Family Marital Quality and Factors Influencing It One Year after the Cianjur Earthquake Disaster
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Abstract:
Disasters impact family life through economic and psychosocial disruption, which can reduce marriage quality. This research aims to analyze the influence of the family environment, vulnerability, and regenerative typology on the marital quality of families of earthquake disaster survivors in the Cianjur district. This research was conducted using a cross-sectional study design. The population of this study comprised families of earthquake survivors in Cianjur Regency. The respondents in this research were the wives of 200 earthquake survivors in Cianjur Regency. This research was approved by the Human Ethics Commission of the Bogor Agricultural Institute (Number 1063/IT3.KEPMSM-IPB/SK/2023). Data analysis was performed using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). The results revealed that marital quality is influenced by the family environment, vulnerability, and regenerative typology. The results also show that the family environment negatively affects family vulnerability and, consequently, the regenerative typology. It is anticipated that the government, academics, community organizations, and other communities will collaborate to provide post-disaster psychosocial assistance through counseling and family consultations. This will help to relieve stress and tension due to various psychosocial problems and improve the quality of marriage. In disaster-prone areas, disaster risk analysis is needed for physical and social aspects, and integration is needed in regional development planning, especially family development, to minimize the impact of disasters on the quality of marriage. The novelty of this research is that it measures marital quality under post-earthquake conditions.
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摘要：
灾难通过经济和社会心理干扰影响家庭生活，从而降低婚姻质量。本研究旨在分析家庭环境、脆弱性和再生类型对展玉县地震幸存者家庭婚姻质量的影响。本研究采用横断面研究设计。本研究的人口包括展玉县地震幸存者的家庭。本研究的受访者是展玉县200名地震幸存者的妻子。本研究经茂物农业研究所人类伦理委员会批准（编号1063/IT3.KEPMSM–IPB/SK/2023）。数据分析采用偏最小二乘结构方程模型（偏最小二乘扫描）。结果表明，婚姻质量受家庭环境、脆弱性和再生类型的影响。结果还表明，家庭环境对家庭脆弱性产生负面影响，从而对再生类型产生负面影响。预测政府、学术界、社区组织和其他社区将通过咨询和家庭咨询等方式合作提供灾后心理社会援助。这将有助于缓解各种心理社会问题造成的压力和紧张，并提高婚姻质量。在灾害易发地区，需要从物质和社会方面进行灾害风险分析，并需要整合区域发展规划，特别是家庭发展，以尽量减少灾害对婚姻质量的影响。这项研究的新颖之处在于它衡量了地震后条件下的婚姻质量。
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1. Introduction


曝光于灾害，连同随之而来的混乱和不确定性，可以减轻婚姻质量（Dai & Wang, 2015; Sunarti, 2015）。研究显示，灾害对婚姻质量的影响是有限的（Lowe et al., 2012）。婚姻质量至关重要，因为它影响着幸福和健康（Finkel et al., 2013），而婚姻不满可能导致离婚（Apostolou et al., 2018; Fallahchai et al., 2019）。


以前的研究已经表明，婚姻质量受家庭工作冲突（Meliani et al., 2014），主观性好（Aspary et al., 2021），家庭发展任务（Rahmaita et al., 2016），应激策略（Fala et al., 2020），工作满意度（Ouyang et al., 2019），社会支持（Khan & Aftab, 2013），和财政管理（Dowlatabadi et al., 2013）。然而，研究旨在针对灾害后时期婚姻质量的特定研究仍然不完整（Low et al., 2012）。因此，研究的目的是通过分析这些影响来提供见解，以改进婚姻质量，其中受灾家庭的影响。

2. Literature Review

2.1. Marital Quality

婚姻质量是维持夫妻关系和家庭生活的重要方面，影响个人的健康和幸福。婚姻质量一般描述为
individual's subjective perception of marital satisfaction and happiness (Segrin & Flora, 2014). Internal factors that can perpetuate a marriage include mutual love, the couple's personality, communication and problem-solving abilities, psychological maturity, and the right choice of a husband or wife. Meanwhile, external factors include financial standards, the wife's employment status, and family attachment to society (Chmielewska, 2012). According to Fincham and Rogge (2010), marriage relationships have two parts: interpersonal and intrapersonal. Marital satisfaction and happiness focus on an intrapersonal approach, as seen from the subjective evaluation of each married individual. The concept of marital happiness is primarily concerned with the emotional dimension of the relationship, encompassing feelings of love, affection, attention, and other emotions that arise between a husband and wife. Marital satisfaction is considered satisfaction with one’s partner and relationship.

