

# Understanding Family Resilience in Aceh

Marty Mawarpury, Sarah Hafiza

*Department of Psychology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Syiah Kuala*

Keywords: Family, Resilience, Aceh.

Abstract: Resilience has been conceptualized on an individual level and regards to the family unit. Resilience is the fundamental concept to understand why some families are devastated while others adapt or even grow stronger. In this research, resilience is defined as a dynamic process leading to positive adaptation in the face of significant adversity in family. The aim of this study was to obtain the picture of family resilience in Aceh. Using quantitative with survey technique method involving 400 Acehnese family that obtained through random sampling. Family resilience questionnaire used to collect data, with Cronbach alpha 0.94., and using descriptive statistic for analysis. The results of the study showed that family resilience in high-category was 79.5% of Acehnese family. At the moderate level were 77%, and other 5% were at a low level. It can be concluded that Acehnese family have a good level of family resilience. Beside, employment status, marital status, education, and religion have correlation with the level of family resilience.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Aceh is a province with two events of prolonged conflict and massive disasters that occurred in 2004. The impact of these two events is needed in people's lives today. Various social problems that occur in the community such as the divorce rate that continues to increase and causes of divorce are economic factors, quarrels, the presence of third parties, infidelity, and narcotics cases (Serambi, 1/31/2019). In addition, there have been widespread cases of damage, especially in the domestic sphere. Young marriages and health problems that make interventions have to be done for fairly complex social problems. A (Family Resilience, <https://aceh.tribunnews.com/2019/02/21/darurat-ketahanan-kamily>).

A family is a unit in society that is an object as well as a subject of development. By the shifting of development that places economic development with social development, makes family development of objects/development goals. In the industrial era 4.0, technological development is a big challenge for family resilience and welfare. Such information is fast entering the family room. Socio-Economic Survey Data (Susenas) based on the purpose to access the internet, the majority of children aged 5-6 years access the internet for entertainment, which is 91 percent. The rush of digital information has

brought profound changes to the family's noble values. These changes sometimes bring a new paradigm for young people in looking at the family. Permissiveness to pornography, deviant sexual behavior, the birth of children out of wedlock, until early marriage is a serious impact. Kominfo data, every day there are about 50 thousand activities of internet users in Indonesia accessing pornographic content. Another fact, the phenomenon of early marriage is also quite high.

This is a big challenge in creating a strong and quality family. Especially in welcoming the demographic bonus, a phenomenon where the population structure is very beneficial in terms of development because the population of productive age is very large, while the proportion of young people is getting smaller and the proportion of old people is not much. Therefore, at present, the resilience and quality of the family must be the main concern to produce reliable human resources as one of the nation's development assets. The strength of national development is rooted in the family element as a micro-community in society. A prosperous family is a basic foundation for the integrity of the strength and sustainability of development. On the other hand, vulnerable and scattered families encourage weak foundations of the life of the state community.

The disruption era initiated the birth of many new models with more visionary and transformative approaches, methods and strategies. This era invites and demands us to dare to adapt and change. Because if not, we will be crushed, then finally disappear without a trace. This reality is certainly a challenge for all parties, including the family. In this era of disruption, families are required to be oases, oceans of warmth, and a paradise for children. The family as the smallest part of society must be a place where inspiration, motivation, and positive suggestions reside.

Family resilience involves the complex interaction of several processes over time; from the way, a family as a functional unity reacts to a critical situation to its capacity to deal with transient conditions of disorganization to newly developed strategies when difficult times emerge, in the short and long term. Resilience can be defined in various ways, but a common thread throughout the scientific literature involves coping in the face of adversity. The academic literature usually proposes that resilience is either a process or an outcome and can develop over time with life experience. In the context of this research, resilience is defined as a dynamic process leading to positive adaption in the face of significant adversity. The measurement of resilience is somewhat hampered by the range of definitions and theories that abound, and the field is not as well advanced as the measurement of wellbeing. One concern about the measurement of resilience is that, by most definitions, resilience can only be demonstrated in the face of adversity, which in turn makes the ethical exploration of resilience problematic. Instead, measures usually approximate actual resilience by capturing 'perceived resilience', or by having participants rate their level of agreement with statements that typically describe resilient people.

