



Designing the Filipino Family Well-Being Survey

Conseulo Chua
University of Philippines, Philippines

Joanne Bantang
University of Philippines, Philippines

Aurora Llige
University of Philippines, Philippines

Florenda Gabriel
University of Philippines, Philippines

Abstract

The objectives of the study were to design a Filipino Family Well-being Survey (FFWS) for parents and children and determine its content validity and reliability. Quantitative and qualitative methods were used, mainly a survey. Initially, 146 items were constructed, but the number was reduced to 75 items after checking for duplication and relevance. The 75 items underwent content validity assessment by six Filipino family experts and reliability analysis, resulting in a final version with a 50-item scale. The reliability of the FFWS, using Cronbach's Alpha, resulted in a high overall reliability of $\alpha = 0.957$ for the parents' version and $\alpha = 0.949$ for the children's version. The final version of the FFWS comprises 50 items across eight dimensions: resource adequacy (12 items), comfortable lifestyle (5 items), financial security and stability (9 items), good family relationships (9 items), good parenting (4 items), good health of family members (2 items), virtuous family life (6 items), and family satisfaction and contentment (3 items). The different dimensions of FFWS have a moderate to high reliability of $\alpha = 0.737$ to $\alpha = 0.929$ for the parents' version and between $\alpha = 0.680$ to $\alpha = 0.919$ for the children's version.

KEYWORDS: FAMILY WELL-BEING, FILIPINO FAMILY, INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

Background of the Study

The family is often regarded as the basic unit of society; therefore, it logically plays a crucial role in the development of larger communities and the attainment of national goals. There is considerable attention and a growing body of scholarly work aimed at conceptualizing (Chua et al., 2022; Crandall et al., 2023; Lee & Han, 2024; McGregor, 2020; Noor et al., 2014; Poston et al., 2003) and measuring family well-being (Brown et al., 2006; Hoffman et al., 2006; Isaacs et

al., 2007). Most of these studies emphasize heavily the health-related aspects of family well-being (e.g., members with special needs, disabilities, mental disorders, or chronic illnesses) (Aznar & Castañón, 2005; García-Grau et al., 2018; Sümen & Öncel, 2024; Vanderkerken et al., 2018), which is indeed important when public health rests on maintenance, prevention, and intervention that starts with the family. The vital role of the family in promoting good health is undeniable; however, its concerns, which can impact society, extend far beyond public health issues. Broader elements of well-being beyond healthcare are just as important. As explained by Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Theory (1979), the family is part of an individual's microsystem, comprising their immediate living and learning environment. In short, the family is the site of core life experiences, milestones, and challenges that impact and shape society, depending on whether struggling, surviving, or flourishing families exist. Therefore, there needs to be a holistic understanding of the family and appreciation for the myriad of things and situations that affect their well-being as a unit.

Several tools have been developed to measure family well-being, including the Beach Center Family Quality of Life Scale (Hoffman et al., 2006), which comprises five domains: family interaction, emotional well-being, material well-being, parenting, and disability-related supports. The Family Quality of Life Survey (Brown et al., 2006) was developed for families caring for members with disabilities, utilizing a five-point Likert scale and narrative report. This instrument was widely used in various countries and was translated into many languages, but it was later updated to the International Family Quality of Life Project, where the proponents refined the nine domains: family relationships, health, finances, influence of values, leisure and recreation, community interaction, careers and planning for careers, support from other people, and support from disability-related services (Isaacs et al., 2007).

While other nations can adapt these tools, the concept of family well-being is complex and multidimensional. Well-being tools measure the presence or absence of certain characteristics or situations, which will greatly vary depending on the day-to-day lives of the families. Therefore, family well-being is highly context-specific due to the differences in cultures and values that are undoubtedly entrenched in the way families form, grow, and thrive. The intricacy surrounding the family and the concept of well-being requires an understanding that is tailored, taking into account certain nuances that are not captured by prevailing Western conceptualizations and tools. In the Asian region, scholars from Hong Kong and Malaysia have developed their own Family Well-being Index. Based on Noor and colleagues (2014), the Malaysian Family Well-being has five domains: family relationships, economic situation, health and safety, community relationships, and religion/spirituality. On the other hand, Hong Kong Chinese Family Well-being has six domains: solidarity, family resources, family health, social involvement, social resources, and work-life balance (Wong et al., 2022).

The Philippines could benefit from having its own conceptualization of family well-being and a corresponding tool for its measurement. Several Filipino scholars have studied well-being, but they have primarily focused on a single aspect or an individual-based group. These are just a few of the more recent studies related to family and well-being, showing vast areas of exploration. For example, Villareal-Aguila (2010) studied family well-being in the context of happiness versus unhappiness; Chen and colleagues (2017) uncovered the implications of changes in family structure and composition on one's psychological well-being; Becina and Carpio (2019) looked into family structures and functions of Filipino families with young children; Masanda (2021) explored the dynamics of contemporary Filipino families in relation

to developing a family-oriented counseling program for the attainment of quality of life; Bandoles (2022) investigated the life satisfaction of elderly Filipinos; and Felipe and colleagues (2023) examined the connection between family health and mental well-being of undergraduate Filipinos.

The more comprehensive attempt at conceptualizing well-being in the Filipino context was made in 2000, through a project conducted by SyCip and colleagues, which involved a nationwide study and survey on *magandang buhay* or well-being. However, this emphasized the individual rather than the family. Nonetheless, it is a pioneering project that underscores the importance of studying deeply the concept of well-being within a local context. Twenty-two years later, a group of Filipino scholars proposed a pioneering holistic conceptualization of the Filipino Family Well-being (FFW) through a qualitative study that surveyed a total of 63 families from low-, middle-, and high-income brackets. Through this research, a holistic understanding of what comprises FFW was formed based on the respondents' answers. Interestingly, regardless of the socioeconomic level of the family, the dimensions that emerged were consistent in the following 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 (Chua et al., 2022). The objectives of this research were to (1) design a Filipino Family Well-being Survey (FFWS) for parents and children, and (2) to determine the content validity and reliability of the instrument.