2.2. Families in Disaster-Affected Areas

Disturbed everyday life after a disaster gives rise to a family crisis. Family crises such as a decrease in income, loss of family members, and loss of valuable assets after a disaster can worsen the relationship between husband and wife due to increased conflict in interactions (Weitzman & Behrman, 2016). Disaster victims face uncertain conditions, resulting in obstacles to fulfilling family functions. Non-optimal implementation of family functions and roles and non-fulfillment of life’s needs are problems faced after disasters (Rusmiyati & Hikmawati, 2012). Losses and changes in family and community life due to disasters are sources of pressure that can cause stress and depression. Therefore, apart from physical post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction, socioeconomic post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction is essential. These measures are expected to help speed up the recovery of disaster victims (Sunarti et al., 2019).

3. Methodology

3.1. Sampling and Study Design

This study employed a cross-sectional design and was conducted in Nagrak Village, Gasol Village, Limbangansari Village, Mekarsari Village, and Cianjur Regency, West Java Province. The research locations were selected due to the severe damage and high casualty rates in these areas following the earthquake. Data collection occurred in October 2023. The population of this study comprised families of earthquake survivors in Cianjur Regency. A stratified non-proportional random sampling technique was employed to select examples of quantitative research. This was based on the stratification of earthquake survivor families according to the level of house damage, with the categories being lightly and heavily damaged houses. The example criterion in this study was an intact family with children. The respondents in this study were 200 wives of earthquake survivors in Cianjur Regency. Wives were chosen as respondents given that wives generally play a more critical role in the domestic sector and thus are expected to know family conditions well. Therefore, the wife’s perception represents the picture of the family quite well. This research received ethical approval from the Bogor Agricultural University Human Ethics Commission (Approval Number 1063/IT3.KEPMSM-IPB/SK/2023).

3.2. Instruments

Data were collected through structured interviews, each lasting approximately 30 min. The following measurement tools were used:

**Family environment**: measured using the LING-GA (family-friendly environment) questionnaire developed by Sunarti (2021), which includes 30 items across two dimensions (socio-economic and physical environments of the house and its surroundings). Responses were rated on a 7-point scale from low (1) to high (7) suitability, with Cronbach’s alpha of 0.916;

**Family vulnerability**: assessed using the SIREN-GA (family vulnerability) questionnaire developed by Sunarti (2021), which comprises 24 items across three dimensions (physical-economic, social, and psychological vulnerability). Responses were rated using a Guttman scale (0 - no, 1 - yes) with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.775;

**Regenerative typology**: measured using the family typology questionnaire developed by McCubbin et al. (2001) and modified by Sunarti (2012). This tool includes 20 items across two dimensions (family hardiness and coherence) with responses on a 4-point Likert scale (1 - never, 2 - sometimes, 3 - often, 4 - always), with Cronbach’s alpha of 0.866;

**Marital quality**: evaluated using the questionnaire developed by Conger et al. (1990) and modified by Sunarti et al. (2005). It includes 40 items across two dimensions (marital satisfaction and marital happiness), with responses on a 4-point Likert scale (1 - strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3 - agree, 4 - strongly agree), with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.919.

3.3. Data Analysis

Data processing began with editing, coding, entry, and scoring and was conducted using Microsoft Excel and SPSS 25.0 for descriptive and inferential analyses. Influence test analysis was performed using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM).

4. Results

4.1. Family Characteristics

The results of the study show that the age of the husband in this study is in the age range of 25-82 years, 56% of the husband's age in this study is in the middle adult category, which is in the age range of 41-60 years, then as many as 35% are in early adulthood (18-40 years), and there are 9% of the husband's age who are in
the late adult category (>60 years). In this study, the wife’s age was 20-60 years; 50.5% of the wives were in early adulthood (18-40 years), and 49.5% were in middle adulthood (41-60 years).

The results showed that the husband’s length of education was 3-16 years; more than half of the total respondents (52.5%) were elementary school graduates, and 27.5% were high school graduates. Only 5% were college graduates. The results indicated that the wife's educational attainment ranged from 3 to 16 years, more than half of the total respondents (56%) were elementary school graduates, 20% were junior high school graduates, and only 2% were college graduates (Figure 1).

The husband’s occupations in this study were quite diverse; 14% worked as private employees, 23.5% worked as farmers, and 37.5% as laborers (construction); 20% held other jobs, including odd jobs, driving, and distributing goods. The wife’s occupation in the study was dominated by homemakers/non-workers, as many as 79%, while 12.5% worked as farmers. Per capita income also varied; as many as 44% were in the per capita income range of ≤500000 rupiah, as many as 40% were in the range 500001-1000000 rupiah, and as many as 11% were in the range 1000001-1500000 rupiah.

