

Family Characteristics, Family Functions and Socio-Economic Status among Families of Contributory Assistance Recipient in Indonesia

Adam Sugiharto^{1*}, Yulina Eva Riany²

¹Republic Indonesia's National Population and Family Planning Board, Permata Street Number 1, Halim Perdanakusuma, East Jakarta 13650

²Departement of Family and Consumer Science, Faculty of Human Ecology, IPB University, Jl. Kamper, IPB Dramaga Campus, Bogor, West Java 16880, Indonesia

*) Corresponding author: adamsatriadifema2012@gmail.com

Abstract

Efforts to realize quality human resources and families can be achieved through optimizing the implementation of the eight family functions. This study aims to analyze the family characteristics and socioeconomic level of families receiving contributory assistance in Indonesia, and to analyze the knowledge of the eight family functions in families receiving contributory assistance. This study uses longitudinal secondary data from the RPJMN Performance Indicator Survey 2015-2019. Data processing and analysis were conducted descriptively and inferentially using cross tabulation and regression tests. The study involved 943,004 individual respondents. The results showed that the higher the socioeconomic class of the family, the higher the knowledge of the eight family functions. However, this study shows that family size does not have a significant influence on socioeconomic class. Another result of this study proves that families with low socioeconomic levels correlate with the amount of PBI contribution assistance received.

Keywords: family characteristics, family function, contribution assistance recipients, family socioeconomic class, family vulnerability

Abstrak

Upaya mewujudkan sumber daya manusia dan keluarga yang berkualitas dapat ditempuh melalui optimalisasi penerapan delapan fungsi keluarga. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis karakteristik keluarga dan tingkat sosial ekonomi keluarga penerima bantuan iuran di Indonesia, dan menganalisis pengetahuan tentang delapan fungsi keluarga pada keluarga penerima bantuan iuran. Penelitian ini menggunakan data sekunder longitudinal dari hasil Survei Indikator Kinerja RPJMN 2015-2019. Pengolahan dan analisis data dilakukan secara deskriptif dan inferensial dengan menggunakan tabulasi silang dan uji regresi. Studi ini melibatkan 943.004 responden individu. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan semakin meningkat kelas sosial ekonomi keluarga maka semakin meningkat pengetahuan mengenai delapan fungsi keluarga. Namun penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa ukuran keluarga tidak memiliki pengaruh signifikan terhadap kelas sosial ekonomi. Hasil lain penelitian ini membuktikan bahwa keluarga dengan tingkat sosial ekonomi rendah, berkorelasi dengan banyaknya penerimaan bantuan iuran PBI.

Kata kunci: karakteristik keluarga, fungsi keluarga, penerima bantuan iuran, kelas sosial ekonomi keluarga, kerentanan keluarga

Introduction

Indonesia's natural topography which consists of urban and rural environments, on the one hand creates a symbiotic mutualism that the village is an inland city and the city provides products needed by families in the village, on the other hand in villages with ethnic uniformity it will be easy to trust and get assistance each other (Schmid et al., 2014), but in terms of the availability of health funds for treatment, urban communities are far more prepared to access primary health care or hospitals, while families in villages only dare to access hospitals when their condition is severe and they must have a BPJS card Prativi et al. (2015).

Health is one of the main indicators of the quality of human resources (HR). Illness contributes to an increase in the Human Development Index (HDI) in Indonesia. The presence of a disease will have an impact on the family being vulnerable from a health perspective (Puspitawati et.al, 2022). This shows that many families in Indonesia still consider children as a promising investment in the future, which can lead to high fertility. On the other hand, Indonesia is promoting the Family Planning Program where it is believed that the fewer the number of family members in Indonesia, the easier it will be to achieve the level of welfare. As a social safety net for economically weak groups of people, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia provides assistance to them through the Social Security Program Administering Agency which is paid in monthly installments by the Government of Indonesia for (38.46%) of the population (BPS, 2022).

According to Meman et al. (2021), health services are a fundamental right for the community, therefore the implementation of the health service program for participants receiving contribution assistance should be able to be provided evenly, but in reality, until now the number of participants receiving contribution assistance is still very low. The limited health budget planned by the government must be given to family groups appropriately. For now, within the limited government finances, the policy for selecting families receiving BPJS assistance needs to take into account the characteristics of the families we are studying. The urgency of this research is that need to provide input to the government in the form of data and facts so that contribution assistance for certain family characteristics is more targeted.

The quality of life of family members can be started by applying each indicator 8 family fuction (agama, sosial budaya, cinta kasih, perlindungan, reproduksi, sosialisasi dan pendidikan, ekonomi, serta lingkungan) functions properly so that all family members grow and develop into quality human resources, not only from a cognitive aspect but also from a character aspect (Wijayanti & Berdame, 2019). Previous study show that family function correlation with family resilience, so that the application of the eight functions is to realize family welfare, namely being able to live a good life where a person feels satisfied both with activities carried out routinely in meeting the basic needs of life and relationships with other people and with their environment (Lado et.al, 2022; Ningsih & Herawati, 2017).