Significance of the Study

The 1987 Philippine Constitution, in Section I, Article XV, stipulates that, “The state recognizes the Filipino Family as the foundation of the nation.” The law mandates the active promotion and development of the Filipino family as its “basic autonomous social institution.” By virtue of Executive Order No. 238, dated 2003, a National Steering Committee on the Filipino Family was established to oversee all policies and programs related to strengthening and supporting Filipino families. The Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) is the primary agency of the Philippine government responsible for social welfare programs (SWPs). It envisions “an empowered society where the poor, vulnerable, and disadvantaged sectors have immediate and equitable access to opportunities for an improved quality of life” (DSWD, n.d.). Some of its SWPs include the *Kapit-Bisig Laban sa Kahirapan* (Arm in Arm Against Poverty)—Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services (*Kalahi-CIDDS*), established in 2003. It is a program that helps communities take ownership of identifying their problems, mostly related to poverty, and taking action to address them (DSWD, n.d.). Another is the *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program* (Bridging Program for the Filipino Family), a conditional cash transfer program established in 2008 to help poor families improve in areas such as health, education, and parenting, among others (DSWD, n.d.). A more recent family initiative by the DSWD is *Pamilya sa Bagong Pilipinas* (The Family in the New Philippines), a family welfare model described as “rights-based, family-oriented, and inclusive,” which features the transition of Filipino families across various stages (DSWD, 2025). Aside from the work of the DSWD, in 2015, the Philippine government outlined in its national vision called *AmBisyon Natin 2040* (Our Ambition 2040), that by this year,

we will all enjoy a stable and comfortable lifestyle, secure in the knowledge that we have enough for our daily needs and unexpected expenses, that we can plan and prepare for our own and our children’s future. Our family lives together in a place of our own, and we have the freedom to go where we desire, protected and enabled by a clean, efficient, and fair government. (National Economic and Development Authority [NEDA], 2016, para. 4)

Finally, in the most recent Philippine Development Plan 2023-2028, the administration presented the country's development roadmap, where salient points for improvement and action greatly depend on the flourishing of Filipino families (NEDA, 2023). As explained, the Philippine government has lofty goals and several agencies and programs geared toward assisting Filipinos in achieving a quality of life; however, there is no unified, comprehensive, and concrete understanding of what comprises FFW, and no measure to describe its current state until this study.

It is, therefore, the hope of the proponents that the FFWS will be used nationwide to support these national goals and initiatives in better planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating programs geared toward addressing the concerns of Filipino families. This is an essential tool because, first, it will help policymakers and social workers develop programs that are more aligned with the specific needs of Filipino families, as it is based on a validated instrument that accurately measures the construct of FFW. The previous and current government programs are based on different and most likely disjointed data collection instruments designed by various committees that may not have a complete picture of FFW. In line with this, offering this data-driven and evidence-based tool will help the officials and practitioners make informed decisions on policy interventions and public initiatives.

Second, since this instrument measures the eight dimensions of FFW, it can accurately pinpoint specific areas of concern; hence, it provides a deeper insight into the underlying issues of the family, which facilitates more specific and focused interventions. For example, when resources are low, is a livelihood program the best support? However, why are many livelihood programs often short-lived or ineffective? What does it say when, using the FFWS, families are shown to be low in resource adequacy but high in family satisfaction and contentment? How can social workers help elevate the ambitions of families? Is it even plausible to make them dream bigger, or is it a futile effort? The point is that this FFWS has considerable potential in revealing the nuances surrounding Filipino families, including their values, goals, needs, and wants.

Finally, in relation to the previous point on providing deeper insights into families, the FFWS accounts for the various notions and ways in which families achieve quality of life. Case in point, while material resources are important, in the case of Filipino families, the conceptualization of FFW takes a unique turn, where the provision of resources is not always the answer to the challenges. In fact, Filipino families reported being happy and content, despite often lacking resources, as long as the family is intact (Chua et al., 2022). Therefore, from a policymaker's point of view, it is important to acknowledge that to achieve family well-being, the assistance route should not only be economically driven. As evidenced by the earlier study on FFW, Filipino families draw on other dimensions when evaluating their well-being (Chua et al., 2022). All these points underscore the importance of developing a FFWS, the process of which is outlined next.

Methodology

Item Generation and Developing the Preliminary Scale

To ensure that the construct of Filipino family well-being (FFW) is properly articulated prior to scale development, the conceptualization of FFW (Chua et al., 2022) was adopted. The findings in this study led to the identification of eight dimensions of Filipino family well-being (Figure 1) and corresponding indicators (Table 1), which served as a framework for generating items for the FFWS. To create an item pool for the preliminary FFWS (parents' version and children's version), the four research team members separately wrote items for each FFW dimension and indicator. This process resulted in an initial pool of 146 statements, which was eventually trimmed down to 75 items after excluding repetitive items.

Content Validation

The preliminary FFWS (FFWS-75) was subjected to content validity following the six-step content validation procedures provided by Yusoff (2019)—“preparing a content validation form, selecting a review panel of experts, conducting content validation, reviewing domain and items, providing score on each item, and calculating Content Validation Index (CVI)” (p. 50). The content validation tool (CVT) involved a 4-point Likert scale that allowed the experts to indicate the relevance of each FFWS item (from high relevance to no relevance) in measuring the dimension of Filipino Family Well-being where the item belongs. The CVT also solicited the experts' comments on each survey item, as applicable.

Six experts from different sub-disciplines of home economics that deal with different aspects of family well-being were selected (i.e., home economics education, home management, family life and child development, food science and nutrition, and clothing and interior design). All experts were Filipino PhD degree holders who were either current or retired professors in home economics. The inclusion criteria ensured that the content validators were well-versed in family well-being in the Filipino context. The recommended number of content validators should be at least six and not more than 10 (Yusoff, 2019).