4.2. Family Environment (X1)

The results of the descriptive test indicated that the average family environment score was 73. Based on the cut-off point, most respondents had a moderate family environment of 63.5%, meaning that some had a good family environment even under disaster conditions (Table 1).

### Table 1. Distribution of family environment dimensions (The authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Environment Dimensions</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low (0-29)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (30-49)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (50-79)</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (80-100)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean±SD</td>
<td>73±11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Socio-economic environment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low (0-29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (30-49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (50-79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (80-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean±SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The physical environment of the house and its surroundings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low (0-29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (30-49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (50-79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1. Dimensions of the Socio-Economic Environment

A significant proportion of respondents, namely 64.5%, have a high socioeconomic status. This is indicated by the fact that the community within the family environment upholds religious values and teachings (78%), there are friendliness, familiarity, and harmony among residents (84%), families know each other well (84.5%), and there is a culture of caring, happiness in helping, and sharing (78.5%). Additionally, there is a willingness to assist vulnerable families in need (79%).

4.2.2. Dimensions of the Physical Environment of the House and Its Surroundings

A significant majority of respondents (55.5%) reported having a moderate-quality physical environment in their homes and immediate surroundings. This is indicated by high levels of housing safety (71.5%), comfort (82%), and adequate space for interaction with neighbors and the community (64%). However, in the dimension of the physical environment of the house and its surroundings, there are still 11% of respondents in the low category, as can be seen from respondents who have low scores (1-3) on the following: adequacy of neighborly and community togetherness facilities (13.5%), prevention of fire disasters (37.5%), prevention of flood, landslide and drought threats (35%), and mitigation of earthquake/fire/tsunami threats (27%).

4.3. Family Vulnerability (X2)

The results of the descriptive test indicated that the average family vulnerability score was 26. Based on the cut-off point, most respondents (45%) exhibited low family vulnerability. However, with regard to physical and economic vulnerability and social vulnerability, the percentage classified as moderate to very high was 20% (Figure 1).

4.3.1. Dimension of Physical and Economic Vulnerability

The average physical and economic vulnerability score was 40. Of the respondents, 46% were in the moderate physical vulnerability category, and 10% were in the very high physical and economic vulnerability category. This was indicated by having a lower income than expenses (54%) and not having six months' savings for family needs (90%), which caused the family to experience difficulty in financing various needs (46.5%).

4.3.2. Dimensions of Social Vulnerability

The mean social vulnerability score was 23. A significant proportion of respondents (40%) were classified as belonging to the low social vulnerability category. This was evidenced by the fact that no family
members violated moral standards (90%), they knew their neighbours and neighbourhood administrators (RT/RW) (96%), and they had no difficulty performing daily worship (91.5%). However, 7% of respondents in the high/very high category exhibited social vulnerability, as evidenced by their tendency to refrain from disclosing essential information to their families (45.5%) and their frequent feelings of exhaustion due to the absence or unclear division of family responsibilities (57.5%).

4.3.3. Dimensions of Psychological Vulnerability
The average psychological vulnerability score was 17. Seventy-three percent of respondents were classified as having a deficient level of social vulnerability, as they reported feeling quickly happy (86%), being easily grateful for their current circumstances (92%), and perceiving ease behind difficulties (93.5%). However, 9.5% of respondents experienced high to very high levels of psychological vulnerability, indicated by feelings of loneliness (28.5%), depression (26%), and helplessness (21%).

4.4. Regenerative Typology (X3)
The results of the descriptive test yielded an average regenerative typology score of 70. Based on the cutoff point, 95% of respondents exhibited a high regenerative typology, while 5% demonstrated a low regenerative typology.

4.4.1. Dimensions of Family Hardiness
A total of 94% of respondents were in the high family hardiness category; this was indicated by thinking about possible problems in family life (57.5%), feeling the need to plan for the family’s future (58%), and feeling confident that the efforts made would be successful (61.5%).

4.4.2. Dimensions of Family Coherence
A total of 94% of respondents were in the high family coherence category; this was indicated by accepting problems as part of family life (65.5%), accepting opinion differences between family members (68.5%), and seeing problems as an opportunity for development (66.5%).

4.5. Marital Quality (Y)
The descriptive test results showed that the average marital quality score was 63. Based on the cutoff point, most respondents had moderate marital quality at 64% (Figure 2).

4.5.1. Dimensions of Marital Satisfaction
A total of 66.5% of respondents have marital satisfaction in the moderate category; this is indicated by being satisfied with their free time filled with activities with their husbands (56.5%), not quarreling over financial matters (56%), not questioning their husbands' work (72.5%), and not arguing with their husbands when determining their children's education (65.5%). However, 26% of respondents were in the low marital satisfaction category; this was indicated by their complaints to their husbands because they were not satisfied with what they currently had (23.5%) and disappointed that they were not open to each other in discussing sexual matters (45.5%).