Mulyati and Martiastuti (2018) mentioned that family functioning of rural families is better than in urban areas, although it did not show statistically significant differences. Families receiving BPJS contribution assistance will affect the implementation of eight family functions, because for some families from low socioeconomic groups contribution assistance provided by the government will secure part of the allocation of family resources for basic needs such as food and drink which are basically not good (Layliyah,

2013). According to Herawati and Endah (2016) families which had good family function, moderate family conflict, and moderate family subjective well-being.

Generally, differences in society based on material possessions are called social class. According to Sabania and Hartoyo (2016) in order to simplify the economic scale of the community, each main variable was transformed into an index score and categorized into three categories (low, moderate, high) based on class interval or the spread of the data. According to Azhari *et al.* (2015) based on community economic data, the household economy can be grouped into 3 groups, namely: lower economic households, middle economic households, and upper economic households. Community economic grouping uses 3 measurement indicator criteria, namely the number of family members, monthly income, and monthly expenses. Government policy support to provide assistance to lower-income families is outlined in a Presidential Instruction Number 1 of 2022 concerning Optimizing the Implementation of the National Health Insurance Program (Kemsekneg, 2018).

According to Herawati *et al.* (2020), the optimal implementation of family functions can support the realization of quality human and family resources. The factors that significantly influence the implementation of family functions are age, marital status, employment status, education level, knowledge of family functions, and access to information. A well-functioning family will produce a good generation and potential human resources which will become the capital of a nation. Therefore, this study tries to reveal the relationship between eight family functions and family characteristics through their socioeconomic class. Also, this study analysis the characteristics of the family and contribution assistance recipients will affect their socio-economic class. Then the research will also find out whether socioeconomic class influences knowledge about the 8 functions of the family. Based on previous study, not many studies have been carried out on this matter by researchers, so this study is important as a novelty for further elaboration. The purpose of this research is to explore the factors that influence the family's knowledge of the 8 functions of the family through their socio-economic class and uncover facts among families who receive BPJS assistance.

Methods

Participants

The survey was carried out using a cluster approach as enumeration areas. Sampling design The Program Performance and Accountability Survey (SKAP) was conducted using stratified multistage sampling, the survey area coverage was national, 34 provinces, the SKAP sample targets were spread across 34 provinces, 514 districts/cities, in 1,935 villages/kelurahan allocated to each stratum by taking into account the wealth quintile (wealth index), household SKAP data collection is done door to door, if the data sent to the server is incomplete, the interviewer will update the listing again. For random households (households) carried out by supervisors using systematic random sampling, the list of households in clusters in SKAP that has been filled in, the central data manager gives approval for 35 households to be interviewed after checking the interview requirements, the interviewer can directly interview 35 selected households. The sample frame for the first stage is a list of villages/kelurahan throughout Indonesia, accompanied by urban/rural classification information, and considering the wealth quintile (wealth index). list of households in the selected cluster.

Measurement

The data used in this study uses secondary data obtained from the 2015 – 2019 Program Performance and Accountability Survey. The characteristics of the SKAP are: national survey, provincial representation, Methodology refers to the IDHS, Instruments are mostly the same as the IDHS, Data collection using smartphones, University/college field implementers in the province under the supervision of the KB and KS Research and Development Center, This survey is more of an evaluation of program implementation, as well as to photographing the performance results that have been carried out by program implementers, surveys are carried out to be able to provide an overview of the performance results of the family planning program at national and provincial levels. There were 4 questionnaires that were circulated, namely: (1) household questionnaire (including family), (2) WUS questionnaire (including EFA), (3) family questionnaire and (4) adolescent questionnaire.

Measuring the performance indicators of the implementation of the KKBPK Program contained in the RPJMN and the 2015-2019 Strategic Plan in the aspects of: Population, Family Planning and Adolescent Reproductive Health, Family Resilience and Family Empowerment and Exposure of families and adolescents to mass media.

There is an ID link between household data, family data, women of childbearing age and adolescents. There is information about assets and the level of family welfare (Wealth Index), Measuring Fertility and a proxy for fertility determinants, History of contraceptive use, unmet need and satisfying demand for family planning services, Quality data and access to information and services on family planning, information on hygiene practices, sanitation and household conditions.

Assets and conditions for compiling wealth index are include Electricity, radio, television, telephone, cellphone, refrigerator, bicycle, motorcycle, canoe, motorboat, animal-drawn cart, car/truck, ship, livestock, herding animal, ox/beef cattle, dairy cow/buffalo, horse / donkeys, goats / sheep, pigs, poultry, the main material for the floor of the house, the main material for the roof of the house, the main material for the outer wall of the house.

Eight family function is quality of life of family members starting with applying every indicators of family functioning namely religious function; Socio-Cultural Function; Love Function; Protection Function; Reproductive Function; Socialization and Education Functions; Economic Function and Environmental Function (Wijayanti & Berdame, 2019)

Socioeconomic Class are including lower-economy households, middle-income households, and upper-economy households. The economic grouping of the community uses 3 criteria, namely the number of family members, monthly income, and monthly expenses. Social assistance is meant to provide services to someone who is unable and does not get help from other parties to meet their survival needs, regardless of the reasons. Aid is money and goods. Family Characteristics are some of the criteria that are usually owned by a household including: education, domicile, and big family.