According to Henry, Morris, and Harrist (2015), family resilience has three waves. The first is Family adaptation to stressors -strengths, meanings, and contexts. The second, Conceptualization, research, and application. And finally, Conceptual clarity; Family Resilience Model (FRM); prevention & intervention. Family resilience is of particular importance to inner-city women in that the inner-city environment is often characterized by high rates of crime, violence, and poverty (Anthony, 2008; Flouri, Tan, Buchana, & Griggs, 2010). Many women who reside in the inner-city face the challenges of raising a family with less than adequate housing, financial and social support resources (Halliday & Wilkinson, 2009). Chen and Clark (2010) found that family

resilience was a mediating factor of parental health and that families with higher scores tended to utilize more support services.

Resilience has been conceptualized on an individual level, so has it been conceptualized with regards to the family unit. Walsh (1998) conceptualizes family resilience as the ability to recover from adversity stronger and more resourceful. Walsh (2002) expands on this conceptualization of family resilience as involving more than just being able to manage and survive a stressful event but also using adversity to forge transformative personal and relational growth. This conceptualization recognizes the potential for personal and relational transformation and growth that can be forged out of adversity. Family resilience as conceptualized by McCubbin and McCubbin (1996) is the family's ability to utilize behavioral patterns and functional competence to negotiate, cope, and even thrive through hardships and crises. Hawley and DeHaan (1996) conceptualize family resilience as a path followed as families adapt and prosper in the face of stress, both in the present and over time. They believe resilient families respond positively to stressful conditions in unique ways, depending on factors such as developmental level, the combination of risk and protective factors, and the family's shared outlook. Several years later, Patterson (2002) also conceptualized family resilience as the adaptive process families utilize to adapt and function competently following exposure to significant adversity or crises. Although these conceptualizations have many similarities, the main constructs of each hold different amounts of importance as identified by the developers.

The Walsh Family Resilience Framework (2003) identified nine key processes and grouped them into three dimensions of family functioning: family belief systems, family organization, and communication/problem-solving processes. The first dimension – family belief systems – involves 1) shared meaning-making efforts, 2) positive outlook and 3) transcendence and spirituality, which facilitate shared efforts to understand adverse situations, their impact, and efforts to overcome challenges. Family resilience is promoted by shared beliefs that increase general functioning, collaborative strategies, and movement toward effective recovery and growth. The second dimension – family organization – involves transactional processes that strengthen 4) flexibility, 5) connectedness/cohesion, and 6) economic and social resources. All contribute to the reorganization necessary for adaptive responses to meet stressful

challenges. The third dimension – communication/problem-solving processes – involves 7) clarity, 8) emotional expression, and 9) collaborative problem-solving. These processes facilitate resilience by clarifying information about adverse conditions, by sharing both painful and positive feelings and by facilitating problem-solving and proactive planning. These fundamental processes express them-selves with different modalities and measures among families, with varied values, resources, and adverse challenges

## 2 RESEARCH METHOD

This research used quantitative methods with survey techniques involving 400 Acehnese families that obtained through simple random sampling. Family Resilience Questionnaire (FRQ) compiled by Walsh in 2003 used to collect data and used descriptive statistics for analysis. Walsh Family Resilience Questionnaire (FRQ) consists of 31 items divided into three dimensions of family functions, namely family belief system, family organization, and communication/problem solving processes. FRQ has 5 Likert Scale answer choices (1 = rarely; 5 = usually). Reliability was measured using the Cronbach alpha technique of .94. This study employed descriptive statistics for analysis to seek the family resilience level of Acehnese. Also, the Chi-Square Test for Independence was used as an additional analysis to seek the correlation between the level of family resilience with demographic data such as sex, age, employment status, marital status, education, and religion by using SPSS20.0 software analysis.

