

Family Resilience in Urban Extreme Poverty

Maulana Rezi Ramadhana^{1*)}

¹Communication Science Study Program, Faculty of Communication and Business, Telkom University, Bangkit Telkom University Building Jl. Telecommunications Canal Buah Batu Indonesia 40257, Bandung, Indonesia

*) Corresponding author: rezimaulana@telkomuniversity.ac.id

Abstract

The impact of poverty causes pressure that weakens family resilience. Although measurements of family resilience are available, there are not many up-to-date measures for urban poor families in Indonesia. The purpose of this study is to describe the profile of family resilience and the conditions of vulnerability of extreme urban poor families. The research subjects were the heads of families (N=416) spread across five sub-districts in the city of Bandung, with the highest number of poverties, where most of the subjects worked as daily laborers. The measurement uses a scale of family resilience through four dimensions: the quality of physical, economic, psychological, social, and family structure as demographic resilience. Data were analyzed with descriptive and correlational statistics using JASP 0.15. The results show that poor families have a level of fulfillment of family resilience qualities of 16.5 percent (12.62 percent on the dimensions of physical endurance, 12.46 percent on the economic dimension, 17.33 percent on the psychological dimension and 19.95 percent on the social dimension). Several dimensions have a significant positive relationship, with the highest level on the relationship between dimensions of physical and economic resilience ($r=0.768$). Six conditions of vulnerability were found, namely related to job instability and income that is less than needed, environmental cleanliness and insufficient food consumption, misunderstanding of family goals, and lack of gratitude for conditions. The research findings show two sub-dimensions in each dimension of social resilience and psychological resilience. Suggestions and implications are directed at recommendations for urban extreme poverty alleviation programs and optimizing family quality programs, especially aspects of independence.

Keywords: extreme poverty, family, family resilience, urban communities

Abstrak

Dampak dari kemiskinan menyebabkan tekanan yang melemahkan ketahanan keluarga. Meski pengukuran ketahanan keluarga telah tersedia, belum banyak hasil ukuran terkini untuk keluarga miskin perkotaan di Indonesia. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah mendeskripsikan profil ketahanan keluarga dan kondisi kerentanan keluarga miskin ekstrem perkotaan. Subyek penelitian adalah kepala keluarga (N=416) yang tersebar di lima kecamatan di kota Bandung dengan jumlah kemiskinan terbanyak yang sebagian besar subjek bekerja sebagai buruh harian. Pengukuran menggunakan skala ketahanan keluarga melalui empat dimensi yaitu kualitas ketahanan fisik, ekonomi, psikologis, sosial, dan struktur keluarga sebagai demografi. Data dianalisis dengan statistik deskriptif dan korelasional menggunakan JASP 0.15. Hasil menunjukkan keluarga miskin memiliki tingkat keterpenuhan kualitas ketahanan keluarga sebesar 16.5 persen. (12.62 persen pada dimensi ketahanan fisik, 12.46 persen dimensi ekonomi, 17.33 persen dimensi psikologi dan 19.95 persen dimensi sosial). Beberapa dimensi memiliki hubungan yang signifikan positif, dengan tingkat tertinggi pada hubungan dimensi ketahanan fisik dan ekonomi ($r=0.768$). Enam kondisi kerentanan ditemukan, yaitu terkait dengan ketidakstabilan pekerjaan dan penghasilan yang lebih kecil dari kebutuhan, kebersihan lingkungan dan ketidakcukupan konsumsi pangan, ketidakpahaman tujuan berkeluarga, dan kurangnya sikap syukur atas kondisi.

Temuan penelitian menunjukkan terdapat dua sub-dimensi pada masing-masing dimensi ketahanan sosial dan ketahanan psikologis. Saran dan implikasi diarahkan pada rekomendasi program pengentasan kemiskinan ekstrem perkotaan, dan optimalisasi program kualitas keluarga, terutama aspek kemandirian.

Kata kunci: keluarga, ketahanan keluarga, kemiskinan ekstrem, masyarakat perkotaan

Introduction

Poverty is a socio-economic condition of people who cannot meet basic needs that are appropriate for humanity (Muzakkir, 2017), while extreme poverty is a condition where people are unable to complete various basic needs, namely food, clean water, proper sanitation, health, housing, education and information access to income and social services. Families categorized as extremely poor are those whose daily living expenses are below the outer poverty line or if their costs are below IDR 10,739/person/day or IDR 322,170/person/month. Accelerating the handling of extreme poverty is the President's direction in 2021, which targets achieving 0 percent in 2024, and one of them is West Java as the target area.

Poverty is synonymous with economically tricky conditions that can hinder social growth while increasing vulnerability, which impacts families (Conger et al., 2000), as well as other risk factors. Due to economic difficulties, individuals who live in poverty areas will try to find ways to survive by expecting benefits, and on the other hand, face negative impacts related to behavior, emotions, and physical, so they need resilience (McLoyd, 1998). Research from Fortini et al. (2019) explains that poverty can cause conflict in family relationships. Other research shows a relationship between economic pressure and the resilience of families living in areas of extreme poverty (Okech et al., 2012).

McCubbin and McCubbin (1996) explain that five main elements of the resilience model are considered resilient for families, namely those who experience stress during life, who have strengths that help recover from negative experiences, benefit from relationships within the community or neighbors, interpret and develop a shared understanding of the conditions experienced, and try to restore balance in life during times of crisis. Although the elements of family resilience have been presented, these findings are still general and do not yet describe the uniqueness of families, especially for family groups in certain territories. Many indicators of family difficulties still need to be investigated to understand how families develop in their environment (Pessoa et al., 2018). Family resilience will differ in certain environmental groups, considering that it is a dynamic family adaptation process when they face difficulties, both from within and outside the family (McCubbin et al., 1988).

