in their neighborhoods and through referrals. The selection of new participants continued until data saturation was reached. The definition of data saturation provided by Fusch & Ness (2015) was used as a guide in determining whether data saturation has been achieved. According to Fusch and Ness, "Data saturation is reached when there is enough information to replicate the study when the ability to obtain additional new information has been attained, and when further coding is no longer feasible" (p. 1408). In the current study, the sample size of 63 participants was more than sufficient to satisfy data saturation, since after analyzing only 60% of the interview transcripts, key terms were already observed to constantly repeat with each additional analysis. At the same time, new codes of family wellbeing no longer emerged. The emergent themes were also observed to be similar across income status and respondent locale.

### **Instrument and Data Collection Procedures**

Since an inductive approach was sought in developing a conceptualization of Filipino FWB, in-depth interviews were conducted to gather narratives about the meaning of family wellbeing for Filipinos. An open-ended interview questionnaire was used to gather data from the families. The study of Poston et. al. (2003) was used as a guide in writing the interview questions. The first part of the interview guide included questions about family wellbeing in general such as: 1) What things or experiences cross your mind when you hear the term family wellbeing? 2) Do you know a family who has family wellbeing? 3) What are the characteristics and experiences of this family? On the other hand, the second part of the interview guide involved more specific questions about the family wellbeing experiences of the individual families such as—1) Can you relay a time wherein your family experienced family wellbeing? 2) Can you describe what you experienced during this time? 3) Can you relay an instance that your family or a family that you know experienced family illbeing?

The interviews were conducted by six trained research assistants. Each research assistant attended an interviewer training session and was provided with an interviewer manual. The first set of data was collected through face-to-face interviews from February to early March 2020.

However, data collection was temporarily halted in mid-March of 2020 due to the COVID 19 Pandemic. Interviews resumed in August 2020, but the mode of the interview was modified from face-to-face to voice or video call due to the movement restrictions brought about by the ongoing pandemic.

In gathering interview data before the Pandemic, the research assistants visited the respective homes of target participants. They explained the nature of the study to them and requested for their informed consent to participate if they meet the study's selection criteria. Similar data collection procedures were followed during the pandemic; however, all communication was carried out through voice or video call and consent forms were accomplished electronically. The interviews lasted for approximately 30 to 45 minutes each. The participants received a simple token (e.g., eco bag, snack items) after each interview.

### **Data Analysis**

The qualitative data that ensued from the interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis. To enhance the credibility of the study findings, interview transcripts were analyzed separately by at least three members of the research team. Each of the researchers individually coded the transcripts and identified family wellbeing categories that were common across the codes. Separate analyses were done for each income level (low, middle, high) and research locale (rural and urban). After their initial analysis, the researcher team met to compare the codes and categories that they generated from the transcripts. Upon comparison, the categories generated were found to be very similar across each individual analysis, and even across the three income levels and respondent locale. However, there were some variations on the labels that were used by the individual researchers. As such, another meeting was held to re-examine the categories and agree on the most appropriate category labels. After agreeing on the categories, the members of the research team recoded all 63 interview transcripts to double-check whether the data indeed matched the FWB categories that were generated. During the process of recoding, a few overlaps among the codes and categories were noted. Following this process, the research team met once again to refine the categories. This iterative data analysis process led to eight themes or dimensions of Filipino Family Wellbeing.

The next step involved identifying specific indicators for each FWB dimension. Each member of the research team separately identified specific indicators for each FWB dimension based on the interview codes. Subsequently, the research team met twice to agree on the indicators that appropriately describe each family wellbeing dimension.

### **Ethical Considerations**

Ethical protocols were practiced all throughout the conduct of the research. Informed consent forms were secured from each willing participant. The details of the informed consent form such as voluntary participation, confidentiality, the benefits, and risks of participation were explained to the potential participants. The data obtained were handled carefully by the research team to ensure confidentiality.

### **Results**

Throughout the iterative process of thematic analysis, eight dimensions of Filipino family wellbeing recurrently emerged—resource adequacy, comfortable lifestyle, financial security and stability, good health of family members, good family relationships, good parenting, virtuous family living, and family satisfaction and contentment. An illustration of the Filipino

FWB dimensions is presented in Figure 1. The definition of each dimension and the common indicators encompassing each dimension are presented in Table 1.