## 3 RESULT

Based on age, it is dominated by 15-25 years, which is 270 (67.5%) subjects. Most of the study subjects had an Unemployment/ Student of 254 (63.5%). Most of the subjects are unmarried, amounting to 304 (76%) subjects, supported by the highest education level was Senior High School 197 (49.3%) subjects. Almost all Muslim subjects were 396 (99%), and 4 other subjects were not Muslim.

Table 1: Distribution of Sociodemographic Factors.

Sociodemographic Factors	n	%
Sex		
Male	86	21.5
Female	314	78.5
Age in years		
15-25	270	67.5
26-35	106	26.5
36-45	24	6
Employment Status		
In Work	146	36.5
Unemployment/ Student	254	63.5
Marital Status		
Married	96	76
Single/ Widowed/ Divorced/ Separated	304	24
Education		
Elementary/ Junior High School	3	.8
High School	197	49.3
Bachelor	144	36
Master/ Doctor	56	14
Religion		
Moslem	396	99
Hindu	1	.3
Buddha	1	.3
Cristian	2	.5

Table 2: Levels of Family Resilience.

Score	Category	N	%
114-155	High	318	79.5
73-113	Average	77	19.3
31-72	Low	5	1.3
Total		400	100

The table above shows the level of family resilience of research subjects. Family resilience in high-category was 79.5% of Acehnese family. At the moderate level there were 77%, and other 5% were at a low level. It can be concluded that Acehnese family have a good level of family resilience.

Chi-Square Test for Independent Testing to see the relationship between the level of family resilience with sex, age, employment status, marital status, education, and religion in families in Aceh. Decision making on the Chi-Square Test for Independent can be done by looking at Asymp. Sig. (2-sided), if the significance value obtained from the results of data analysis is less than 0.05 (<0.05), it can be concluded that there is a relationship between variables (demographic data) and the level of family

resilience. But on the contrary, if the significance value is greater than 0.05 ( $> 0.05$ ) then there is no relationship between the variables tested (Machali, 2015).

Table 3: Chi Square Test for Independent.

Chi Square Test for Independent	Category (N=400)			
	Asymp. Sig.	High	Average	Low
Level of family resilience*Sex	.527			
Male		66	18	2
Female		252	59	3
Level of family resilience*Age	.062			
15-25		205	60	5
26-35		90	16	0
36-45		23	1	0
Level of family resilience*Employment status	.005			
In Work		128	18	0
Unemployment/Student		190	59	5
Level of family resilience*Marital status	.032			
Married		85	11	0
Single/Widowed/Divorced/Separated		233	66	5
Level of family resilience*Education	.020			
Elementary/Junior High School		2	1	0
High School		142	51	4
Bachelor		127	16	1
Master/Doctor		47	9	0
Level of family resilience*Religion	.000			
Moslem		316	76	4
Hindu		0	0	1
Buddha		1	0	0
Cristian		1	1	0

Based on the results of testing on demographic data with family resilience level showed a significance value of  $<0.05$  of 4 demographic data, namely on employment status, marital status, education, and religion. This can be interpreted that

these four demographic data have a relationship with the level of family resilience. Thus two demographic data have no relationship with the level of family resilience, namely sex. 527 ( $> 0.05$ ) and ages. 062 ( $> 0.05$ ).

## 4 DISCUSSION

This study aimed to obtain a picture of family resilience using the Family Resilience Questionnaire. According to Luthar, et. al. (2000) said that the perspective of family resilience is how families can dynamically, can recognize the strengths of each other, maintain mutual relations to deal with conflicts that arise, until the problem becomes a reinforcement for family security, and not as a destroyer. According to Bergh and Bjork (2012) if the family has a strong belief system, then every problem is not an obstacle or pressure but a challenge that must be faced. According to Walsh (2006), the key difference system in the family is the main thing of the functioning of the family that forms resilience within the family. Walsh (2006) argues that the factors forming family resilience are belief systems, organizational patterns and communication patterns, besides that they are always hopeful (Shabhathi, 2012), being optimistic in life and having good self-efficacy (Kulsum, 2013). This has an impact on the achievement of the problem-solving process and decision making in the family (Wright, Walsh, and Belt in Walsh, 2006).