Analysis

To analyze the independent variables X1 and X2 on the intermediate variable (z) and the intermediate variable on the dependent variable (y) statistical analysis is used. Path analysis using Stata SE Version 13.1 application being chosen to analyze available data. Our suspect that the socio-economic condition of a family whether the family is at a low, middle or high socioeconomic level is influenced by the characteristics of the

family, including: the level of education of the family members, whether the location of their residence is urban or rural, and then how large the number of family members is. Apart from that, we should also suspect that the economic shock will suddenly collapse the socio-economic classes that are already carried by families in Indonesia, the shock is mainly caused by one or several family members who are sick in the condition that the head of the family is not a permanent employee. So that a social cushion such as BPJS for health with premium contributions paid by the Government becomes a factor that also influences the formation of socio-economic classes in society. In this study we put more emphasis on the actual functioning of the implementation of the eight family functions more in families with low, middle or high socioeconomic class.

Findings

Family Characteristics

From all educational backgrounds, the largest socioeconomic class is the middle class with 97,998 people, the second is the low class 67,476 people and the least is the high socioeconomic class 56,247 people. Research disaggregated between education levels found that the majority of respondents who had not attended school were in the middle socioeconomic class (40.66%). Respondents who attended elementary school were in the low socioeconomic class (38.98%) and the middle level (49.01%). The majority of respondents who attended junior high school were in the middle level socioeconomic class (46.57%), followed by low economic level (30.32%). The majority of respondents who attended high school were in the middle socioeconomic class (45.42%) followed by the high socioeconomic class (33.37%). For the academic level, the majority occupy high socio-economic class (57.20%) followed by middle-level social class (30.56%). Similarly, for the tertiary level, the majority occupy a high socio-economic class (66.33%) followed by a middle-level social class (23.62%). Looking at the portion of the socioeconomic class level based on this level of education, it can be concluded that the higher the education level of the respondents in order of welfare, the largest portion of the respondents occupy the high social class, the lower portion is occupied by the middle class and the least portion is the low socioeconomic class (see Table 1).

Table 1. Results of the crosstab test of respondents' educational level on family socio-economic class

Education Level Ever Occupied	Family Socio-Economic Class			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Never School	3.107	1.221	99	4.427
Not School Yet	8.676	11.255	7.751	27.682
Primary School	30.679	38.568	9.446	78.693
Junior High School	11.752	18.047	8.952	38.751
Senior High School	11.231	24.051	17.668	52.950
D1/D2/D3/Academic	558	1.394	2.609	4.561
University	1.473	3.462	9.722	14.657
Total	67.476	97.998	56.247	221.721

Family Function

The largest portion of respondents are unemployed/student (37.15%), the second portion is unemployed/housewife (19.76%), the third portion is farmers (14.15%), the fourth portion is entrepreneur/trader (9.93%), the fifth portion is private employee (6.16%), the sixth portion is freelancer (5.10%), the rest occupies a not too significant portion. The socio-economic class of the respondents that deserves attention is the middle category for respondents who have not worked/students (43.22%), the middle category for respondents who do not work/housewives (45.56%), low socioeconomic class category for farmers (48, 69%) and fishermen (53.48%), middle socioeconomic category for entrepreneurs/traders (47.68%), high socioeconomic category for Civil servant/Soldier/Police/ State Company/Regional Company (61.82%), Private Employees (44.99%), and Retirees (54.70%). And the middle socioeconomic category for freelancers (53.91%) and others (45.08%). Looking at the results of this study, it can be concluded that the low-level socioeconomic groups are farmers (48.69%) and fishermen (53.48%), and high-level socio-economic groups are Civil servant/Soldier/Police/State Owned Company/Regional Owned Company (61.82%), Employees (44.99%), and Retirees (54.70%) (Table 2).

Table 2. Results of the crosstab test for the type of occupation of the head of the family on the family's socio-economic class

Type of Work	Family Socio-Economic Class			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Not Work Yet/Student	24.723	35.607	22.042	82.372
Not Work/Wife	14.011	19.961	9.844	43.816
Farmer	15.385	14.696	1.519	31.600
Fishermen	1.443	1.009	246	2.698
Entrepreneur/Trader	4.392	10.503	7.133	22.028
Civil servant/Soldier/Police/State Owned Company/Regional Owned Company	918	2.288	5.191	8.397
Private Employees	2.136	5.381	6.147	13.664
Retirement	181	743	1.116	2.040
Freelancer	3.282	6.105	1.937	11.324
Other	1.005	1.705	1.072	3.782
Total	67.476	97.998	56.247	221.721

Family and Socio-Economic

More respondents live in rural areas (57.24%), than those who live in urban areas (42.76%). For respondents living in urban areas, the order of socioeconomic levels is as follows: medium (43.88%), high (40.91%), low (15.20%), while for respondents living in rural areas the order of socioeconomic levels is as follows: medium (44.43%), low (41.81%), high (13.75%), so it can be concluded that based on their domicile area both in urban and rural areas, the majority of respondents are in middle socioeconomic status (44.20 %) (see Table 3).