During the content validation process, the preliminary FFWS was sent electronically to each expert. The experts reviewed each item and domain and provided a score for the relevance of each item. The CVTs were returned to the research team within a month. Subsequently, a CVI was computed. An item was considered valid if the CVI was at least 83%. Since there were six content validators, at least five should tag the item as relevant or highly relevant to the dimension of Filipino family well-being under consideration.

A revised 70-item FFWS (FFWS-70) was created based on the CVI scores for each item and the experts' comments. After this, the FFWS was pilot tested on five parents and five adult children. Seven respondents reported no issues with the FFWS. Three respondents provided comments, which were taken into consideration when rephrasing some of the items.



Figure 1. Filipino Family Well-being Dimensions

Note. Permission granted by the International Journal of Home Economics (Chua et al., 2022). Conceptualization of Filipino family wellbeing. International Journal of Home Economics. 15(2), 103-114.)

Table 1. Dimensions and Indicators of Filipino Family Well-Being

Filipino Family Wellbeing Dimensions <i>Definition</i>	Indicators
Resource Adequacy <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>	1. Family has sufficient food to eat every day 2. Family can send children to school 3. Family has access to medical and health needs 4. Family has sufficient resources to meet daily needs 5. Family members have adequate clothing 6. Family has a decent and safe dwelling space
Comfortable Lifestyle <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>	1. Family can provide the simple wishes of children 2. Family has choice over basic needs (e.g. choosing the food and clothing that they like) 3. Family can enjoy simple vacations, leisure activities, and simple luxuries 4. Family can afford to celebrate special occasions 5. Family members have sufficient time to rest and relax
Financial Security and Stability <i>This dimension refers to the regularity and stability of the family's income, their capacity to acquire assets,</i>	1. Family has a regular and stable source of income

Filipino Family Wellbeing Dimensions	Indicators
Definition	
<i>and their capacity to save and financially prepare for the future.</i>	2. Family has the financial resources to acquire assets 3. Family has enough savings for emergencies and future needs
Good Health of Family Members	
<i>This refers to the general health of family members.</i>	1. All family members are generally healthy 2. There is absence of long-term illness in the family
Good Family Relationships	
<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
Good Parenting	
<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
Virtuous Family Living	
<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
Family Satisfaction and Contentment	
<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. Permission granted by the International Journal of Home Economics (Chua et al., 2022). Conceptualization of Filipino family wellbeing. International Journal of Home Economics. 15(2), 103-114.)

Reliability Analysis of Filipino Family Well-being Survey

The FFWS-70 was administered to parents and adult children to test its reliability using online and face-to-face methods. The sample for the reliability analysis comprised 217 adult children and 60 parents. The children comprised 179 (82.5%) females and 38 (17.5%) males, with ages ranging from 18 to 25 years old. Most were Roman Catholics (60.8 %), while the rest came from other Christian denominations. Most children (77%) lived in the same household as their parents. They came from various regions in the Philippines, the majority coming from Region 1 (Ilocos Region). As for the parent respondents, 50 (83.3 %) were mothers and 10 (16.7%) were fathers. Their ages ranged from 30 to 59 years old. The majority of them (75 %) were Roman Catholics. They belonged to varied income groups, with 60% coming from the middle-income bracket. The parents were located in various regions in the Philippines. However, most came from Metro Manila, the capital of the Philippines, and nearby rural areas such as Rizal, Bataan, and Laguna. The children respondents were selected based on the criteria that they should be between 18

and 25 years old, single, and Filipinos residing in the Philippines. The same inclusion criteria were followed for the parent respondents, except that they should be between 18 and 59 years old. The respondents were reached through snowball sampling and referrals.

A Google Form version of the FFWS was designed to facilitate online data collection. Subsequently, a “Call for Respondents” notice was posted on social media, which provided an overview of the survey, the inclusion criteria, and the links to the FFWS Google Forms. Informed consent was secured before the survey by linking an Informed Consent Form (ICF) to the FFWS Google Forms. A total of 235 adult children responded to the online survey. However, 18 respondents were excluded because they did not meet the selection criteria for age, resulting in a final count of 217. On the other hand, only 56 parents answered the online survey. Face-to-face data collection was performed to reach more parent respondents. This method yielded an additional four respondents, totaling 60 parents.

The internal consistency of the FFWS and its subscales was measured using Cronbach’s Alpha (α) in SPSS version 29. The α values for the scale, if each item were deleted, were also examined. The acceptable range of α value considered for the scale is 0.7 to 0.8 (Kline, 1999; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). For scales with fewer items, values around 0.6 are still considered reasonable and adequate (Taber, 2018). In fact, Cronbach (1951) has argued that the main point in instrument development is that the scores obtained when using the instrument have to be interpretable, and this is “often possible without needing very high values of alpha” (p. 1288).

Special attention was also given to items with very high α values since there are authors who cautioned about the high values stating that it could indicate redundant items or a lengthy scale (Panayides, 2013). There is no consensus, though, on the range of acceptable or ‘too high’ α values. There are reports that values ranging from 0.70 to 0.95 are acceptable while there are those who suggest that values >0.90 already suggest redundancy in items (Panayides, 2013; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). There are also experts who opined that α values more than 0.95 or 0.99 are the values to watch out for (Frost, n.d.) and deleting items to shorten the test may be more efficient or usable without affecting the internal reliability of the scale. Thus, the quantitative results were examined and correlated with the item-total correlation and qualitative analysis of the items. If high α values are paired with high inter-item correlations, it may also exhibit a too specific or narrow coverage of the construct under consideration (Panayides, 2013). There seems to be a consensus that the corrected item-total correlations should range between .30 and 0.70 for a good scale (Ferketich, 1991; Field, 2018).