The results showed that 79.5% of families were in the high resilience categorization, and the moderate resilience categorization was 19.3%. According to Hendrayu, Kinanthi, and Brebahama (2017), this can be interpreted that individuals view their families as being able to overcome difficult problems or situations effectively enough, but have not been able to maximize the use of protective factors they have to help overcome difficult situations or risk factors. According to Erdem and Slesnick (2010), resilience consists of risk factors and protective factors. Risk factors are all things that can potentially cause difficulties in increasing or maintaining the resilience of the family. While protective factors are things that can strengthen families in dealing with problems and maintain resilience such as the ability to survive, social support. We also observed there's a correlation between the level of family resilience with socio-demography (sex, age, employment status, marital status, education, and religion) (Table 3).

The results of this study indicate that females have the highest levels of family resilience ( $n = 252$ ) than males ( $n = 66$ ), but based on the results of data analysis there is no difference in the level of family resilience with sex. The results of research conducted by Hendrayu, et al. in 2017 found the results of research that there is no difference in the level of family resilience in terms of the sex of the child. The results of previous studies and expert opinion also show that the sex of children, in this case, the differences in the sex of the child can cause differences in perceiving family resilience, seta education, marital status and age of marriage owned by parents also affect the level of family resilience that is family-owned (Hendrayu, et al, 2017).

There is no relationship between the level of family resilience with age (Sig. 062). According to Sixbey (2005) that life experiences have an impact on family resilience when family members get older and experiences that indicate an increased process of resilience in the family. Children also have an important contribution to family resilience, which is influenced by age, cognitive and emotional development, self-esteem, social orientation, achievement motivation, and social comprehension (Canino & Spurlock, 1994; Masten & Coatsworth, 1998). In terms of employer status, there is a relationship with the level of family resilience. Individuals who do not work indirectly also have low incomes. The results of research conducted by Orthner, Jones-Sampey, and Williamson (2004) families or individuals who have low income, difficult to communicate regularly and sometimes avoid talking about problems that are in the family. Furthermore, Orthner, et al. (2004) also found that economic vulnerability affects family functioning because adult caregivers have greater stress on money problems and about not being able to give children the lifestyle benefits associated with having income, even though it is marginal (Conger & Conger, 2002; Rubin, 1994).

There is a relationship between the level of family resilience and education (Sig = .20). The majority of individuals who have completed high school have higher family resilience than other levels of education. This is supported by the existence of Law number 19 of 2016, the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia has a Smart Indonesia Program to support the implementation of universal secondary education or pioneering compulsory education for 12 (twelve) years, from elementary schools to elementary schools. Top Up (High School / equivalent). According to Mashego and Taruvinga (2014);

Bradley and Hojjat (2016) that the higher education that is pursued it tends to have a good level of family resilience. Bhana and Bachoo (2011) also found that individuals who had academic achievements belonged to families who demonstrated belief patterns that revolved around a positive outlook on life, had clear goals, high personal efficacy (Carson, Chowdhury, Perry, & Pati, 1999; Amatea, Smith-Adcock, & Villares, 2006).