Table 3. Domicile area crosstab test results on family socio-economic class

Domicile Area	Family Socio-Economic Class			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Town	14.408	41.609	38.795	94.812
Village	53.068	56.389	17.452	126.909
Total	67.476	97.998	56.247	221.721

Family and Ethnicity

The five largest ethnic groups in this study are: other (30.47%), Javanese (24.26%), Malay (8.44%), Sundanese (6.12%) and Bugis (5.15%). The analysis of the ethnicity of the respondents juxtaposed with the majority socioeconomic class is as follows: Aceh is dominated by the middle class (44.57%), Bali is dominated by the middle class (45.35%), Banjar is dominated by the low class (66.77%), Banten is dominated by the middle class middle class (57.91%), Batak dominated by middle class (49.97%), Betawi dominated by middle class (48.26%), Bugis dominated by low class (43.60%), China dominated by high class (45.54%), Dayak are dominated by the low class (72.20%), Javanese are dominated by the middle class (51.43%), Madurese are dominated by the middle class (47.30%), Malays are dominated by the middle class (41.72%), Minangkabau are dominated by the middle class (47.81%), Undefined/other dominated by middle class (42.03%), Sasak dominated by middle class (59.51%), and Sundanese dominated by middle class (52.97%). So that through this research it can be concluded that the majority of respondents based on three socioeconomic classes are as follows, high: Chinese, Middle: Aceh, Bali, Banten, Batak, Betawi, Javanese, Madurese, Malay, Minangkabau, Undefined/Other, Sasak, and Sundanese, Low: Bugis, Dayak, Banjar (see table 4).

Table 4. Ethnic crosstab test results on family socio-economic class

Tribes	Family Socio-Economic Class			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Aceh	1.424	2.704	1.939	6.067
Bali	1.209	2.915	2.303	6.427
Banjar	4.445	1.004	1.208	6.657
Banten	210	977	500	1.687
Batak	1.562	3.913	2.356	7.831
Betawi	170	1.887	1.853	3.910
Bugis	4.980	3.649	2.794	11.423
China	326	956	1.072	2.354
Dayak	4.052	857	703	5.612
Javanese	10.678	27.675	15.451	53.804
Madura	1.080	1.309	378	2.767
Malay	6.361	7.810	4.549	18.720
Minangkabau	1.495	4.818	3.764	10.077
Other	26.154	28.401	13.009	67.564
Sasak	547	1.934	769	3.250
Sunda	2.783	7.189	3.599	13.571
Total	67.476	97.998	56.247	221.721

Religion of Family

More Muslims occupy the middle socioeconomic class (46.59%) followed by low socioeconomic rank (27.27%), more Christians occupy the low socioeconomic class (43.63%) followed by the middle socioeconomic rank (34.72%), Catholics are mostly in

low socioeconomic class (53.75%) followed by middle economic rank (30.185%) (See Table 5).

Table 5. Crosstab test results of respondents' religion on respondents' family welfare class level

Religion	Family Socio-Economic Class			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Islam	47.569	81.274	45.613	174.456
Kristen	12.776	10.169	6.339	29.284
Katholik	5.125	2.877	1.532	9.534
Budha	220	676	416	1.312
Hindu	1.548	2.783	2.201	6.532
Konghucu	42	151	131	324
Other	196	68	13	277
Total	67.476	97.998	56.245	221.719

Sosio-Economic Class and Recipient of Contribution Assistance

The results of the study stated that the ratio of small families as recipients of Contribution Assistance and non-Contribution Assistance recipients was 59, 06 percent: 40.74 percent. As for large families, the ratio of families as recipients of Contribution Assistance and not recipients of Contribution Assistance is 62.31 percent versus 37.69 percent. However, in terms of the number of small families as Contribution Assistance recipients compared to large families as Contribution Assistance recipients, it was 94.4 percent versus 3.25 percent. The difference of 2.34 percent is other family data recorded in the survey but ignored in the analysis. (see table 6).

Table 6. Family large crosstab test results for families' recipient of contribution assistance

Variabel	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	95% Conf. Interval
Family Socio-Economic Class					
Middle	-.0598385	.0024324	-24.60	0.000	-.0646059
High	-.1871599	.0027762	-67.42	0.000	-.1926011
_cons	.4813267	.0018719	257.14	0.000	.4776579

Family Head's Livelihood and Socio-Economic Class

Seen in table 7, the regression results prove that the highest regression coefficient is the type of work civil servant/soldier/police/state company/regional company others that have a positive correlation with the family's social and economic class, this is proven statistically significant below 0.05, which is 0.000, with a 95 percent confidence level. The regression coefficient is 0.538, the highest among the others (see table 7).