Four items that contributed to lower overall scale reliability were removed. Six other repetitive items were also deleted, resulting in an FFWS of 60 (FFWS-60) items. The α of the FFWS-60 was then determined. After this, a final FFWS version with 50 items (FFWS-50) was constructed, which was subjected to another round of reliability analysis.

Decision Parameters on Removing Items

Items were removed from the scale based on two criteria: redundancy and the inability to make a meaningful contribution to the scale. Items with a corrected item-total correlation of more than 0.70 were removed from the scale if they replicated another item. Similarly, items that were very similar to another item, upon visual inspection, were deleted from the scale even if their item-total correlations did not exceed 0.70. On the other hand, items with corrected item-total correlation that did not have at least 0.30 in either the total scale or the sub-scale were also removed because they contributed poorly to the reliability of the scale.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical principles were practiced throughout the study. An informed consent form was presented and secured before data collection to protect the participants' welfare. The ICF contained information on the purpose of the study, study procedures, duration of participation, voluntary participation, risks, benefits and incentives, expenses, and confidentiality.

Results

Preliminary Filipino Family Well-being Survey (FFWS-75)

The statements in the FFWS-75 were spread out across the eight dimensions of family well-being. There were 20 items under resource adequacy (RA), 9 items under comfortable lifestyle (CL), 11 items under financial security and stability (FSS), 14 items under good family relationships (GFR), 7 items under good parenting (GP), 4 items under good health of family members (GHFM), 7 items under virtuous family life (VFL), and 3 items under family satisfaction and contentment (FSC). The FFWS follows a Likert scale format, which measures family well-being based on how much an individual agrees or disagrees with specific statements in the survey. Each survey item was scored from one to five, with five as the highest score for positively stated items. Reversed scoring is followed for negatively stated items (Table 2).

Table 2. FFWS Item Scoring Guide

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Positively Stated Items	5	4	3	2	1
Negatively Stated Items	1	2	3	4	5

Content Validity of the Preliminary Family Well-being Survey

The CVI values of the preliminary FFWS items are presented in Table 3. As shown, 68 out of the 75 items had CVI values of at least 0.83, indicating that these items are relevant to the construct of FFW and to the specific FFW dimension to which the items belong. On the other hand, there were 6 items that had CVI scores of less than 0.83, which signified that these items are not highly relevant in measuring FFW. Upon inspection, 4 of these items were deleted from the item pool. However, 2 items with CVI values of 0.67—"Our family can grant the simple wishes/wants of the children" and "We can afford to eat the food that we like" were retained because these items reflect indicators that are salient among Filipino families (Chua et al., 2022). Aside from the CVI scores, the content validators also provided qualitative comments on some items in the FFWS to improve the structure of the items. Considering the quantitative and qualitative outcomes of the content validation, a revised FFWS was assembled.

Table 3. Content Validation Index Scores of the FFWS-75 Items

Dimension (Number of Items)	Number of Items According to CVI Score	
	≥ 0.83	< 0.83
Resource Adequacy (20)	19	1
Comfortable Lifestyle (9)	5	4
Financial Security and Stability (11)	11	0
Good Family Relationships (14)	14	0
Good Parenting (6)	5	1
Good Health of Family Members (4)	4	0
Virtuous Family Life (7)	7	0
Family Satisfaction and Contentment (3)	3	0
TOTAL	68	6

Note. A CVI score of at least .83 is required to consider an item as valid

Final Filipino Family Well-being Survey (FFWS-50)

The FFWS-50 is similar in format, structure, scoring scheme, and general content to the preliminary FFWS, except for the number of items. It contains items that are spread across the eight dimensions of FFW: RA (12 items), CL (5 items), FSS (9 items), GFR (9 items), GP (4 items), GHFM (2 items), VFL (6 items), and FSC (7 items). There are two versions of the FFWS—one for parents and one for children. The two versions are identical except for five statements under the dimension “good parenting.”

The FFWS-50 can be administered to Filipino families with at least one child and one parent. In the FFWS, the family refers to the immediate family, including parents, children, spouse, and siblings who may be related by blood or adoption. The FFWS is intended to measure the well-being of families from different income levels and localities (i.e., rural or urban). Further, the FFWS can be answered by either parent (or both parents) and any adult child of the family. The FFWS is designed as a self-administered instrument. However, it may also be administered by the researcher or a research assistant, depending on the nature of the research or the characteristics of the respondent.

The scoring procedures of the FFWS are straightforward. Each item is scored according to the guidelines in Table 2. To determine the total FFWS score, the average score of all items is computed, resulting in a score from one to five. For families wherein both parents are asked to separately answer the FFWS, the average of their scores should be obtained. The final FFWS scores may be interpreted based on the parameters in Table 4.

Table 4. FFWS Total Score Interpretation

Total Score	Interpretation
1 to 2.99	Low level of family well-being
3 to 3.99	Moderate level of family well-being
4 to 5	High level of family well-being

Reliability of the Final Filipino Family Well-being Survey (FFWS-50)

Both versions of the FFWS, one for parents and the other for children, were analyzed for their reliability. As seen in Table 5, the α results show that both have very good internal consistency; the scale for parents has a 0.957 α value and 0.949 for the children (Table 5). An analysis of the α values associated with each item ranges from 0.955 to 0.957 (parents' version) and 0.947 to 0.950 (children's version), which are around the same value as their respective total α . The results for both versions suggest that the retained items in this shortened scale contribute well to measuring the overall construct of family well-being. There is no specific item that will cause a substantial change in α value if removed.