Figure 1. Filipino Family Wellbeing Dimensions

Table 1. Dimensions and Indicators of Filipino Family Wellbeing

Filipino Family Wellbeing Dimensions	Indicators
<b>Resource Adequacy</b> <i>This dimension pertains to the ability of the family to acquire or access basic needs such as food, clothing, shelter, health care, and education.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Family has sufficient food to eat everyday</li> <li>2. Family can send children to school</li> <li>3. Family has access to medical and health needs</li> <li>4. Family has sufficient resources to meet daily needs</li> <li>5. Family members have adequate clothing</li> <li>6. Family has as a decent and safe dwelling space</li> </ol>
<b>Comfortable Lifestyle</b> <i>This dimension refers to the ability of the family to enjoy simple leisure and comforts of life and their capacity to choose or acquire things that they want.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Family can provide the simple wishes of children</li> <li>2. Family has choice over basic needs (e.g., choosing the food and clothing that they like)</li> <li>3. Family can enjoy simple vacations, leisure activities, and simple luxuries</li> <li>4. Family can afford to celebrate special occasions</li> <li>5. Family members have sufficient time to rest and relax</li> </ol>
<b>Financial Security and Stability</b> <i>This dimension refers to the regularity and stability of the family's income, their capacity to acquire assets, and their capacity to save and financially prepare for the future.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Family has a regular and stable source of income</li> <li>2. Family has financial resources to acquire assets</li> <li>3. Family has enough savings for emergencies and future needs</li> </ol>
<b>Good Health of Family Members</b> <i>This refers to the general health of family members.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All family members are generally healthy</li> <li>2. There is absence of long-term illness in the family</li> </ol>

Filipino Family Wellbeing Dimensions	Indicators
<i>Definition</i>	
<b>Good Family Relationships</b> <i>This dimension refers to the positive, loving, and harmonious relationships among family members, family togetherness, and their capacity to support each other and solve internal problems.</i>	1. Family can solve internal problems and challenges 2. Family has a positive, loving, and harmonious relationship 3. Family is complete (not broken) 4. Family spends time together 5. Family members help each other 6. Family has positive communication 7. Family is happy as a whole
<b>Good Parenting</b> <i>This refers to the ability of the parents to raise morally upright children and provide the necessary guidance.</i>	1. Parents provide proper guidance to children 2. Parents serve as good role models to children 3. Parents are able to raise good children 4. Parents can enable children to finish their education
<b>Virtuous Family Living</b> <i>This refers to family members practicing sound moral values and having faith in God. This entails refraining from vices and engaging in charitable acts.</i>	1. The family has faith in God 2. The family practices good moral values
<b>Family Satisfaction and Contentment</b> <i>This refers to the general satisfaction that family members feel with their living standards.</i>	1. The family is satisfied with their standard of living 2. The family is contented with what they have

Note. This table took inspiration from the presentation of family wellbeing domains in the study of Poston et.al. (2003), p. 322

### Resource adequacy

Resource adequacy pertains to the ability of the family to acquire or access sufficient basic needs such as food, clothing, shelter, and education. This points to the universal aspect of living a good life that starts with having adequate necessities to support a family's daily living and functioning. Resource adequacy is not necessarily akin to financial adequacy, since basic needs may be accessed through other means such as gifts or assistance from relatives, neighbors, and the government. One major indicator of this dimension is that the family should have sufficient food to eat every day. One respondent shared, "We get to eat enough throughout the day. Even though it is just adequate, at least we still eat."

Across the income groups, many noted the unwritten rule of having three meals a day. Although few specifically noted the importance of having rice in their diet, the respondents did not give a detailed description of the food they should eat, not even the quality and diversity of meals. Sufficiency is measured in terms of the required frequency of daily food intake. Another indicator of resource adequacy is sending children to school. Once again, the respondents did not give very specific requirements except to say that their children should go to a "good school." In general, they referred to the simple fact that their children can be formally educated as seen in the following response: "I can say that we have family well-being because I could send my child to a good school."