In achieving family resilience, literature such as Walsh (2006) describes three processes for achieving family resilience, namely building meaning and trust, managing social support resources, and applying interaction and problem-solving. In Indonesia, the Regulation of the Minister of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection Number 6 of 2013 concerning the implementation of family development stipulates the concept of family resilience and welfare, which includes five things, namely (1) legal basis and family integrity, (2) physical resilience, (3) economic resilience, (4) psychological-social resilience, and (5) socio-cultural resilience. By explaining variables and indicators, these

five things are dimensions as instruments for measuring family resilience, which has now become a family quality index (Kemen PPPA, 2020).

The family quality index measures the success of family development in Indonesia. It is a benchmark for planning and an indicator of success for family development at the central government, provincial, regional government, and district/city regional government levels. The quality of physical and economic resilience is related to the ability of family members to obtain financial resources from outside the family system to meet basic needs such as clothing, food, housing, education, and health. The quality of social resilience is related to the strength of the family in applying religious values, maintaining bonds and commitments, effective communication, and sharing and accepting roles in the family. The quality of psychological resilience is related to the ability of family members to manage their emotions to produce a positive self-concept, strength, satisfaction with fulfilling needs, and achieving family development tasks.

The West Java government has issued a regional regulation regarding the implementation of family resilience development. As a mandate for this regional regulation, a family resilience motivator (Motekar) was formed as a community empowerment cadre originating from the local village (kelurahan) community, which has the knowledge, willingness, and ability to facilitate activities to empower pre-prosperous families and women in improving the quality of life and that of their families so that better, which at the same time can reduce the social problems that occur (Fahrudin, 2016).

Issues about families and family resilience have attracted many experts to confirm and explore new findings in different contexts. Schrodt (2015) explained that a dynamic role within the family can activate family functioning and facilitate the process of family resilience. The results of research on family resilience previously yielded contributions from various contexts and perspectives, such as resilience in recipient families of the "Program Keluarga Harapan" (Rizki, 2017; Antika, 2018; Lestari, 2020), the role of husband, wife and in meeting their needs in facing economic pressures (Aulia et al., 2018), the role of women in realizing economic improvements for family resilience (Wulan et al., 2022), family resilience in facing the new normal (Megawanty & Hanita, 2021), family resilience in the disability group (Isnaeni & Ayubi, 2021), economic strength of poor families in urban areas (Amalia & Samputra, 2020), food security of rural communities (Herawati et al, 2011), resilience of families of the poor (Wahyudi, 2020), the role of socioeconomic status and social support for family resilience survivors of covid-19 (Sholihah et al., 2023), gender equality and family resilience in East Java and North Sumatra Provinces (Puspitawati et al., 2016), to the role of family resilience motivators in increasing family resilience (Qomariah, 2018; Hasanah & Komariah, 2019).

Based on the literature review, so far, there has been little research on the resilience of families living in urban extreme poverty areas; instead, at this time, more intensive efforts are needed in family quality development, which is a strategic step by the government towards national development goals (Nursyif, 2020). This research is essential as a mapping in identifying the vulnerability factors of poor families based on the quality dimensions of economic, physical, psychological, and social resilience. The findings of this study serve as an illustration and complement to previous results, which have implications for prioritizing the treatment of poor families and analyses of controls in addressing the vulnerabilities of families living in areas with extreme urban poverty.

Methods

Participants

This study uses a survey method that provides a quantitative descriptive interpretation related to the attitudes and opinions of a family group through a cross-sectional study approach through questionnaires in data collection, which aims to generalize from the sample to the population (Fowler, 2008).

Data collection was carried out in West Java Province with five locations categorized as areas with extreme poverty in the city of Bandung, namely the sub-districts of Babakan Ciparay, Bandung Kulon, Bojongloa Kaler, Bojongloa Kidul and Batununggal. Data collection was carried out from August to September 2022. A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed to research respondents with the criteria of (1) head/family member living in one of the five sub-districts with extreme poverty, (2) male or female gender, (3). willing to complete the questionnaire and return it to the survey officer. Prior to data collection, we conducted audiences in the five sub-districts to obtain research approval, and involved youth teams from each sub-district in assisting the survey process and approaching residents, as well as data collection. Of the 500 questionnaires distributed to respondents, 49 sheets were not returned, 22 were lost, five were damaged, and 10 were not responded to entirely. Hence, the data analyzed amounted to 416 sheets/research participant that fulfilled 100 percent of the results of the response to the questionnaire filling.

Measurement

The questionnaire contains family resilience with the definition of a family's ability to manage the problems it faces based on the resources it must meet its needs (Sunarti, 2001). There are four dimensions used as measurements in this study which refer to family resilience as an element forming the 2020 family quality index (Kemen PPPA, 2020), namely, (1) economic resilience, (2) physical resilience, (3) psychological resilience, and (4) social resilience. The questionnaire also displays information about family structure as a demographic that can support the findings. Each dimension contains item indicators that are responded to using the Guttman dichotomous scale (0=not available, and 1=available).