Table 7. Results of the family head's livelihood regression function against family socio-economic class

Big Family	Not Recipient	Recipient	Total
Remote	1	1	2
Small Family ≤ 4	131.392	90.329	221.721
Big Family > 4	4.524	2.737	7.261
Extended Family 3	243	141	384
Extended Family 4	19	26	45
Total	139.168	95.204	234.372

Effect of Family Characteristics Analysis, and Eight Family Functions on Families Recipient of BPJS Contribution Assistance

Higher education has a positive correlation with family socioeconomic class, and is statistically significant, as evidenced by the confidence level below 0.005. The confidence interval value in higher education is between 1.14 to 1.18, meaning that the number is condensed and narrowed, thus proving that the distribution of the data is more focused (See Table 8). The lower the education of the head of the family, the lower the socioeconomic class of the family.

Table 8. Results of the regression function of the head of the family's education level on the family's socio-economic class

Variabel	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	95% Interval	Conf. Coef.
Family Head's Education						
Not School Yet	.5778592	.0105994	54.52	0.000	.5570847	.5986337
Primary School	.3552975	.0100873	35.22	0.000	.3355267	.3750683
Junior High School	.5439184	.0103916	52.34	0.000	.5235511	.5642856
Senior High School	.7362097	.0102305	71.96	0.000	.7161581	.7562613
D1/D2/D3/Academic	1.060123	.0140887	75.25	0.000	1.032509	1.087737
University	1.166743	.0113018	103.24	0.000	1.144592	1.188894
_cons	1.378247	.0097873	140.82	0.000	1.359064	1.39743

The Regression Results BPJS PBI Contribution Recipients Against Family Social Class

The regression results show that among the recipients of PBI contributions (Recipients of Contribution Assistance in families with high socioeconomic status have a negative correlation with PBI recipients. This indicates that families with high socioeconomic status do not receive PBI. Meanwhile, low socioeconomic families have a positive correlation with a coefficient value of 0.481 and statistically significant with a 95% confidence level and below 0.05, which is 0.000. This means that in low socioeconomic families, they receive a lot of PBI (Table 9).

Table 9. Result of regression function of BPJS PBI contribution recipients against family social Class

Family Head's Livelihood	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	95% Conf. Interval	Family Head's Livelihood
Not Work/Wife	-.0577741	.0040596	-14.23	0.000	-.0657308	-.0498175
Farmer	-.3982497	.0046044	-86.49	0.000	-.4072742	-.3892252
Fishermen	-.4053078	.0136291	-29.74	0.000	-.4320205	-.3785951
Entrepreneur/Trader	.1603579	.0052808	30.37	0.000	.1500076	.1707082
Civil servant/Soldier/Police /State Owned	.5384241	.0080201	67.13	0.000	.5227049	.5541433
Company/Regional Owned Company						
Private Employees	.3235735	.0063723	50.78	0.000	.3110839	.3360631
Retirement	.5013881	.0154538	32.44	0.000	.4710992	.5316771
Freelancer	-.0832557	.0069442	-11.99	0.000	-.0968662	-.0696452
Other	.0448486	.0111948	4.01	0.000	.0229071	.06679
_cons	1.960824	.0024133	812.51	0.000	1.956094	1.965554

The Size of The Family and Socioeconomic Class

The size of the family has no significant effect on socioeconomic class, as evidenced by none of the p-values below 0.005 with a 95% confidence level. The coefficient is also negatively correlated with the size of the family. Therefore, it can be concluded that the smaller or larger the family does not affect the socioeconomic condition of the family (Table 10).

Table 10. Results of the family regression function against family socio-economic class

Big Family	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	95% Conf. Interval	
1 (nuclear family)	-.5506447	.5254839	-1.05	0.295	-1.58058	.4792901
2 (Ext Family)	-.6571409	.5255539	-1.25	0.211	-1.687213	.3729311
3(Ext Family)	-.6927083	.5268482	-1.31	0.189	-1.725317	.3399005
4(Ext Family)	-.8555556	.537032	-1.59	0.111	-1.908124	.1970132
_cons	2.5	.5254815	4.76	0.000	1.47007	3.52993

The Effect of Family Socio-Economic Class to the Knowledge About The Eight Family Functions

Table 11 shows that the higher the socioeconomic class, the higher the knowledge about the eight family functions. Statistically it is very significant as evidenced by the P value below 0.05, which is 0.000 with a coefficient of 0.676. This proves that high socioeconomic class is positively correlated with awareness of the eight family functions. The confidence interval value in higher education is between 0.646 to 0.706, meaning that the difference in the number is only 0.06, this number is constricted and narrowed thus proving that the distribution of the data is more focused (Table 11).

Table 11. Results of family social class regression function against eight family functions

Family Socio-Economic Class	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	95% Conf. Interval	
Middle	0.2758214	0.0144237	19.12	0.000	0.2475515	0.3040913
High	0.6765587	0.0153639	44.04	0.000	0.6464461	0.7066713
_cons	-1.96298	0.0115405	-170.10	0.000	-1.985599	-1.940362

Discussion

Respondents based on their domicile area are both in urban and rural areas. Based on the level of education, it can be concluded that the higher the level of education of the respondents, the higher the social class. This finding is consistent with the results of Lado et al. (2022) research that the results of the regression analysis show that there is a positive relationship between the level of education and the level of application of 8 family functions (Y). The result by Lado et al. (2022) also shows that simple linear regression analysis shows that the variable level of application of eight family functions has a significant effect on the level of family welfare.