The family's access to medical and health needs emerged as another indicator of resource adequacy. Just like having sufficient meals every day, the respondents stated that having enough resources at hand to cover health-related expenses is important to family well-being. These resources for medical needs should be readily or easily accessible. These sentiments can be seen in the following response: "You have enough money for proper healthcare. If someone is sick, you have no trouble finding money to pay the doctor." Other indicators that emerged pertain to other basic needs such as clothing and shelter. They, once again, pointed out that there is no need for excess. These needs should be met at the minimum level where they can

feel protected and safe. One respondent pointed out, “The house should be comfortable and livable. It does not have to be luxurious. It’s safe and clean.”

Beyond addressing food, clothing, shelter, education, and health needs, a family should have other sufficient resources for running the household. Therefore, another indicator is having sufficient resources to meet other daily needs including paying for utilities and other bills. The respondents further described that sufficiency means not having to borrow money for basic needs.

### **Comfortable lifestyle**

While resource adequacy pertains to acquiring the necessities where family members are adequately supported and family functioning is not impeded, comfortable lifestyle is focused on pleasures of life. This dimension refers to the ability of the family to enjoy simple leisure and comforts of life and their capacity to choose or acquire things that they want. Several indicators emerged under this dimension. The first and most prominent indicator is the ability of the family to provide for the simple wishes of the children as seen in the following response: “I can buy what my children want when there is extra money.”

This indicator seems to be unique to Filipino FWB as it was not highlighted in other FWB studies. This study showed that for Filipinos, family wellbeing is closely linked to providing the simple desires of children. It is interesting to note that none of the respondents focused solely on their personal wants or wishes. Rather, they referred to the wants of their children or their entire family unit. This reflects the Filipino value of family-centeredness. In connection to this is another strong indicator which is having choice over basic needs (e.g., choosing the food and clothing that they like) of the family, such as this statement from one respondent, “We can buy what we want. We can eat what we want, even if it’s expensive.”

None of the respondents shared extravagant choices, but merely noted several things they wish to do that go beyond the basic level of needs. This capacity to choose simple wants is indicative of having a comfortable lifestyle. It allows the family to be more relaxed, knowing they have some extra resources to spend on simple luxuries. This is related to another indicator which is the family’s ability to enjoy simple vacations and leisure activities. The family’s ability to celebrate special occasions and spend time to rest and relax also emerged as indicators of this dimension. Celebrating as a family is a big part of the Filipino family culture. Oftentimes, this means inviting relatives and friends to join special occasions such as birthdays and Christmas.

### **Financial Security and Stability**

Next to comfortable lifestyle, financial security and stability emerged as another salient dimension of Filipino FWB across all income strata and locale (urban or rural). Financial security and stability pertain to the regularity and stability of the family’s income, their capacity to acquire assets, and their capacity to save and financially prepare for the future. In contrast to resource adequacy, family security and stability go beyond simply having sufficient resources or means to acquire basic daily needs. One prominent indicator of this dimension is income stability and regularity, which is seen as a means for families to either improve their living standards (for low-income families) or maintain their current standards of living (for high-income families). Related to having a stable source of income is the emphasis on having a good job or source of livelihood.

The capacity of the family to acquire assets also emerged as an indicator of this dimension. Particularly, the respondents placed strong importance on acquiring their own house and car. One respondent shared, “Yes, (we have family wellbeing) because we are slowly achieving our dream of owning a nice house and a car that we can use.”

Another strong indicator of financial security and stability is the capacity to save for the future needs of the families and for emergency situations, especially healthcare needs. Having a secure emergency fund to rely on is essential for Filipino families, especially since the Philippines do not have adequate social services such as free healthcare and livable government pension benefits. One respondent mentioned, “To achieve family wellbeing, a family should have savings to rely on during emergencies.”