Economic resilience. The quality of economic resilience consists of six statement items; examples of items on this dimension include "having a job that is relatively stable," "having an income higher than the necessities of a decent life," and "having savings for six months for family needs". The value of Cronbach's alpha (α) on this scale is 0.859, while the reliability value of the re-test correlation coefficient on this dimension item is categorized as high (0.815 - 0.863).

Physical resilience. The quality of physical endurance consists of six statement items, Examples of items on this dimension include "a clean and healthy home environment", "have availability of medicines", and "have good lighting". The value of Cronbach's alpha (α) on this scale is 0.857, while the reliability value of the re-test correlation coefficient on this dimension item is categorized as high (0.822 - 0.851).

Psychological resilience. The quality of psychological resilience consists of ten statement items. Examples of things on this dimension include "having agreed on family rules, "accepting the division of roles between husband and wife," and "reminding that marriage is a sacred promise that must be kept." The value of Cronbach's alpha (α) on this

scale is 0.641, while the reliability value of the re-test correlation coefficient on this dimension item is categorized as moderate (0.558 - 0.685).

Social resilience. The quality of social stability consists of nine statement items, examples of items on this dimension include "understanding family goals", "prioritizing family affairs", and "planning every family activity". The value of Cronbach's alpha (α) on this scale is 0.690, while the reliability value of the re-test correlation coefficient on this dimension item is categorized as moderate (0.629 - 0.686).

Family demographics. Family demographics include the age of the respondent, head of the family, marital status (marriage), number of family members living in the same house, occupation of the head of the family, father's education, mother's education, and average monthly income (Table 1).

Analysis

The statistical analysis used in this study was (1) descriptive by calculating the average score (2) ANOVA to test differences in scores between demographic groups, (3) correlation and regression tests to test the relationship between one or more predictor variables with one response variable. Data processing was assisted by using Microsoft excel software and Jeffrey's Amazing Statistics Program (JASP) 0.15 software.

Findings

Family Demographics

Most of the research respondents were fathers (95.7%) as heads of families, with an average age of 43.89 (SD=17.82), while the average age of mothers was 40.90 (SD=16.44). Most families live with their partner (Father and Mother) completely, and on average have three to four other family members living together in the dwelling. Most heads of families work as daily labourers, while the rest work as traders, employees, drivers, farmers, and civil servants in the sub-district. Most of the monthly income of the heads of families (96.4%) is below 4 million rupiah per month.

Table 1. Univariate association of family demographic variables with family resilience

Demographic Aspect		N	%	M	±	SD	F	P
Head of the family	Father	398	95.7	0.165	±	0.157	0.323	0.570
	Mother	18	4.3	0.143	±	0.167		
Marital state	Married	340	81.7	0.171	±	0.165	1.920	0.148
	Divorced	43	10.3	0.124	±	0.092		
	Death divorce	33	7.9	0.146	±	0.135		
Number of Members of one house	One person	9	2.2	0.227	±	0.218	1.009	0.432
	Two persons	36	8.7	0.184	±	0.178		
	Three people	143	34.4	0.169	±	0.168		
	Four people	124	29.8	0.151	±	0.141		
	Five people	55	13.2	0.138	±	0.126		
	Six people	26	6.3	0.180	±	0.169		

Continue from Table 1

Demographic Aspect		N	%	M	±	SD	F	P
Number of Members of one house	Seven people	16	3.8	0.204	±	0.182	1.009	0.432
	Eight people	3	0.7	0.020	±	0.035		
	Nine people	2	0.5	0.240	±	0.113		
	Over Ten people	2	0.5	0.225	±	0.134		
Head of Family Occupation	Trader	63	15.1	0.140	±	0.125	3.532	< 0.001
	Breeder	11	2.6	0.185	±	0.171		
	Laborer	240	57.7	0.150	±	0.145		
	Employee	39	9.4	0.240	±	0.189		
	Retired	11	2.6	0.265	±	0.209		
	Civil servant	2	0.5	0.435	±	0.247		
	Security guard	11	2.6	0.101	±	0.102		
	Driver	19	4.6	0.157	±	0.157		
	Farmer	20	4.8	0.211	±	0.215		
Father's education	Elementary	123	29.6	0.124	±	0.138	8.693	< 0.001
	Middle school	137	32.9	0.164	±	0.148		
	High school	148	35.6	0.186	±	0.165		
	Diploma/bachelor	8	1.9	0.371	±	0.221		
Mother's Education	Elementary	154	37.0	0.144	±	0.151	7.382	< 0.001
	Middle school	134	32.2	0.158	±	0.149		
	High school	124	29.8	0.185	±	0.161		
	Diploma/bachelor	4	1.0	0.482	±	0.172		
Average Monthly Income (rupiah)	Under 1 million	144	34.6	0.117	±	0.103	22.462	< 0.001
	1-2 million	124	29.8	0.119	±	0.107		
	2-3 million	79	19.0	0.235	±	0.189		
	3-4 million	54	13.0	0.291	±	0.221		
	Above 4 million	15	3.6	0.156	±	0.099		

The statistical results of the Pearson chi-square test showed that there was a significant relationship between the type of work and monthly income ($p < 0.001$) and the kind of work and parental education ($p < 0.001$). The data shows that the average family income below 1 million rupiah per month is owned by most heads of families with this type of labour. At the same time, the rest are traders, drivers, farmers, and ranchers. In contrast, the average income of 1-2 million rupiah per month is mainly owned by heads of families with types of labour, while a small number of traders, retirees, farmers, drivers, employees, and breeders. An average income of 2-3 million rupiah per month is owned by a third of the heads of families with the type of work as labourers and employees, while the others are traders, security guards, drivers, breeders, and farmers, while the average income of 3-4 million rupiah per month is owned by all heads of families with jobs as civil servants, while others are employees, security guards, breeders, farmers, traders, drivers, and labourers. The average income above 4 million rupiah per month is

owned by the head of the family with the type of work as an employee and a small number of traders.