The research result showed that the size of the family has no significant effect on socioeconomic class. The coefficient is also negatively correlated with the size of the family. Therefore, it can be concluded that the smaller or larger the family does not affect the socioeconomic condition of the family. Sugiharto, Hartoyo, and Muflikhati (2016) suggest that plotting one's income does not affect welfare. Sugiharto et al. (2016) also

found from the results of research that the number of family members has no effect on welfare. The results of this study are certainly contrary to the results of Syafitri's research (2019), that partially the variable number of family members has a significant influence on the level of family welfare. Also contrary to the results of Hanum et al. (2018) which states that partially, the number of family members or income has a positive and significant influence on welfare or family consumption. Simultaneously, the test results prove that the number of family members and income have a significant effect on welfare or consumption in society.

Previous research conducted by Lado et al (2022) using multiple linear regression analysis, showed that the variables of formal education, age, frequency of socialization simultaneously affect the level of implementation of eight family functions. The results are in line with the results of study where the results state that the higher the socioeconomic class, the higher the knowledge of the eight family functions. This finding reveals which social class novelty is actually exposed to the knowledge of eight family functions. The results of the 2017 Medium-Term Development Plan Survey (RPJMN) found by Wijayanti and Berdame (2019) that in general, respondents (88.6%) never listened to/know about the eight family functions.

This research also found that many Indonesian families from middle and low social classes are not exposed to the understanding of the eight family functions. For this maybe other efforts need to be exercised by the practitioner and stakeholder to socialize the eight family function and its implementation. Socialization and implementation can adopt to Wijayanti (2018) must apply the 5W method: who (who delivers), what (what message is conveyed), in which channel (media used), to whom (to whom it is addressed), and with what effect (effect/influence).

The results showed that the majority of the recipients of contribution assistance were from whole families. This makes sense because BPJS PBI distribution is based on poor families, thus intact families occupy the largest portion of BPJS PBI recipients. One type of BPJS membership is BPJS PBI (Contribution Assistance Recipients) participants whose monthly contributions are paid by the government. Participants of this type are also participants who previously held Community Health Insurance (JAMKESMAS) and Regional Health Insurance (JAMKESDA) cards, currently PBI participants are KIS (Healthy Indonesia Card) card holders, generally BPJS participants of this type are only entitled to class 3 and can only choose health facilities at village/kelurahan health centers or sub-district health centers (Nurgahayu & Ulfah, 2020). The party authorized to determine the criteria for the poor and the needy is the Ministry of Social Affairs after coordinating with the Minister and/or heads of related institutions. These include the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration and the Ministry of Home Affairs. Later, the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) will follow up the criteria that have been applied by the Ministry of Statistics by collecting data. The Ministry of Health then followed up on the data from the BPS by submitting it to BPJS Health. BPJS Health then provides a single identity number to Contribution Assistance Recipients (Rini & Sugiharti, 2017).

Family characteristics that affect the socioeconomic class of the family is the livelihood of the head of the family with a 95 percent confidence level of regression. The family characteristics that do not affect the socioeconomic class of the family is the size of the family with a 95 percent regression confidence value. These results are of course contradictory, while Indonesia is promoting the Family Planning Program which is believed that the fewer the number of family members of the Indonesian population, the

level of welfare will be easily achieved. High Socioeconomic class is a family class that does not receive BPJS PBI with a 95 percent regression confidence value. Family characteristics can affect the optimization of family functions.

This study resulted in the finding that poor families had negative knowledge about the application of the eight family functions, while middle-class families had a positive result and rich families had a positive. Respondents' opinion on the government's contribution to the BPJS contribution guarantee is positive for the poor family group, and the middle-class family and the rich family group. It can be understood that the contribution of government contribution assistance is indeed only given to poor family groups so that the other two family groups evaluate it negatively. The research results of Eka P.N. (2014) also confirmed that the implementation of Health Insurance National Health Insurance (JKN) by BPJS for the poor is included into the membership category Contribution Assistance Recipients (PBI) which JKN utilization given is on class III health facility.