Marital status has a relationship with family resilience (Sig. 032). Although the majority of subjects are not married, they have a high level of family resilience. On the other hand, said by Mashego and Taruvinga (2014); Bradley and Hojjat (2016) that the longer the age of marriage tends to have a good level of family resilience. It was found that the majority of subjects were Moslem and there was a religion relationship with the level of family resilience ( $p = 000$ ). High levels of religion tend to describe a resilient person, accept his personality and others, and the ability to adapt to environmental changes (McCubbin & McCubbin, 1988; Walsh, 1998). Individuals who believe that everything is God's intervention, so with a good belief system, the family can interpret an event as a positive thing (Walsh, 2006). Another factor that can affect family resilience is the ethnicity that family members have. According to Neo, Fung, and Chang (2015), the tribes are related to family resilience, different types of tribes that are owned will have different ways for families to deal with problems.

Researchers suspect other factors are more related to family resilience in study participants, such as the psychological condition of the family, the relationship between parents and children, social support (Lester, Stein, Saltzman, Woodward, MacDermid, Milburn, Mogil, & Beardslee, 2013), family experiences in dealing with difficulties (Kuntz, Blinkhorn, Route, Blinkhorn, Lunsy & Weiss, 2014) as well as time spent in family activities (Holman, 2014). However, in this study, researchers did not explore more deeply about these various factors.

## REFERENCES

- Amatea, E. S., Smith-Adcock, S., & Villares, E. (2006). From family deficit to family strength: Viewing families' contributions to children's learning from a family resilience perspective. *Professional School Counseling, 9*, 177-189.