Related to the last type of work and education, a third of the heads of households with the kind of labour and farming work are junior high school and elementary school graduates, and a small number are high school graduates. This differs from the work of traders and breeders, most of whom are high school graduates. Meanwhile, security guards and retirees are elementary school graduates, and most of the employees' jobs are high school graduates.

Economic Resilience

Families living in areas with extreme poverty show the quality of economic resilience with a fulfilment rate of 12.46 percent. Job stability (5.8%) and income more significant than life's necessities (8.2%) are indicators with the lowest fulfilment rate (Table 2). The correlation results for all hands on this dimension also show a relationship, especially regarding family savings ownership and income management ($r=0.71$). The regression test results show the amount of income and the ability to manage income simultaneously as a factor that influences 29.1% on job stability. Meanwhile, the amount of income and the ability to manage and manage income can affect 61.7 percent of the possibility of a family having savings. On the other hand, significant income, savings ownership, and ability to collect income can provide a potential of 47.5 percent for families to develop skills to increase income. The results of differences in scores between demographic groups showed that there were significant differences in the quality of family economic security based on the average monthly family income ($F(4,411)=18,854$, $p<0.001$), the work group of the head of the family ($F(8,407)=2,764$, $p<0.001$), parental education level ($F(3,412)=9.198$, $p<0.001$), and family marital status ($F(2,413)=3.156$, $p=0.044$). A higher quality of economic resilience is shown by families with an average income of over 4 million rupiah per month ($SD=0.364$), work as a Civil Servant ($SD=0.232$), parental education equivalent to diploma/bachelor ($SD=0.392$), and families with complete marital status ($SD=0.266$).

Physical Resilience

Most families in areas with extreme poverty experience the quality of physical resilience with an indicator fulfillment of 12.62 percent. The cleanliness factor of the living environment (8.7%) and the adequacy of food consumption (8.7%) are indicators with the lowest fulfillment rate (Table 2). The correlation of all indicators on this dimension showed a significant positive relationship, especially the cleanliness of the living environment and the availability of medicines ($r=0.68$). The factors of availability of medicines, adequacy of food consumption, and clean water simultaneously can also affect 64.2% of the quality of cleanliness and environmental health of the residents. Meanwhile, the adequacy of food consumption is influenced by 40.3% by environmental hygiene, good lighting, air circulation, and clean water. The results showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the quality of family physical resilience based on the group's average monthly family income ($F(4,411)=37,231$, $p<0.001$), based on the workgroup of the head of the family ($F(8,407)=2,874$, $p=0.004$) and family marital status ($F(2,413)=3.078$, $p=0.047$). Heads of families show a higher quality of physical endurance with an average income of over 4 million rupiah per month ($SD=0.389$), heads of families with jobs as Civil Servants ($SD=0.474$), and families with complete marital status ($SD=0.267$).

Psychological Resilience

Most families in areas with extreme poverty experience the quality of psychological resilience with an indicator fulfillment result of 17.33 percent. The factor of getting used to an attitude of gratitude for conditions (9.6%) is an indicator with the lowest level of fulfillment (Table 2). The correlation with the hands-on dimension showed a significant positive relationship between the division of husband-wife roles and the interaction of family gatherings ($r=0.64$) and reminding family members of good things ($r=0.61$). The attitude of reminding each other that marriage is a sacred promise that must be kept and reminding members of the good influences 38.1% to develop the habit of being grateful for the conditions experienced. The results showed a statistically significant difference in the quality of family psychological resilience based on the group's average monthly family income ($F(4,411)=2.881, p=0.022$). A higher rate of psychological resilience is shown by heads of households with an average income of 2-3 million rupiah per month ($SD=0.186$).

Social Resilience

Most families in areas with extreme poverty experience the quality of psychological resilience with an indicator fulfillment result of 19.95 percent. The factor of understanding the purpose of having a family (7.0%) is an indicator with the lowest level of fulfillment (Table 2). The results of the correlation with the hands-on dimension showed a significant positive relationship with respect for the family by planning joint activities ($r=0.728$) and prioritizing family affairs ($r=0.724$) and understanding family goals by planning everyday activities ($r=0.640$), respecting family members ($r=0.692$) and prioritizing family matters by planning joint activities ($r=0.622$). The indicators of planning daily activities and respecting family members influenced 51.8 percent of families in understanding family goals. The results showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the quality of family social security based on the group's average monthly family income ($F(4,411)=12.419, p<0.001$), based on parental education level ($F(3,412)= 5.494, p<0.001$). A higher quality of social security is shown by heads of households with an average income of over 4 million rupiah per month ($SD =0.191$) and parents with diploma/bachelor equivalent education ($SD=0.228$).