The principle of social assistance that we must agree on is that everyone has the right if declared worthy by the community or social officials according to mutually agreed criteria and procedures. This principle is to protect the family from serious problems in both the medium and long term. Social Protection is useful for protecting someone from being unable to meet their daily needs when suddenly the breadwinner is sick, has an accident, is laid off and is old. According to Ulriksen and Plageron (2016), social protection research and policies often have an unbalanced view of the relationship between rights and obligations, thus separating "poor people" from "non-poor people". This has implications for the solidarity and sustainability of the social protection system. Applying citizenship theory to social protection, they argue that duties should not simply be assumed by the state or imposed on beneficiaries as conditional requirements. The solution is, whatever the circumstances, because citizens are still citizens, some are productive and some are vulnerable, then towards all citizens, the state is obliged to fulfill their obligations and rights, even though their contributions and needs for social protection are different. Thus, sustainable social protection policies will increase the agency of citizens as rights holders and duty bearers

This study only measured three indicators that indirectly affected knowledge of 8 family functions, including employment status, knowledge of family functions and level of education. The influence of these three indicators can be direct or indirect. The research data used does not necessarily represent the overall characteristics of families in Indonesia. Further research can be carried out to expand the existing influence indicators, namely age, marital status and access to information.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Conclusion

In the limited amount of State Budget and Revenue owned by the Government of Indonesia, the BPJS for health with premiums paid by the government is given to the most vulnerable economic class, namely the lower socio-economic group. This will increase the welfare of families with low socioeconomic levels while at the same time reducing the level of vulnerability of the family when at any time a family member falls ill or requires health services with the BPJS PBI contribution guarantee.

Then the research also successfully finds out whether socioeconomic class has an effect on knowledge about 8 family functions. That the higher the socioeconomic class,

the higher the knowledge about the eight family functions. Statistically it is very significant as evidenced by the P value below 0.05, which is 0.000 with a coefficient of 0.676. This proves that high socioeconomic class is positively correlated with awareness of the eight family functions. The confidence interval value in higher education is between 0.646 to 0.706, meaning that the difference in the number is only 0.06, this number is constricted and narrowed thus proving that the distribution of the data is more focused

Recommendation

Based on the research findings, the authors recommend the following suggestions, first for researchers, to re-examine other factors that make the size of a family have no effect on family welfare. Please examine the three indicators that influence knowledge of eight family functions that have not been covered in this study, namely age, marital status and access to information sources. Please explore further how significantly poverty bearing programs such as BPJS PBI are able to raise the level of welfare of Indonesian families who are in disadvantaged socio-economic classes. Further research is needed if the majority of the recipients of contribution assistance are from intact families, then what is the condition of a small number of incomplete families who are not recipients of the contribution assistance program. Second, for practitioners and policy makers regarding the BPJS PBI Contribution, the results of this study should become new knowledge that their policies are appropriate where most recipients of the BPJS PBI Contribution come from low socioeconomic classes. Third, for practitioners and policy makers regarding the eight family functions, it clearly mentions that efforts to increase family welfare will also automatically increase understanding and eight family function, therefore make various efforts to improve the welfare of Indonesian families.

References

- Azhari I., Rintyarna B. S., Arifianto D. (2015). Grouping of community economic groups in Kertonegoro Village, Jenggawah district using the K-Means Algorithm, Smart Business System, Informatics Engineering Study Program. Faculty of Engineering. Jember: Muhammadiyah University of Jember
- [BPS] Badan Pusat Statistik. (2022). Percentage of Population Having Health Insurance by Province and Type of Insurance, 2021. Retrieved from https://www.bps.go.id/indikator/indikator/view_data_pub/0000/api_pub/UUROM3lMeGsxZ0czT2xFeEJsK0VWZz09/da_04/1
- Chrustueny, A. R. (2016). Deskripsi pengalaman ayah sebagai orang tua tunggal dalam melalui proses resiliensi. Yogyakarta (ID): Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- Eka, P. N. (2014). Efektivitas penerapan jaminan kesehatan nasional melalui bpjs dalam pelayanan kesehatan masyarakat miskin di Kota Padang. Prodi Ilmu Administrasi Negara Fakultas Ilmu Sosial Universitas Negeri Padang. *TINGKAP, Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial Budaya dan Ekonomi*, 10 (2), 175-189. <https://doi.org/10.24036/tingkap.v10i2.4421>
- Hanum, Nurlaila., & Safuridar. (2018). Analysis of family socio-economic conditions on family welfare in Karang Anyar Village, Langsa City, Development Economics