Table 5. FFWS Reliability Statistics

	N items	Cronbach's Alpha	
		Parent Version	Children Version
Entire FFWS	50	0.957	0.949
<i>[Dimension]</i>			
Resource Adequacy	12	0.889	0.821
Comfortable Lifestyle	5	0.863	0.857
Financial Security and Stability	9	0.832	0.867
Good Family Relationships	9	0.929	0.919
Good Parenting	4	0.888	0.892
Good Health of Family Members	2	0.742	0.680
Virtuous Family Life	6	0.887	0.895
Family Satisfaction and Contentment	3	0.737	0.696

For the parents' version, the corrected item-total correlations are of moderate to strong correlations; all items have values of more than 0.3, indicating that items correlate well with the scale. On the other hand, the children's version of FFWS has 3 items with low corrected item-total correlations (values range from 0.219 to 0.252). These items are three of the six negatively stated items of the scale, namely: RA 10: "We have difficulty paying the necessary hospital bills" (0.252), RA 13: "We borrow money to sustain the needs of our family" (0.219), and FSC 3: "My family is not satisfied or contented with what we have." (0.225). This could mean that the items may not be contributing meaningfully to the scale's overall reliability. These 3 items, however, are retained since the reliability test for each subscale resulted in acceptable levels of corrected item-total correlations (more than 0.30), indicating their contribution to measuring the subscales. Also, the parents' version of the scale has substantial correlations for the same items.

It should be noted, nevertheless, that children's responses to negatively stated items should be addressed during the data gathering to ensure valid responses. In earlier versions of the scale, the items removed due to low corrected item-total correlations were also negatively stated. In fact, the three remaining negatively stated items (e.g., RA 19, FSS 10, and FSC 1) also have the lowest corrected item-total correlation with values ranging from 0.309 to 0.317, just slightly above the 0.30 reference.

As a multi-dimensional scale with eight dimensions, the α and the item-total correlations for each subscale are also reported. The parents' version of the scale has acceptable α values, with the GFR having the highest α value of 0.929 and the FSC α value of 0.737, even with just three items (Table 5). For the children's version, there are α values below the generally acceptable level of ≥ 0.70 . These are GHFM ($\alpha = 0.680$ with 2 items) and FSC ($\alpha = 0.696$ with 3 items). While the values for the two dimensions could be argued to be due to fewer items, since α values can increase with simply adding more items (Cortina, 1993; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), these values are still considered reasonable and adequate (Taber, 2018).

In light of reports indicating high α values, and considering that the overall scale and two of its dimensions have high α values (i.e., more than 0.90), the FFWS was examined to further assess items with corrected item-total correlations of more than 0.70. Specifically, the items were examined as to how they are phrased, whether they are redundant with some items, or have too specific examples.

Resource Adequacy Subscale

For the RA subscale, both versions exhibit desirable item-total correlations of more than 0.3 (Table 6). There are 3 items, however, with more than 0.70 item-total correlations; namely, RA 5: "Our family lives in a decent and comfortable house," RA 9: "Our family members have access to quality medical care when needed," and RA 12: "Our family can afford to pay utility bills on time." The items are not necessarily redundant; the topics pertain to various areas where resources are used (e.g., education, medical needs, utilities) and are not overly specific compared to other items. In this regard, the items may be retained, considering that the content validity results for these items demonstrate high relevance to measuring the subscale.

Table 6. Reliability Analysis for the Resource Adequacy Subscale

Resource Adequacy	Parents' Version		Children's Version	
	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
RA 1: Our family has enough food to eat every day.	0.524	0.884	0.525	0.805
RA 4: Our family can afford to send all children to a good school.	0.639	0.879	0.512	0.804
RA 5: Our family lives in a decent and comfortable house.	0.732	0.876	0.580	0.801
RA 6: We live in an area that is safe from natural disasters.	0.628	0.879	0.505	0.805
RA 7: We feel safe living in our neighborhood.	0.670	0.878	0.473	0.807
RA 9: Our family members have access to quality medical care when needed.	0.704	0.874	0.608	0.796
RA 10: We have difficulty paying the necessary hospital bills.	0.487	0.891	0.353	0.820
RA 11: Our family can provide adequate clothing for its members.	0.639	0.881	0.616	0.798
RA 12: Our family can afford to pay utility bills on time.	0.759	0.872	0.623	0.796
RA 13: We borrow money to sustain the needs our family.	0.596	0.884	0.338	0.824
RA 17: We are living in a place that is safe from crime.	0.446	0.888	0.497	0.806
RA 19: It's difficult for my family to make ends meet.	0.630	0.879	0.309	0.825

Comfortable Lifestyle Subscale

The CL subscale has an acceptable α of 0.863 and 0.857 for the parents' and children's versions, respectively, with 5 items (Table 5). Qualitative analysis of the items that have high item-total correlation (CL 2: "We can afford to eat the food that we like," CL 3: "Our family can go on family trips or vacations," and CL 5: "We can buy gifts for family members during special occasions." shows that these are unique items, and deleting these items will result in the lowest α value for this dimension, especially for the parents' version (Table 7). Thus, these items were retained.

Table 7 Reliability Analysis for the Comfortable Lifestyle Subscale

Comfortable Lifestyle	Parents' Version		Children's Version	
	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
CL 1: Our family can grant the simple wishes/wants of the children.	0.659	0.847	0.609	0.844
CL 2: We can afford to eat the food that we like.	0.774	0.814	0.728	0.814
CL 3: Our family can go on family trips or vacations.	0.520	0.876	0.738	0.811
CL 4: Our family can enjoy simple leisure activities together.	0.711	0.832	0.641	0.836
CL 5: We can buy gifts for family members during special occasions.	0.814	0.802	0.662	0.831

Financial Security and Stability Subscale

The FFS subscale, with 9 items, has an α of 0.832 for the parents' version and 0.867 for the children's version (Table 5). The items FSS 2: "Our breadwinner can lose his/her job any moment," and FSS 10: "My family does not have financial resources during emergencies" have low corrected item-total correlation in the children's version, and removing the items can slightly improve the subscale's α . The items, however, may be retained since the values are acceptable in the parents' version. One item, FSS 3: "At least one child needs to work to support our needs," was removed due to its low reliability and correlation values. For both versions, the corrected item-total correlations are below 0.3, indicating that it does not correlate well with the overall scale (Table 8). Another item that was removed is FSS 12: "We would likely depend on other people financially after retirement" because the test showed a very weak negative correlation, i.e., corrected item-total correlation = -0.018 (children's version). Excluding those 2 items substantially improved the internal reliability of the dimension and the entire scale, especially for the children's version.