Table 2. Distribution of frequency availability of indicators on the quality of family resilience (N=416)

Indicator		Not available		Available	
		n	%	n	%
Economic resilience					
KE1	Have a relatively stable job.	392	94.2	24	5.8
KE2	Income is greater than the needs of a decent life.	382	91.8	34	8.2
KE3	Have savings for six months of family needs.	367	88.2	49	11.8
KE4	Managing income to have savings.	363	87.3	53	12.7
KE5	Manage income for developmental needs.	342	82.2	74	17.8
KE6	Develop skills to increase income.	339	81.5	77	18.5
Physical resilience					
KF1	The home environment is clean and healthy.	380	91.3	36	8.7
KF2	Availability of medicines	364	87.5	52	12.5
KF3	Has good lighting	350	84.1	66	15.9
KF4	Consuming sufficient, healthy, and nutritious food.	380	91.3	36	8.7
KF5	Has air circulation	343	82.5	73	17.5

Continue from Table 2

Indicator	Not available		Available	
	n	%	n	%
Physical resilience				
KF6 Have clean water	364	87.5	52	12.5
Psychological resilience				
KP1 Have agreed family rules.	369	88.7	47	11.3
KP2 Receives the division of roles between husband and wife.	359	86.3	57	13.7
KP3 Reminds that marriage is a sacred promise that must be kept.	353	84.9	63	15.1
KP4 There is always time to gather and do activities together.	300	72.1	116	27.9
KP5 Get used to being grateful and grateful for existing conditions.	376	90.4	40	9.6
KP6 Reminds to see the good side of every condition.	372	89.4	44	10.6
KP7 Discuss feelings and thoughts openly.	342	82.2	74	17.8
KP8 Satisfied with the family's economic condition	331	79.6	85	20.4
KP9 Feel satisfied interacting with the family.	297	71.4	119	28.6
KP10 Often feels helpless.	342	82.2	74	17.8
Social resilience				
KS1 Understand the purpose of having a family.	387	93.0	29	7.0
KS2 Prioritizing family matters.	346	83.2	70	16.8
KS3 Plan every family activity.	368	88.5	48	11.5
KS4 Involve family members in decision-making.	259	62.3	157	37.7
KS5 Encouraging family members to have independence.	252	60.6	164	39.4
KS6 Practicing empathy and being happy to help.	345	82.9	71	17.1
KS7 Encouraging family members to excel.	285	68.5	131	31.5
KS8 Value and accept family members.	374	89.9	42	10.1
KS9 I'm sure many people will help if you need help.	350	84.1	66	15.9

Dimensional Relationship and Analysis of Indicators of Family Resilience

The average family monthly income is related to economic resilience ($r=0.30$), physical resilience ($r=0.388$), and social resilience ($r=0.320$). In addition, a relationship was also found between the dimensions of economic resilience and physical resilience ($r=0.768$), social resilience ($r=0.523$), and psychological resilience ($r=0.221$). On physical resilience, a significant relationship was found between social resilience ($r=0.571$) and psychological resilience ($r=0.459$). While psychological resilience is related to social resilience ($r=0.461$) (Table 3).

Table 3. Relationship between family demographics and dimensions of family resilience

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Average Income	—						
2. Father's education	0.389***	—					
3. Mother's education	0.232***	0.558***	—				
4. Economic resilience	0.308***	0.208***	0.188***	—			
5. Physical resilience	0.388***	0.234***	0.123*	0.768***	—		
6. Psychological resilience	-0.004	-0.003	0.025	0.221***	0.459**	—	
7. Social resilience	0.326***	0.179***	0.109*	0.523***	0.571***	0.461***	—

Note: Significant * $p < 0.05$; Significant ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

The factor analysis results show that seven indicators (KP1 to KP7) and three indicators (KP8 to KP10) indicate the sub-dimensional of psychological resilience. While four indicators (KS1, KS2, KS3, KS8), and five (KS4, KS5, KS6, KS7, KS9) indicate the sub-dimensional of social resilience (Table 4).

Table 4. Factor analysis of the dimensions of the quality of family resilience

Item	Factor						Uniquenes s
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
KE-3	0.834						0.304
KE-4	0.786						0.383
KE-5	0.764						0.416
KE-6	0.754						0.431
KE-2	0.618						0.618
KE-1	0.513						0.736
KF-2		0.790					0.376
KF-1		0.786					0.383
KF-3		0.752					0.434
KF-5		0.702					0.507
KF-4		0.640					0.591
KF-6		0.611					0.627
KP-2			0.784				0.394
KP-3			0.714				0.496
KP-6			0.661				0.567
KP-5			0.653				0.577
KP-7			0.543				0.700
KP-4			0.538				0.697
KP-1			0.511				0.738
KP-9				0.696			0.515
KP-10				0.581			0.669
KP-8				0.406			0.831
KS-8					0.918		0.153
KS-3					0.815		0.329
KS-2					0.768		0.418
KS-1					0.744		0.440
KS-4						0.755	0.438
KS-5						0.753	0.430
KS-7						0.704	0.507
KS-6						0.612	0.618
KS-9						0.556	0.688

Discussion

The non-fulfilment of indicators on the quality dimensions of physical, economic, psychological and social resilience has illustrated the low resilience of families living in areas with extreme poverty. So far, the level of fulfilment of family resilience quality is shown through a figure of 16.5 percent. The low quality of economic resilience is shown by almost all families not having a stable job and having a significant relationship with income that is less than what is needed.

The adequacy of family income is measured based on the subjective perception of the head of the household regarding the adequacy of household income to meet daily needs. The results show that 64.4 percent of families have an average income of below 2 million rupiah per month, and refer to BPS data which publishes data on the poverty line per household in 2023 with an average of IDR 2,592,657/household/month indicates that most families living in areas with extreme poverty can be categorized as poor families. In addition, generally, their income is below the provincial minimum wage for the city of Bandung, which is set at IDR 4,048,462 in 2023. This explanation shows that low family per capita income can affect family economic resilience.