### **Good Health of Family Members**

Aside from resource and financial needs, the respondents across all income groups identified good health as one aspect of family well-being. This dimension refers to the general health of family members. Two indicators were identified for this dimension. The first indicator, “all family members are generally healthy” is about having good health and being able to maintain good health for all the members of the family. In the words of the respondent, the family should have “ability to prepare and provide for health”. Good health for the respondents includes not only physical health but mental and emotional health as well (“not having emotional distress”). The second indicator pertains to the “absence of long-term illness in the family”. This indicator refers to freedom from any sickness or incident that negatively impacts the health of the family members. This includes accidents as one respondent said that “accidents have a big effect on health”. It also includes not having chronic diseases that lead to prolonged hospitalizations and perennial illnesses. Maintaining good health also indicates that healthy family members would be able to care for each other. One respondent said that: “When members are healthy, they are able to take care of the sick family.” Moreover, there is also recognition that health translates into other aspects of well-being, thus, the axiom “health is wealth” mentioned by the respondents.

### **Good Family Relationships**

Good family relationships emerged as another dominant dimension of family wellbeing. Good family relationship refers to the positive, loving, and harmonious relationships among family members. The most common expectations of respondents are simply being together peacefully, spending happy times after a day’s work, and expressing love between couples and among family members. One respondent shared that there’s family well-being when one “goes home to a happy family after work where family members—children and parents—share stories, talk to each other, laugh together, even sing together.”

Many respondents simply say that the absence of fights or conflict already constitutes a good life. In fact, for many respondents, the economic aspect of FWB becomes insignificant if there is no harmony within the family. In the same manner, a conflictual relationship is seen as aggravating a family who already suffers financial inadequacy. As one respondent shared, “If the relationship is chaotic, there’s always fighting; it’s already bad that a family has nothing to eat so it is worse if on top of that, there’s still fighting! A good life does not always pertain to having material goods, as long as the relationship is intact, [that is already a good life]”.

This dimension even acknowledges that there can still be problems even if a family is living a good life; however, the key point is that the family members have the capacity to support each other and solve internal problems together. Synonymous to cooperation in solving problems is helping one another, especially in achieving their family goals. It is reflected in some of the responses, particularly among those in the low-income group, who believe that even if there is resource insufficiency, a good life can still be achieved. According to one respondent, “There’s cooperation; no faulty-finding if problems arise, instead, they will find a solution to whatever problem the family encounters.”



### **Good Parenting**

Similar to the previous dimension, good parenting is another indicator that is grounded on the social and relational aspects of well-being. This dimension refers to the ability of the parents to be good role models to their children, to raise morally upright children, and provide the necessary guidance for their children to finish their education. Good parenting is an equally important responsibility of parents, perhaps more so than providing children with sufficient resources. It is usual for Filipino families to say that good parenting, which results in having good children can compensate for the lack of financial stability or security of a family. It can be observed, however, that the success indicators of raising children well slightly differ according to the income class. For the low- and middle-income families, raising children well means that the children have finished schooling that promises a stable career and are doing well financially. A respondent shared, “I tell you that it is not only financial success that suggests a good life; when I was able to support my children until they finish schooling, I can already say that we already have a good life.”

On the other hand, for high income families, raising children well means exhibiting good behavior or breeding—an indigenous concept articulated to mean having a good social background and good manners. As mentioned by one respondent, “You can see that the kids have breeding; not problematic.”

### **Virtuous Family Life**

This dimension elucidates further what it means to have a good family relationship and good or well-behaved children. It appears that being good parents and having a good family relationship are outcomes of practicing a virtuous life. It is differentiated from the other dimensions by anchoring the basis of virtue to faith in God and is practiced through sound moral values, refraining from vices, and engaging in charitable acts. Living a virtuous life does not necessarily mean devout practice—it is sufficient that they believe and hope in God and that belief is lived. This is not surprising since Filipinos are known for their religiosity and majority are believers in God or a Supreme Being. Many respondents resonate with this statement, “for me, the number one indicator of a good life is the family’s belief in God.”

### **Family Satisfaction and Contentment**

This dimension of family well-being refers to the general satisfaction that family members feel with their living standards. This dimension is most noticeable among low-income and middle-income families and less among the high-income ones. The first indicator for this dimension—“the family is satisfied with their standard of living”—indicates a feeling that the family has enough for the kind of life that they want. As one respondent puts it “we are satisfied that we are doing okay”. The second indicator refers to the family’s “contentment with what they have”. Family well-being is not determined by mere acquisition of wealth and extravagant living but in having sufficient resources for their wants. One respondent said, “we are not looking for more material things, but just what’s right; we do not need a car, we can still travel”.