Table 8. Reliability Analysis for the Financial Stability and Security Subscale

Financial Security and Stability	Parents' Version		Children's Version	
	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
FSS 1: Our family has a stable source of income.	0.690	0.800	0.712	0.844
FSS 2: Our breadwinner can lose his/her job any moment.	0.373	0.834	0.283	0.884
FSS 4: Our family has the financial capacity to buy a house.	0.464	0.824	0.710	0.842
FSS 5: Our family can afford to buy luxuries.	0.506	0.819	0.705	0.843
FSS 6: We have enough savings for emergencies.	0.579	0.810	0.746	0.841
FSS 7: We have enough financial means to prepare for retirement (e.g. savings, social security, investments, business).	0.621	0.806	0.701	0.843
FSS 8: Our breadwinner has a permanent job or a regular source of income.	0.635	0.807	0.632	0.850
FSS 9: My family has resources to buy a car/vehicle.	0.620	0.805	0.727	0.840
FSS 10: My family does not have financial resources in case of emergency.	0.445	0.824	0.274	0.882

Good Family Relationships Subscale

The α results of the GFR subscale are already very good, with 0.929 for the parents' version and 0.919 for the children's version (Table 5). This subscale was reduced from 12 to 9 items. Three items in the children's version of the scale presented problematic values for corrected item-total correlations and were thus removed. Items GFR 2: "Our family finds it difficult to resolve internal conflicts," GFR 8: "It is difficult to get help from family members," and GFR 11: "My family finds it difficult to have open communication" have correlation values below the acceptable 0.3 (Table 9). In addition, removing the items resulted in a significantly improved internal reliability for both versions.

There are items (GFR 5, 9, & 10) that have very high corrected item-total correlations, but upon examining the statements, they are unique and present varied descriptions of having good relationships. In fact, the descriptions *buo* (complete), *masaya* (happy), and having a loving relationship were articulated by the respondents during the FFWS conceptualization study, and therefore, can be considered salient concepts and were favorably validated by experts. Thus, these items are retained.

Table 9. Reliability Analysis for the Good Family Relationships Subscale

Good Family Relationships	Parents' Version		Children's Version	
	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
GFR 1: Our family collectively finds solutions to our problems.	0.684	0.924	0.482	0.923
GFR 3: Members of my family have a harmonious relationship.	0.703	0.924	0.495	0.924
GFR 4: Our family makes it a point to spend quality time together.	0.673	0.926	0.730	0.909
GFR 5: We consider our family as complete.	0.811	0.916	0.699	0.912
GFR 7: Our family members help each other during difficult times.	0.754	0.920	0.752	0.907
GFR 9: In general, we are a happy family	0.837	0.915	0.870	0.898
GFR 10: We have a loving relationship as a family.	0.825	0.915	0.884	0.897
GFR 12: Members of my family treat each other with respect.	0.708	0.923	0.723	0.910
GFR 13 Members of my family enjoy bonding moments together.	0.702	0.924	0.814	0.903

Virtuous Family Life Subscale

The VFL subscale has much better internal reliability and corrected item-total correlations results among all others (Table 10). For both versions, the α values are within the acceptable range of 0.70 to <0.90, with the α values of the individual items around the same value for the dimension and have more than 0.3 minimum correlation. Although some correlation values for both versions have more than 0.7 corrected item-total correlation values, indicating possible redundancy with other items, a qualitative analysis of the items shows various aspects of virtuous living, from belief in God to having good moral values. These items do not overlap with other dimensions, and even with items within the VFL dimension. If items VFL 1: "We are God-fearing," VFL 2: "Our family has a strong faith in God," as well as VFL 5: "We are able to sustain or support spiritual needs of the family," and VFL 6: "Our family is guided by good moral values" are removed simply because of the high correlation values, the FFWS may lose its power to anchor the family well-being to faith in God and moral values, indicators that are unique to the Filipino culture and have been prominent themes emanating from the conceptualization stage of the instrument. The CVI results from experts also support the retention and inclusion of the above-mentioned items.

Table 10. Reliability Analysis for the Virtuous Family Life Subscale

Virtuous Family Life	Parents' Version		Children's Version	
	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
VFL 1: We are God-fearing.	0.835	0.849	0.711	0.879
VFL 2: Our family has a strong faith in God.	0.839	0.848	0.699	0.88
VFL 3: Our family members behave according to good moral values.	0.711	0.866	0.712	0.878
VFL 5: We are able to sustain or support the spiritual needs of the family.	0.589	0.891	0.783	0.867
VFL 6: Our family is guided by good moral values.	0.746	0.86	0.777	0.868
VFL 7: Our family makes it a point to help those in need.	0.559	0.888	0.642	0.89

Good Parenting Subscale

The GP subscale, reduced to 4 items, also has acceptable α values with 0.888 for the parent version and 0.892 for the children's version (Table 5). All the corrected item-total correlations are more than 0.3, though most items have more than 0.7 values, indicating a possible redundancy with other items within the GP dimension (Table 11). Examining the items, GP 3: "We look up to our parents as good role models," and GP 5: "Our parents serve as good role models to us," indeed appear similar, and they both have correlation values greater than 0.7 for both versions. Thus, 1 of the items (i.e., GP 3) was removed.