Most of the families had elementary and junior high school graduates (62.5%). This condition of education which tends to be low causes a person to lack certain skills needed in life. The limited education you have will also cause limitations to enter the world of work (Annur, 2013). Besides that, one factor that affects family welfare is savings ownership (Iskandar et al., 2010), which most families do not own in extreme poverty. With the quality of the economic resilience of impoverished families in urban areas, families are forced to find various ways to survive, such as seeking welfare benefits (Seccombe, 2000).

The analysis results show that the factors influencing families to have savings are the amount of income, management and regulation of income, and all of these indicators can encourage family opportunities to develop skills in increasing income. This explanation shows the importance of attention from institutions/government/work centers not only to provide working capital assistance and develop work skills to increase income, but the importance of provision in managing and maintaining income. This finding seems to be in line with the results showing that “Bantuan Langsung Tunai (BLT) Program” has no effect on welfare because it creates a large dependency (Iskandar et al., 2010), and people in urban areas experience more difficulty in maintaining income (Maryono, 1999). The findings regarding pressure in the economic sector appear to be directly related to the condition of their family's resilience, which is followed by a lack of sufficient food and nutrition to meet their daily physical needs. In general, the level of fulfillment of the physical resilience indicator reached 12.62 percent indicating that the quality of the physical resilience of families living in areas of extreme poverty is also low.

One of the determining factors found in this study's results is most families' failure to create a clean living environment. Instead, environmental cleanliness is also a determining factor for family health (Blum, 1974), influenced by the adequacy of food consumption and access to clean water. According to the results of this study, it seems that the quality of physical resilience of families in areas with extreme poverty has not yet reached an understanding of environmental sanitation. This shows that there is no optimal effort to encourage changes in people's behaviour about the importance of cleanliness.

Instead of having to do with environmental hygiene, most families in extreme poverty do not even have sufficient food, which indicates the potential for food insecurity. Literature shows that food consumption patterns are influenced by food availability and socio-cultural practices in the family (Harper et al., 1985). On the other hand, family income also influences food availability, which determines purchasing power. On the other hand, ignorance of understanding of nutrition also affects the insufficiency of food availability to meet their basic needs, which is identical to that experienced by poor families (Ermawati, 2011). With indicators of unavailability of medicines, non-compliance with environmental hygiene and nutritional food insecurity, this appears to

affect the incidence of disease and malnutrition in children, according to research results that indirect causes of infection include food security and environmental health (Istiono et al., 2009).

The level of fulfilment of the quality of psychological resilience, which reached 17.33 percent and social security, which reached 19.95 percent, was most indicated by the lack of an attitude of gratitude for accepting family conditions and the family's lack of understanding about family goals which also showed its connection with the lack of joint activities in the family and prioritizing family affairs. Family. In families living in areas with extreme poverty, the acquisition of an understanding of family goals is influenced by interaction factors and attitudes of respect for family members. This is in line with research results, which explain one of the processes in building family resilience, namely sharing meaning, and family trust values (Walsh, 2006), and low family communication interactions can show negative emotions that affect family resilience (Ramadhana, 2020). Family communication is a way for parents and children to be involved in the process of creating meaning, identity, and interaction (Baxter, 2014).

In explaining the social reality of the family, family communication can build a system of beliefs and relation schemes that are marked by patterns and forms that are visible, namely through conversation orientation and conformity orientation schemes (Fitzpatrick & Ritchie, 1994). The life of family feelings through the involvement of emotions that arise can also affect the pressure that appears on the family so that this pressure can affect the attitude of acceptance of the conditions that the family experiences (Folkman & Moskowitz, 2000) as shown in the results of this study that most families do not accept conditions and attitudes of gratitude. In optimizing the strength of the family on the social side is very dependent on the support of family members (Burgess & Gutstein, 2007); on the other hand, every family also has the responsibility to develop the abilities and potential of other family members.

In overcoming family vulnerability, there are six priorities for strengthening the resilience of families living in extreme urban poverty areas, namely employment to earn a stable income, assistance by family resilience motivators through family guidance to understand the goals of marriage and family, counselling to families to encourage behaviour change in creating a clean living environment, assistance and advising for the provision of nutritious food accompanied by an understanding of malnutrition, and strengthening spiritual values in improving the mentality and behaviour of residents. Although an initial picture of family resilience can be identified, this study still has limitations, including using measurement instruments with a dichotomous scale that only provides limited answers and a small sample of respondents.

As a finding, based on family resilience measurement instruments, new construction was found in explaining the quality dimensions of psychological resilience and social resilience quality dimensions. The quality dimension of psychological resilience can be divided into two factors/sub-dimensions, namely (1) the sub-dimension related to "family communication" with indicators a) having agreed family rules, b) accepting the division of roles between husband and wife, and c) remind that marriage is a sacred promise that must be kept, d) there is always time to gather and do activities together, e) get used to being grateful and grateful for existing conditions, f) remind to see the good side of every condition, and g) discuss various feelings and mind openly. (2) the sub-dimension related to "psychological well-being", with indicators a) feeling satisfied with the family's economic conditions, b) feeling satisfied with interacting within the family, and c) often feeling helpless. The quality dimension of social security can be

divided into two factors/sub-dimensions, namely (1) sub-dimensions related to "family values" with indicators a) understanding family goals, b) prioritizing family affairs, c) planning every activity family, and d) respect and accept family members. (2) sub-dimensions related to "family social participation" with indicators a) involving family members in decision making, b) encouraging family members to have independence, c) practising empathy and being happy to help, d) encouraging family members to excel, and e) believe that there are many people who will help if you need help.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Conclusion