- Anthony, E.K. (2008). Cluster profiles of youths living in urban poverty: Factors affecting risk and resilience. *Soc Work Res*, 32(1), 6-17.
- Bergh, I. & Bjork, M. (2012). Sense of coherence over time for parents with a child diagnosed with cancer. *BMC Pediatrics*, 12 (79), 1-5.
- Bhana, A., & Bachoo, S. (2011). The determinants of family resilience among families in low- and middle-income contexts: a systematic literature review. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 41(2), 131-139.
- Bradley, J. M & Hojjat, M. (2016). A Model of Resilience And Marital Satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, DOI: 10.1080/00224545.2016.1254592
- Canino, I. A., & Spurlock, J. (1994). *Culturally diverse children and adolescents: Assessment, diagnosis, and treatment*. New York: Guilford.
- Carson, D. K., Chowdhury, A., Perry, C. K., & Pati, C. (1999). Family characteristics and adolescent competence in India: Investigation of youth in southern Orissa. *Journal of Youth and Adolescents*, 28, 211-233.
- Chen, J. Y., & Clark, M. J. (2010). Family resources and parental health in families of children with Duchenne muscular dystrophy. *Journal Nurs Res*, 18(4), 239-248.
- Conger, R. D., & Conger, K. J. (2002). Resilience in Midwestern families: Selected findings from the first decade of a prospective, longitudinal study. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 361-373.
- Erdem, G., & Slesnick, N. (2010). That Which Does Not Kill You Makes You Stronger: Runaway Youth's Resilience to Depression in The Family Context. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 80(2), 195-203.
- Flouri, E., Tan, J., Buchana, A., & Griggs, J. (2010). Adverse life events, area socio-economic disadvantage, and adolescent psychopathology: The role of closeness to grandparents in moderating the effect of contextual stress. *Stress*, 13(5), 402-12.
- Halliday, J., & Wilkinson, T. (2009). Young, vulnerable and pregnant: family support in practice. *Community Pract*, 82(10), 27-30.
- Hawley, D. R., & DeHaan, L. (1996). Toward a definition of family resilience: Integrating life-span and family perspectives. *Family Process*, 35(3), 283-298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.1996.00283.x>
- Hendrayu, V. G., Kinanthi, M. R., & Brebahama, A. (2017). Resiliensi keluarga pada keluarga yang memiliki kedua orangtua bekerja. *Schema (Journal of Psychology Research)*, 3(2), 104-115.
- Henry, C. S., Morris, A. S., & Harrist, A. W. (2015). Family Resilience: Moving into the Third Wave. *Family Relations*, 64, 22-43. DOI:10.1111/fare.12106.
- Holman, J. (2014). *Parenting Stress And Parenting Behavior in Families With A Child Diagnosed With ADHD: The Moderating Effect Of Family Resilience*. Dissertation, Fielding Graduate University.
- Kulsum, U. (2013). *Faktor-faktor resiliensi pada ibu dengan anak penyandang tuna rungu*. Diakses dari <http://psikologi.ub.ac.id/wpcontent/uploads/2013/10/jurnal-fixpdf.pdf>.
- Kuntz, H, O., Blinkhorn, A., Rouette, J., Blinkhorn, M., Lunsy, Y & Weiss, J. (2014). Family Resilience- An Important Indicator When Planning Services For Adult With Intellectual And Developmental Disabilities. *Journal of Developmental Disabilities*, 20 (2), 55-66.
- Lester, P., Stein, J, A., Saltzman, W., Woodward, K., MacDermid, S, W., Milburn, N., Mogil, C & Beardslee, W. (2013). Psychological Health of Military Children: Longitudinal Evaluation of Family-Centered Prevention Program to Enhance Family Resilience. *Military Medicine*, 178(8), 838-845.
- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., and Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development*, 71(3), 543-562.
- Machali, I. (2015). *Statistik itu mudah*. Yogyakarta: Lembaga Ladang Kita.
- Mashego, T, A, B & Taruvinga P. (2014). Family Resilience Factors Influencing Teenagers Adaptation Following Parental Divorce in Limpopo Province South Africa. *Journal of Psychology*, 5(1), 19-34.
- Masten, A. S., & Coatsworth, J. D. (1998). The development of competence in favorable and unfavorable environments: Lessons from research on successful children. *American Psychologist*, 53, 205-220.
- Masten, A., & Garmezy, N. (1985). Risk, vulnerability, and protective factors in developmental psychopathology. In B. Lahey & A. Kazdin (Eds.), *Advances in clinical psychology*, (8) 1-52. New York: Plenum Press.
- McCubbin, H. I., & McCubbin, M. A. (1988). Typologies of resilient families: Emerging roles of social class and ethnicity. *Family Relations*, 37, 247-254.
- McCubbin, M., & McCubbin, H. (1996). Resiliency in families: A conceptual model of family adjustment and adaptation in response to stress and crisis. In H. McCubbin, A. Thompson, & M. McCubbin (Eds.), *Family assessment: Resiliency, coping and adaptation—inventories for research and practice*. Madison WI: University of Wisconsin System.
- Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. (2016). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. *Salinan*.
- Neo, A. H. C., Fung, D., Chang, W. C. (2016). An Actor-Partner Interdependence Model on Family Resilience and subjective well-being. *Psychology*, 07(06), 889-900.
- Orthner, D. K., Jones-Sampey, H., & Williamson, S. (2004). The resilience and strength of low-income families. *Family Relations*, 53, 159-167.

- Patterson, J. M. (2002). Integrating family resilience and family stress theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 349–360.
- Rubin, L. B. (1994). *Families on the fault line: America's working class speaks about the family, the economy, race and ethnicity*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Seccombe, K. (2002). Beating the odds versus changing the odds: Poverty, resilience, and family policy. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 384–394.
- Shabhati, N. P. (2012). *Hubungan antara Resiliensi Keluarga dan Harapan pada Mahasiswa yang Berasal dari Keluarga Miskin*. Skripsi. Universitas Indonesia.
- Sixbey, M. T. (2005) *Development of the family resilience assessment scale to identify family resilience constructs*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida (UMI Document Reproduction Service UMI Number: 3204501).
- Walsh, F. (1998). *Strengthening family resiliency*. New York: Guilford.
- Walsh, F. (2002). A family resilience framework: Innovative practice applications. *Family Relations*, 51(2), 130-137.
- Walsh, F. (2003). Family resilience: a framework for clinical practice. *Fam Process*, 42(1), 1–18.
- Walsh, F. (2006). *Strengthening family resilience*. New York: Guilford Press.