- Study Program, Faculty of Economics, Samudra University, *Samudra Journal of Economics and Business*, 9 (1). <https://doi.org/10.33059/jseb.v9i1.460>
- Hamid S.R.A, Saleh S. (2013). Exploring single parenting process in Malaysia: Issues and coping strategies. Institute of Education, International Islamic University Malaysia, 53100 Jalan Gombak, Selangor Darul Ehsan, West Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 84, 1154 – 1159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.718>
- Herawati, T., Endah, N.Y. (2016). The effect of family function and conflict on family subjective well-being with migrant husband. *Journal of Family Sciences*, 1 (2), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jfs.1.2.1-12>
- Herawati, T., Krisnatuti, D., Pujihastuty, R., & Latifah, E.W. (2020). Faktor-faktor yang memengaruhi pelaksanaan fungsi keluarga di Indonesia. *Jur. Ilm. Kel. & Kons.*, 13(3), 213-227. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2020.13.3.213>
- [Kemsekneg] Kementerian Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia. (2018). Presidential Instruction of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 2022 concerning Optimizing the Implementation of the National Health Insurance Program.
- Lado, B., Warami, H., & Tjolli, I. (2022). Penerapan delapan fungsi keluarga dan dampak terhadap kesejahteraan keluarga di Kabupaten Sorong. *Cassowary*, 5(1), 58-68. <https://doi.org/10.30862/cassowary.cs.v5.i1.87>
- Layliyah, Z. (2013). Perjuangan hidup single parent. *Jurnal Sosiologi Islam*, 3(1), 90. <https://doi.org/10.15642/jsi.2013.3.1.%25p>
- Mulyati, M., & Martiastuti, K. (2018). The relationship between family function and adolescent autonomy in the rural and urban area. *Journal of Family Sciences*, 3(1), 15-29. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jfs.3.1.15-29>
- Memam, R. B., Aripa, L., & Kartini. (2021). Implementation of health services for BPJS participants recipients of contribution assistance at the Mamajang Health Center, *Preventive Promotive Journal*, 4(1), 29 – 38. <https://doi.org/10.47650/jpp.v4i1.254>
- Ningsih, D. S., & Herawati, T. (2017). The influence of marital adjustment and family function toward family strength in early marriage. *Journal of Family Sciences*, 2 (2), 23-33. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jfs.2.2.23-33>
- Nurgahayu, & Ulfah, N. (2020). Kesesuaian anggota BPJS penerima bantuan iuran (pbi) dengan indikator kemiskinan di Kecamatan Malua Kabupaten Enrekang. *Window of Public Health Journal*, 1(3), 220-231. <https://doi.org/10.33096/woph.v1i3.53>
- Puspitawati, H., Sitepu, P. N., Kasidi, H., Gunawan, I., Sarma, M., Santoso, P., Herawati, T., Septiyana, M., Anggraeny, S., & Azizah, Y. (2022). *Family Quality Development Volume 3, Issue 1*. Bogor (ID): PT. IPB Press Publisher.
- Puspitawati, H., Sitepu, P. N., Kasidi, H., Gunawan, I., Sarma, M., Santoso, P., Herawati, T., Septiyana, M., Anggraeny, S., & Azizah, Y. (2022). *Family Quality Development Volume 2, Issue 1*. Bogor (ID): PT. IPB Press Publisher.
- Puspitawati, H., Sitepu, P.N., Kasidi, H., Gunawan, I., Sarma, M., Santoso, P., Herawati, T., Septiyana, M., Anggraeny, S., & Azizah, Y. (2022). *Family Quality Development Volume 1*. Bogor (ID): PT. Penerbit IPB Press.
- Prativi, A. N., Chriswardani, S., & Pawelas, S.A. (2015). Analisis kesiapan puskesmas sebagai provider BPJS Kesehatan (Studi di Puskesmas Kedungmundu dan Puskesmas Tlogosari Kulon). *Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 3 (2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jkm.v3i2.11863>

- Rini, A. S., & Sugiharti, L. (2017). Determining factors of poverty in Indonesia: household analysis. *JJET (Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi Terapan)*, 1(2), 80-95, <https://doi.org/10.20473/jiet.v1i2.3252>
- Sabania, H., & Hartoyo. (2016). Economic pressure, livelihood strategy, and family well-being in Cimanuk Watershed, Garut and Indramayu, West Java, Indonesia. *Journal of Family Sciences*, 1(1), 24-38. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jfs.1.1.24-38>
- Saputra, M. F., & Krisnatuti, D. (2022). Level of stress, self-adjustment, and quality of life for single father. *Journal of Child, Family, and Consumer Studies*, 1(3), 166-174. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jcfcs.1.3.166-174>
- Sugiharto A., Hartoyo, & Muflikhati I., (2016). Strategi nafkah dan kesejahteraan keluarga pada keluarga petani tadah hujan. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen*, 9(1), 33-42. <https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2016.9.1.33>
- Suwinita, I. G. A. M., & Marheni, A. (2015). Perbedaan kemandirian remaja SMA Antara yang single father dengan single mother akibat perceraian. *Jurnal Psikologi Udayana*, 2(1), 59–67. <https://doi.org/10.24843/jpu.2015.v02.i01.p06>.
- Schmid, K, Ramiah, A. A., & Hewstone M. (2014). Neighborhood ethnic diversity and trust: the role of intergroup contact and perceived threat. *Psychological Science* 25(3), 665-674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613508956>
- Syafitri, N. (2019). The Effect of Income, Education, and Number of Family Members on the Level of Family Welfare in Medan Belawan District. Faculty of Economics and Islamic Business. Medan (ID): North Sumatra State Islamic University
- Ulriksen, M. S., & Plagerson, S. (2014). Social protection: rethinking rights and duties. *World Development*, 84, 755-765. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.07.009>
- Wijayanti, U. T., & Berdame D. Y. (2019). Implementasi Delapan Fungsi Keluarga di Provinsi Jawa Tengah. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 11(1), 15 – 29. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jk.v11i1.2475>
- Wijayanti, U. T. (2018). Kendala-kendala BKB (Bina Keluarga Balita) holistik integratif di Provinsi Sulawesi Utara. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 10(1), 65-76. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jk.v10i1.205>