Research on the resilience of families living in urban extreme poverty areas is needed as an overview and mapping efforts on family vulnerability factors based on the quality dimensions of economic, physical, psychological, and social resilience. The results of the study show that families living in areas of extreme poverty have a level of fulfillment of family resilience qualities of 16.5 percent. The fulfillment of the indicators was 12.62 percent on the quality of physical resilience, 12.46 percent on the quality of economic strength, 17.33 percent on the quality of psychological power, and 19.95 percent on the quality of social stability. Several dimensions have a significant positive relationship, with the highest level on the relationship between dimensions of physical and economic resilience. Six conditions of vulnerability were found, namely related to job instability and income that is less than needed, environmental cleanliness and insufficient food consumption, misunderstanding of family goals, and lack of gratitude for conditions. The research findings show that there are two sub-dimensions in each dimension of social resilience and psychological resilience.

Recommendation

Overcoming the problem of family resilience in poor families cannot be done separately from problems such as unemployment, education, health, and other problems that are closely related to poverty. It needs a cross-sectoral, cross-actor approach in an integrated and coordinated and integrated manner. For local governments, it is necessary to have a priority map in implementing strategic programs in optimizing programs to strengthen the resilience of families living in areas with extreme poverty, especially regarding increasing self-sufficiency through coaching, work centres, and productivity to achieve food self-sufficiency. For family resilience motivators (Motekar), it is important to master the leading indicators of each quality dimension of family resilience, so that they can provide holistic assistance and align with other sizes, one form of approach model using behavior change communication. For future research, the findings of this study are initial information that needs to be analyzed in more depth through exploratory techniques to obtain results that can confirm and involve family demographic variables and analysis units.

References

- Amalia, L., & Samputra, P. L. (2020). Strategi ketahanan ekonomi keluarga miskin penerima dana bantuan sosial di Kelurahan Tanah Tinggi Jakarta Pusat. *Jurnal SOSIO KONSEPSIA*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.33007/ska.v9i2.1792>
- Annur, R. (2013). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kemiskinan di Kecamatan Jekulo dan Mejobo Kabupaten Kudus Tahun 2013. *Economics Development Analysis Journal*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.15294/Edaj.V2i4.3209>
- Antika, A. (2018). Studi Komparasi Ketahanan Keluarga Antara Keluarga Penerima Dan Bukan Penerima Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH).
- Aulia, R., Ridho, M., & Rapli, A. (2018). Ketahanan keluarga: tinjauan kebersamaan keluarga menghadapi tekanan perekonomian di Kota Jambi. *Khazanah Intelektual*, 2(3), 333-340. <https://doi.org/10.37250/newkiki.v2i3.32>
- Baxter, L. A. (2014). *Theorizing The Communicative Construction Of "Family": The Threer's*. In L. A. Baxter Ed., *Remaking "Family" Communicatively*. New York (US): Peter Lang
- Blum, Hendrik L. (1974). *Planning For Health, Development And Application Of Social Changes Theory*. New York (US): Human Sciences Press.
- Burgess, A. F., & Gutstein, S. E. (2005). Quality of life for people with autism: raising the standard for evaluating successful outcomes. *Child And Adolescent Mental Health*, 12(2), 80-86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-3588.2006.00432.x>
- Ermawati, R.O.(2011). Analisis ketahanan pangan rumah tangga miskin pada daerah rawan banjir di Kecamatan Jebres Kota Surakarta. Skripsi. Fakultas Pertanian. Surakarta : Universitas Sebelas Maret
- Fathurrizqi, M. I. (2020). Hubungan tingkat kesejahteraan dan ketahanan keluarga: kasus keluarga fertilitas rendah di Kecamatan Panggang Gunungkidul (Doctoral Dissertation, Universitas Gadjah Mada).
- Fitzpatrick, M. A., & Ritchie, L. D. (1994). Communication schemata within the family: multiple perspectives on family interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 20, 275–301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1994.tb00324.x>
- Folkman, S., & Moskowitz, J. T. (2000). Positive affect and the other side of coping. *American Psychologist*, 55(6),647–654. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.6.647>
- Fortini, R. M., Teixeira, E. C., Silveira, S. D. F., & Moreira, V. D. S. (2019). Measurement of rural multidimensional poverty in the Northern and Jequitinhonha Mesoregions of Minas Gerais. *Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural*, 57(1), 161-180. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1234-56781806-94790570110>
- Fowler, F. (2013). *Survey Research Methods (5th Edition)*. Los Angeles (US): Sage Publication
- Harper, L. J, Deaton, B. J, & Driskel, J. A (1985). *Pangan, Gizi Dan Pertanian*. Jakarta (ID): UI Press
- Hasanah, V. R., & Komariah, D. N. (2019). MOTEKAR (Motivator Ketahanan Keluarga) Dan Pemberdayaan Keluarga Rentan. *PAUD Lectura: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 2(02), 42-56. <https://doi.org/10.31849/paud-lectura.v2i02.2519>
- Herawati, T., Ginting, B., Asngari, P. S., Susanto, D., & Puspitawati, H. (2011). Ketahanan pangan keluarga peserta program pemberdayaan masyarakat di pedesaan. *Jurnal Gizi dan Pangan*, 6(3), 208-216.