Table 11. Reliability Analysis for the Other Subscales

Good Parenting, Good Health of Family Members and Family Satisfaction and Contentment	Parents' Version		Children's Version	
	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
GP 1: Our parents provide guidance for us to finish our education.	0.832	0.829	0.795	0.848
GP 2: Our parents fulfill their duties for our educational needs.	0.646	0.898	0.796	0.848
GP 4: Our children are being raised with good moral values.	0.829	0.829	0.691	0.889
GP 5: Our parents serve as good role models to us.	0.727	0.868	0.789	0.851
GHFM 1: Our family members are generally healthy.	0.594	.	0.517	.
GHFM 4: Members of our family enjoy good health.	0.594	.	0.517	.
FSC 1: We are discontented with our current standard of living.	0.626	0.57	0.603	0.477
FSC 2: My family is satisfied with whatever blessings we have.	0.491	0.752	0.381	0.753
FSC 3: My family is not satisfied or contented with what we have.	0.641	0.568	0.605	0.475

Good Health of Family Members and Family Satisfaction and Contentment Subscales

The last two subscales, GHFM and FSC, although consisting of only 2 and 3 items, respectively, have acceptable levels of α (Table 5). All the values under the corrected item-total correlations are also above 0.3 (Table 11), indicating a good correlation between the items and the dimension. There are no specific issues in including these items for the scale.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study developed a metric that measures FFW based on salient dimensions and indicators that capture the real meaning of family well-being for Filipinos. The FFWS statements demonstrate good content validity, indicating that each item effectively contributes to measuring FFW. In addition, the generally high reliability levels of each dimension and the entire scale demonstrate the FFWS's ability to consistently measure FFW.

In improving the overall scale and the dimensions, selected items, which do not correlate well with other items within the dimension and the overall scale, should be removed. Items that may be redundant based on quantitative and qualitative analyses may be removed to further shorten the scale without significantly reducing the internal reliability. These same items may be retained to serve as consistency checks and to retain the content validity and discriminating power of the scale.

A study on how negatively phrased statements in measuring family well-being may be further conducted. While it is generally recommended that negatively stated items should be included to reduce item response bias, it is essential to assess how respondents, particularly child respondents, generally understood the statements. Does it really address item response bias, or does the phrasing of the items confuse respondents and unnecessarily encumber them in shifting their mindset of the appropriate response anchor to tick or encircle?

To ensure its usability and capture more members of the population, it is recommended that the scale be translated into the major languages of the Philippines. This is particularly useful since self-administration of the instrument is the most efficient way of gathering data.

Finally, the study recommends utilizing the scale for educational, research, and program planning purposes for Filipino families in different locales. The FFWS is an appropriate and useful tool in determining the effectiveness of family programs in the Philippines aimed at improving family life.

Funding Declaration

This research received funding support from the University of the Philippines-Diliman Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Development through the Outright Research Grant.

Biographies

Professor **Consuelo Chua** holds a PhD in Education, major in Research and Evaluation, from the University of the Philippines Diliman. Before this, she pursued two Master's degree programs: the Master of Business and Commerce from the University of Western Sydney and the Master of Arts in Educational Psychology from the University of the Philippines Diliman. She also graduated with a Bachelor of Science in the Home Economics program at UP Diliman. Her expertise includes Research Methods, Household Resource Management, Entrepreneurship and Livelihood Education, and Well-being. **Email:** ctchua@up.edu.ph

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0279-7415>

Professor **Joanne Bantang** holds a PhD in Education, major in Research and Evaluation, and a Master's in Education, major in Educational Psychology, from the University of the Philippines Diliman. She also graduated with a Bachelor of Science in the Home Economics program at UP Diliman. Her expertise includes Research Methods, Consumer Education, Supervision and Evaluation, and Program Quality Assessment. **Email:** jrbantang@up.edu.ph

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-6228-0493>

Aurora Llige is an Associate Professor from the College of Home Economics, University of the Philippines. She obtained her doctoral degree in International Studies from the Graduate School of International Studies, Ewha Womans University in Seoul, South Korea. She is trained in home economics, teacher education and curriculum development, and development cooperation. **Email:** asllige@up.edu.ph

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2607-8116>

Florenda Gabriel was an assistant professor in the College of Home Economics, University of the Philippines. She taught at the university for 29 years, beginning as an instructor in 1994. She served as the College Graduate Program Coordinator (August 2019-August 2021) and before that, as College Secretary (July 2013-December 2019). She also chaired the Department of Home Economics Education (June 2003-May 2006). She was an advocate of home economics, serving not just the University as a professor, but also her local communities through public service initiatives. She passed away in 2023, but she will always be remembered for her deep wisdom and love for teaching and learning.

References

- Aznar, A. S., & Castañón, D. G. (2005). Quality of life from the point of view of Latin American families: A participative research study. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 49(10), 784-788. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2005.00752.x>
- Becina, A. P. J., & Carpio, L. P. D. (2019). Developmental tasks, family structures and functions of selected Filipino families with young children: A cross-sectional study. *The Filipino Family Physician*, 57(2), 86-92. <https://thepafp.org/journal/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/PAFP-Journal-2019-2-22-28.pdf>
- Bandoles, G. G. (2022). Determinants of life satisfaction among elderly Filipinos: A mixed-method analysis. *Asian Studies: Journal of Critical Perspectives*, 58(2), 29-69. https://ac.upd.edu.ph/acmedia/zgallery/asj_58_2_2022/ASJ_58_2_2022_FINAL/03_Bandoles_-_Article_ASJ_58-2-2022.pdf
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