### **Discussion**

This study is the first attempt to develop a conceptualization of Filipino FWB and develop dimensions and indicators that distinctly describe the construct. Previous studies, mostly Western in origin, developed conceptualizations of FWB based on an analysis of related literature rather than from the perspectives of real families. For instance, an early attempt by home economists looked into a conceptualization of FWB based on the critical science paradigm composed of three aspects of human interest—technical action and the material dimension, communicative action, and the practical-moral dimension, and power and the emancipative

dimension (Baldwin, 1996) but did not propose a definition nor dimensions of the concept. On the other hand, a more recent conceptualization of family well-being was proposed by McGregor (2020), which comprised eight dimensions. There were studies that developed conceptualizations of family quality of life based on interviews of family members or individuals (e.g., IHC, New Zealand, 2016, Poston et. al, 2003) or consultations with various stakeholders (Isaacs, et.al., 2007), but the focus was more on the conceptualization of family quality of life for families with a disabled member.

This study revealed that the Filipino's concept of family wellbeing can be captured in terms of eight dimensions—resource adequacy, comfortable lifestyle, financial security and stability, good health of family members, good family relationships, good parenting, virtuous family living, and family satisfaction and contentment. Some of the dimensions (resource adequacy, comfortable lifestyle, financial security and stability, good health of family members, good family relationships, virtuous family living) are similar to the dimensions found in other studies, however, the indicators have some distinctions. A comparison of the family quality of life or FWB domains that emerged from Western studies and the current study point to certain peculiarities with the way Filipinos perceive FWB.

First, it can be noted that “resource adequacy” and “comfortable lifestyle” dimensions echo other attempts at understanding well-being and its dimensions. This is mainly because these two describe fundamental human needs that will allow them to function and flourish (Gasper, 2007; Ventegodt, Merrick, & Andersen, 2003). However, the indicators of resource adequacy (e.g., access to basic needs, healthcare, and basic education) are commonly included under financial wellbeing in other studies (e.g., Poston, et.al, 2003). Yet, in the present study resource adequacy comprise a separate dimension because Filipino families, especially from low-income groups, do not view access to resources solely from a financial perspective. Resource adequacy could be obtained through other means such as government aid, assistance (in kind or in cash) from other people, or readily available resources in one's community. It should be noted that the perspective of Filipinos on what constitutes sufficient resources is anchored on the general standard of living in the Philippines, which may not be globally accepted.

Second, some indicators of “a comfortable lifestyle” such as leisure and recreation were also evident in other family wellbeing conceptualizations (e.g., Isaacs, et.al., 2007; Poston, et. al, 2003), but one prominent indicator in the current study (satisfying the simple wishes of children) is unique to the Filipino concept of FWB. This captures the primary importance that Filipino families give to their children and validates an earlier study by Dy & Chua (2020), saying that one major source of happiness for Filipinos is providing for the needs and wants of their children.

Third, while parenting was a domain that was similarly found in the study of Poston, et.al. (2003) albeit not in other conceptualizations, one distinct emphasis of good parenting in the Filipino FWB sense is the ability to put children through school, specifically finish college education. This peculiarity validates the priority given by Filipino families to education. Filipino parents give primary importance to education and consider education “as one of the most important legacies they can impart to their children (Maligalig, et.al, 2010, p. 1).” They view education as a ticket to a good future and a way out of poverty (Maligalig, 2010).

Fourth, while the dimension, virtuous family living, was similar in a sense to the dimension of “spiritual health” of McGregor (2020) that considers having a relationship with a deity (for Filipinos, God in particular) and “influence of values” by Isaacs, et.al. (2007) that considers the utilization of values to guide life, “virtuous family living” also emphasizes living a virtuous life

that is free from immoral acts and vices. The importance of helping others and giving to charity was also a salient indicator of this dimension.