- Iskandar, H., Sumarwan, U., & Khomsan, A. (2010). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kesejahteraan keluarga. *Kesehatan Masyarakat, 1*, 133-141.
- Isnaeni, I., & Ayubi, D. (2021). Gambaran ketahanan keluarga disabilitas di masa pandemi COVID-19. *Media Publikasi Promosi Kesehatan Indonesia (MPPKI), 4*(4), 507-516. <https://doi.org/10.56338/mppki.v4i4.1758>
- Istiono, W. W., Suryadi, H., & Haris, M. (2009). Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi status gizi balita. *Berita Kedokteran Masyarakat, 25*(3), 150. Retrieved from <https://download.garuda.kemdikbud.go.id/article.php?article=2980017&val=26728&title=Analisis%20Faktor-Faktor%20yang%20Mempengaruhi%20Status%20Gizi%20Balita>
- Lestari, W. (2020). *Ketahanan Keluarga Pasca Graduasi Dari Program Keluarga Harapan (Studi Kasus Keluarga Penerima Manfaat PKH Sukoharjo, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia)* (Doctoral Dissertation, UNS (Sebelas Maret University)).
- Maryono, E. (1999). Peta Dampak Krisis dan Kapasitas Masyarakat. *Penerbit Jari Indonesia Masyarakat Sipil untuk Transparansi dan Akuntabilitas Pembangunan*. Jakarta.
- McCubbin, H. I., & McCubbin, M. A. (1988). Typologies of resilient families: Emerging roles of social class and ethnicity. *Family Relations, 247-254*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/584557>
- McCubbin, M. A., & McCubbin, H. I. (1996). Resiliency in families: A conceptual model of family adjustment and adaptation in response to stress and crises. *Family assessment: Resiliency, coping and adaptation: Inventories for research and practice*, 1-64.
- McLoyd, V. C. (1998). Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development. *American psychologist, 53*(2), 185-204. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0003-066X.53.2.185>
- Megawanty, R., & Hanita, M. (2021). Ketahanan keluarga dalam adaptasi new normal pandemi COVID-19 di Indonesia. *Jurnal Lemhannas RI, 9*(1), 42-54. <https://doi.org/10.55960/jlri.v9i1.375>
- Muzakkir, I. (2017). Penerapan metode tophis untuk sistem pendukung keputusan penentuan keluarga miskin pada desa Panca Karsa Ii. *ILKOM Jurnal Ilmiah, 9*(3), 274-281. <https://doi.org/10.33096/ilkom.v9i3.156.274-281>
- Nursyif, A. (2020) Rancangan undang-undang ketahanan keluarga dalam perspektif sosiologi gender. *Journal of Civics And Education Studies, 7*, 58. <https://doi.org/10.32493/jpkn.v7i1.y2020.p55-68>
- O'Leary, Z. (2014). *The Essential Guide To Doing Your Research Project (2nd Ed.)*. London (ID): SAGE.
- Okech, D., Howard, W. J., Mauldin, T., Mimura, Y., & Kim, J. (2012). The effects of economic pressure on the resilience and strengths of individuals living in extreme poverty. *Journal of Poverty, 16*(4), 429-446. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10875549.2012.720659>
- Pessoa, A. S. G., Coimbra, R. M., Koller, S. H., & Ungar, M. (2019). Hidden resilience in the life of adolescents with involvement in drug trafficking. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa, 34*. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102.3772e34426>
- Puspitawati, H., Herawati, T., & Rahma, A. (2016). Telaah pengintegrasian perspektif gender dalam keluarga untuk mewujudkan kesetaraan dan keadilan gender dan ketahanan keluarga di Provinsi Jawa Timur dan Sumatera Utara.

- Qomariah, D. N. (2018). *Studi Analisis Tentang Peran Dan Fungsi Motekar Dalam Meningkatkan Ketahanan Keluarga (Kasus Pada Masyarakat Miskin Perkotaan Di Kota Bandung)* (Doctoral Dissertation, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia)
- Ramadhana, M. R. (2020). Mempersiapkan ketahanan keluarga selama adaptasi kebiasaan baru di masa pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Kependudukan Indonesia*, 61-68. <https://doi.org/10.14203/jki.v0i0.572>
- Rizki, M. N. (2017). Pengaruh Implementasi Program Keluarga Harapan (Pkh) Terhadap Ketahanan Keluarga Di Kelurahan Jakasampurna (Doctoral Dissertation, Universitas Negeri Jakarta).
- Secombe, K. (2000). Families in poverty in the 1990s: Trends, causes, consequences, and lessons learned. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(4), 1094-1113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01094.x>
- Sholihah, F., Susanti, E., & Mas'Udah, S. (2023). Pengaruh status sosial ekonomi keluarga dan dukungan sosial terhadap ketahanan keluarga penyintas Covid-19. *Jurnal Litbang: Media Informasi Penelitian, Pengembangan Dan IPTEK*, 19(1), 73-84. <https://doi.org/10.33658/jl.v19i1.319>
- Wahyudi, T. W. (2020). Ketahanan Pangan Masyarakat Miskin Di Kecamatan Cimanggung (Doctoral Dissertation, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia).
- Walsh, F. (2006). *Strengthening Family Resilience* (2nd Ed., 384 P.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Wulandari, N., Indrianti, D. T., & Hilmi, M. I. (2022). Analisis gender peran perempuan pesisir pada ketahanan keluarga di desa Puger Kulon Kabupaten Jember. *Jendela PLS: Jurnal Cendekiawan Ilmiah Pendidikan Luar Sekolah*, 7(1), 52-60.