- Brown, I., Brown, R. I., Baum, N. T., Isaacs, B. J., Myerscough, T., Neikrug, S., Roth, D., Shearer, J., & Wang, M. (2006). *Family Quality of Life Survey: Main caregivers of people with intellectual or developmental disabilities*. Surrey Place Centre. <https://www.surreyplace.ca/documents/FQLS%20Files/FQOLS-2006%20ID%20DD%20Version%20Aug%2009.pdf>
- Chen, F., Bao, L., Shattuck, R. M., Borja, J. B., & Gultiano, S. (2017). Implications of changes in family structure and composition for the psychological well-being of Filipino women in middle and later years. *Research on Aging*, 39(2), 275-299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027515611181>
- Chua, C., Gabriel, F., Bantang, J., & Llidge, A. (2022). Conceptualization of Filipino family wellbeing. *International Journal of Home Economics*, 15(2), 103-114. https://www.ifhe.org/fileadmin/user_upload/e_Journal/Vol_15_2_corr/P11_1.pdf
- Const. (1987) art. XV, § 1 (Phil.).
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 98-104. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.1.98>
- Crandall, A., Holmes, E. K., Villalon, S. E., Weiss-Laxer, N. S., & Berge, J. M. (2023). A conceptual model of family well-being: Bridging constructs, fields, and practice applications. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 16(1), 431-448. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12543>
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (n.d.). *Through the years: A short history of DSWD*. <https://www.dswd.gov.ph/dswd-through-the-years/>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2025). *Unveiling new initiatives to empower Filipino families during the DSWD 74th anniversary celebration*. <https://standards.dswd.gov.ph/2025/03/unveiling-new-initiatives-to-empower-filipino-families-during-the-dswd-74th-anniversary-celebration/>
- Felipe, J. J. G., Cleofas, J. V., & Pua, J. S. L. C. (2023). Family health and mental well-being among young Filipino undergraduates: The mediating role of self-care. *The Family Journal*, 32(2), 241-248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10664807231205578>
- Ferketich, S. (1991). Focus on psychometrics: Aspects of item analysis. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 14, 165-168. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.4770140211>
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics*. Sage.
- Frost, J. (n.d.). *Cronbach's alpha: Definition, calculations, and example*. Statistics by Jim. https://statisticsbyjim.com/basics/cronbachs-alpha/#google_vignette
- García-Grau, P., McWilliam, R. A., Martínez-Rico, G., & Grau-Sevilla, M. D. (2018). Factor structure and internal consistency of a Spanish version of the Family Quality of Life (FaQoL). *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 13(2), 385-398. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-017-9530-y>
- Hoffman, L., Marquis, J., Poston, D., Summers, J. A., & Turnbull, A. (2006). Assessing family outcomes: Psychometric evaluation of the Beach Center Family Quality of Life Scale. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(4), 1069-1083. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00314.x>
- Isaacs, B. J., Brown, I., Brown, R. I., Baum, N., Myerscough, T., Neikrug, S., Roth, D., Shearer, J., & 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>
- Kline, P. (1999). *A handbook of psychological testing (2nd ed.)*. Routledge.
- Lee, S. Y., & Han, K. S. (2024). Family strength: A concept analysis. *Journal of Korean Academy of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 33(2), 124-137. <https://doi.org/10.12934/jkpmhn.2024.33.2.124>
- Masanda, A. B. (2021). The contemporary Filipino family life: Towards a comprehensive family-oriented counseling program. *Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Science*, 5(1), 16-22. <https://doi.org/10.26855/jhass.2021.01.003>
- McGregor, S. L. T. (2020, May). *Conceptualizing family well-being* (McGregor Monograph Series 202001). McGregor Consulting Group. https://consultmcgregor.com/documents/publications/conceptualizing_family_wellbeing.pdf
- National Economic and Development Authority. (2016). *The life of all Filipinos in 2040: Matatag, maginhawa at panatag na buhay*. <https://2040.depdev.gov.ph/about-ambisyon-natin-2040/>
- National Economic and Development Authority. (2023). *Philippine Development Plan 2023-2028*. <https://www.neda.gov.ph/philippine-development-plan-2023-2028/>
- Noor, N. M., Gandhi, A. D., Ishak, I., & Wok, S. (2014). Development of indicators for family well-being in Malaysia. *Social Indicators Research*, 115(1), 279-318. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0219-1>
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, L. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. McGraw-Hill Higher.

- Office of the President. Executive Order No. 238, s. 2003: Amending Executive Order No. 241 by expanding the powers and functions and membership of the National Steering Committee of the Family Week, (2003)(Phil.), <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/5/5509>
- Panayides, P. (2013). Coefficient alpha: Interpret with caution. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 9(4), 687-696. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v9i4.653>
- Poston, D. J., Turnbull, A. P., Park, J., Mannan, H., Marquis, J., & Wang, M. (2003). Family quality of life: a qualitative inquiry. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 41(5), 313-28. [https://doi.org/10.1352/0047-6765\(2003\)41<313:FQOLAQ>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1352/0047-6765(2003)41<313:FQOLAQ>2.0.CO;2)
- Sümen, A., & Öncel, S. (2024). Examination of the psychometric properties of the short and long forms of the Family Health Scale in Turkish culture. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, 79, 249-255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedn.2024.10.022>
- 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. <https://cids.up.edu.ph/download/measurement-filipino-well-being/>
- Taber, K. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273-1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>
- Vanderkerken, L., Heyvaert, M., Onghena, P., & Maes, B. (2018). Quality of life in Flemish families with a child with an intellectual disability: A multilevel study on opinions of family members and the impact of family member and family characteristics. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 13(4), 779-802. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-017-9558-z>
- Villareal-Aguila, M. C. (2010). Well-being in the Filipino family. *Miriam College Faculty Research Journal*, 32(1). Philippine EJournals. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=3490>
- Wong, M. M. C., Ma, J. L. C., Wan, P. S., Xia, L. L., & Fok, M. H. T. (2022). The development and validation of a Family Wellbeing Index for Hong Kong Chinese families. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 31, 1683-1697. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-022-02281-6>
- Yusoff M. S. B. (2019). ABC of content validation and content validity index calculation. *Education in Medicine Journal*, 11(2), 49-54. <https://doi.org/10.21315/eimj2019.11.2.6>