Finally, the dimension “family satisfaction and contentment” was not evident in other family wellbeing conceptualizations, making this distinct to Filipino FWB. This dimension substantiates an earlier finding that Filipino families, particularly low-income families, find happiness by being content with whatever they have and the simple provisions from God (Dy & Chua, 2020). In the current study, many Filipino families signified being satisfied with a simple life and keeping the family together. The respondents mentioned the importance of family contentment, without necessarily having an abundance of material resources. For Filipinos, FWB may still be achieved, even if resources are limited, as long as the family is satisfied and content.

### Conclusion and Recommendations

This study developed a conceptualization of Filipino family wellbeing based on the perspectives of individual family members. Filipino FWB can be described in terms of eight dimensions—resource adequacy, comfortable lifestyle, financial security and stability, good health of family members, good family relationships, good parenting, virtuous family living, and family satisfaction and contentment. Most of these dimensions have similarities with earlier conceptualizations of FWB, however, the indicators that describe these dimensions have certain distinctions, indicating that there are peculiarities with how Filipinos assign meaning to FWB. Of particular interest is the importance given to providing the simple wishes of children, which was a salient dimension of a comfortable lifestyle. Another distinction is the value given to supporting children through college, which was an indicator of good parenting. One unique dimension that emerged, family contentment and satisfaction, was not evident in other FWB conceptualizations. This captures the notion of Filipinos that FWB is achievable so long as the family is happy and content.

This study has certain limitations that may be addressed by succeeding research. First, although the sample included families from rural and urban areas, only rural areas near the capital city was included. There is a possibility that families in remote rural areas have conceptions of FWB that were not captured in this study. Future studies may consider gathering the perspectives of families from other geographic areas in the Philippines that were not part of the study. Second, member checking was not implemented due to the time lapse between data collection and analysis that was caused by the ongoing pandemic. Although, this limitation was mitigated by recoding the interview transcripts after the initial round of conceptualization, future studies would benefit from conducting a member check of emerging dimensions to further strengthen the validity of the FWB conceptualization.

Finally, since the study showed that Filipino FWB has its peculiarities, the development of a family wellbeing measure that is suitable for Filipino families is recommended.

### Acknowledgement

This study was funded by the Office of the Vice-Chancellor for Research and Development, University of the Philippines, Diliman.

### References

- Albert, J.R.G., Santos, A.G.F., & Vizmanos, J.F.A. (2018, December). Defining and profiling the middle class. *PIDS Policy Notes*. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidspn1818.pdf>
- Armstrong, M.I., Birnie-Lefcovitch, S. & Ungar, M.T. (2005). Pathways between social support, family well-being, quality of parenting, and child resilience: What we know. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *14*, 269-281. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-005-5054-4>

- Baldwin, E. (1996). Family well-being: A conceptualization guide to professional practice. *Toward a Theory of Family Well-being*. (pp. 5-14). Kappa Omicron Nu Honor Society. [https://www.kon.org/family\\_well-being\\_1.pdf](https://www.kon.org/family_well-being_1.pdf)
- Braun, B., & Bauer, J. (1997, June). From welfare to well-being: A framework for dialogue and action. in M. Henry, D. Mistifer, & F. Smith (Eds.), *Toward a Theory of Family Wellbeing II*. (pp. 60-64). Kappa Omicron Nu Honor Society. [https://www.kon.org/family\\_well-being\\_2.pdf](https://www.kon.org/family_well-being_2.pdf)
- Camfield, L., Streuli, N., & Woodhead, M. (2009). What's the use of 'well-being' in contexts of child poverty? Approaches to research, monitoring and children's participation. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 17, 65-109. <https://doi.org/10.1163/157181808X357330>.
- Diener, E., & Scollon, C. N. (2014). The What, Why, When, and How of Teaching the Science of Subjective Well-Being. *Teaching of Psychology*, 41(2), 175-183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628314530346>
- Dy, K.D.K. & Chua, C.T. (2020). Happiness among urban poor Filipino families. *IAFOR Journal of Psychology and the Behavioral Sciences*, 6 (1), 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.22492/ijpbs.6.1.01>
- Fahey, T., Keilthy, P., & Polek, E. (2012). *Family relationships and family well-being: A study of families of nine year-olds in Ireland*. University College Dublin and the Family Support Agency. [https://onefamily.ie/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Family\\_Relationships\\_and\\_Family\\_Well-Being\\_Dec\\_2012.pdf](https://onefamily.ie/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Family_Relationships_and_Family_Well-Being_Dec_2012.pdf)
- Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are We There Yet? Data Saturation in Qualitative Research. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1408-1416. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2015.2281>
- Gasper, D. (2007). *Conceptualising human needs and wellbeing*. [https://repub.eur.nl/pub/50678/metis\\_168753.pdf](https://repub.eur.nl/pub/50678/metis_168753.pdf)
- Gough, I., & McGregor, J. (2007). *Wellbeing in developing countries: From theory to research*. Cambridge University Press. [http://assets.cambridge.org/97805218/57512/frontmatter/9780521857512\\_frontmatter.pdf](http://assets.cambridge.org/97805218/57512/frontmatter/9780521857512_frontmatter.pdf)
- IHC New Zealand. (2016, April). *What's important for family wellbeing*. What's important for family well-being\_7May2016\_0.pdf (ihc.org.nz)
- Isaacs, B. J., Brown, I., Brown, R. I., Baum, N., Myerscough, T., Neikrug, S., ... Wang, M. (2007). The international family quality of life project: Goals and description of a survey tool. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 4(3), 177-185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1741-1130.2007.00116.X>
- King, P. (2007, March). *The concept of wellbeing and its application in a study of ageing in Aotearoa New Zealand*. (EWAS Working Paper Series No. 8). <http://www.ewas.net.nz/Publications/filesEWAS/Conceptualising%20Wellbeing.pdf>
- Maligalig, D.S., Caoli-Rodriguez, R.B., Martinez, A. & Cuevas, S. (2010, May). *Education outcomes in the Philippines*. (ADB Economics Working Paper Series No. 199). <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/28409/economics-wp199.pdf>
- Mapa, D.S. (2021, December 17). *Proportion of poor Filipinos registered at 23.7 percent in the first semester of 2021*. Philippine Statistics Authority. <https://psa.gov.ph/poverty-press-releases/nid/165535>
- McGregor, S. L.T. (2020, May). *Conceptualizing family well-being*. (McGregor Monograph Series 202001). Seabright, NS: McGregor Consulting Group. [www.consultmcgregor.com](http://www.consultmcgregor.com)
- Philippine Statistics Authority (2003, October). *Approving and adopting the official concepts and definitions for statistical purposes of the selected: Prices, population, housing, and tourism*. (NSCB Resolution No. 11 Series of 2003) <https://psa.gov.ph/article/nscb-executive-board-resolution-no-11-approving-and-adopting-official-concepts-and>
- Poston, D.J., Turnbull, A.P., Park, J., Mannan, H., Marquis, J., & Wang, M. (2003). Family quality of life: a qualitative inquiry. *Mental Retardation*, 41 5, 313-28. [https://doi.org/10.1352/0047-6765\(2003\)41<313:FQQLAQ>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1352/0047-6765(2003)41<313:FQQLAQ>2.0.CO;2)
- SyCip, L.Y., Asis, M.B., & Luna, E. M. (2000). *The measurement of well-being: Technical report*. University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies.
- Ventegodt, S., Merrick, J., & Andersen, N. J. (2003). Quality of life theory III. Maslow revisited. *The Scientific World Journal*, 3, 1050-1057. <https://doi.org/10.1100/tsw.2003.84>
- Wish, N. B. (1986). Are We Really Measuring the Quality of Life? Well-Being Has Subjective Dimensions, As Well As Objective Ones. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 45, 93-99. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1536-7150.1986.tb01906.x>
- Wollny, I., Apps, J., Henricson, C. (2010) *Can Government measure family wellbeing? A literature review*. London: Family and Parenting Institute. <https://www.familyandchildcaretrust.org/sites/default/files/Resource%20Library/Can%20Government%20measure%20Family%20Wellbeing%20%282010%29.pdf>