4.5.2. Dimensions of Marital Happiness
A total of 59% of respondents had marital happiness in the moderate category; this was indicated by maintaining marital commitment (95%), feeling that their husbands did not cheat on them (93.5%), not feeling alienated from their husbands’ families (90%), and not feeling underestimated by their husbands’ families when building a household (91%). However, 33% of respondents were in the low marital happiness category. This was indicated by the traits of the husband that were disliked (57.5%) and the attitudes of the husband that were also disliked (59%).

4.6. Factors Affecting Marital Quality
The results indicated that the latent variables of family environment, vulnerability, and regenerative typology in relation to marital quality met the established criteria, with an AVE > 0.5, composite reliability > 0.7, SRMR ≤ 0.08, and Cronbach’s alpha > 0.6. The outer loading value in the empirical model of the effects of family characteristics, religiosity, environment, vulnerability, and regenerative typology on marital quality is > 0.5. This means that the dimensions in this study validly describe the characteristics of the variables and are consistent.

Table 3 and Figure 3 show that the family environment, vulnerability, and regenerative typology have a significant effect on marital quality. The family environment significantly positively affects marital quality through regenerative family; thus, a more supportive family environment can improve marital

<p>| Table 2. Distribution of regenerative typology dimensions (The authors) |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regenerative Typology Dimensions</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regenerative Typology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (0-50)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (51-100)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean±SD</td>
<td>70±12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Hardiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (0-50)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (51-100)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean±SD</td>
<td>69±12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coherence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (0-50)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (51-100)</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean±SD</td>
<td>71±14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
quality. Family vulnerability has a significant negative effect on marital quality, meaning that the higher the family vulnerability, the lower the marital quality. Regenerative typology significantly positively affects marital quality, meaning that the higher the regenerative typology, the better the marital quality. Furthermore, the direct effect between variables is that family vulnerability significantly negatively affects regenerative typology, meaning that the higher the family vulnerability, the lower the regenerative typology. The family environment significantly negatively affects family vulnerability, implying that a more supportive family environment can reduce family vulnerability.

Table 3. Effect test results (The authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Direct effect</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1-X2</td>
<td>-0.221*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1-X3</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.086*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1-Y</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.118*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2-X3</td>
<td>-0.388**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2-Y</td>
<td>-0.365**</td>
<td>-0.087*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3-Y</td>
<td>0.223*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * Significance ≤ 0.05; ** Significance ≤ 0.01; X1 - family environment; X2 - family vulnerability; X3 - regenerative family; Y - marital quality

5. Discussion

This research draws on functional, structural, family ecology, and family system theories, emphasizing the interconnectedness of individuals and systems, particularly during natural disasters. The Cianjur earthquake disrupted family structure and functions, leading to an imbalance in family roles and duties. Post-disaster, families faced significant changes, resulting in tension, marital strife, and financial issues, which became major stressors. Geological disasters like earthquakes cause more substantial damage than hydrometeorological events, with increasing intensity intensifying the impact on victims in Indonesia (Sunarti & Syahrini, 2011; Sunarti, 2018). Research on post-disaster marital quality remains limited, despite evidence that disasters alter family dynamics, such as increased rates of marriage, birth, and divorce (Warchal & Graham, 2011; Lowe et al., 2012).

Disasters make marital conditions vulnerable and disrupt marital quality (Williamson et al., 2021). The study revealed that more than half of the respondents had moderate marital quality, were satisfied with their current situation, and maintained good communication with their husbands' families. However, a notable proportion experienced low marital quality. Family crises, such as decreased income and loss of family members and assets, can worsen marital relationships due to increased conflict (Weitzman & Behrman, 2016). Postdisaster changes can lead to tension within families, financial problems, and marital discord (Sunarti & Syahrini, 2011).

During crises, families frequently lose their assets and are unable to return to their destroyed homes. This forces them to live in refugee camps, which creates an unsafe and vulnerable environment (Laily & Sunarti, 2022). Such environments negatively affect marital quality because a vulnerable family environment increases stress and reduces marital satisfaction (Woszidlo & Segrin, 2013; Gustiani & Gustina, 2020). More than half of the disaster survivors in the study were in the moderate family environment category, and family life satisfaction was strongly linked to the family environment’s condition. A better family environment enhances life satisfaction, whereas a vulnerable environment diminishes it (Salamah et al., 2023).

The study also found that most disaster survivors’ families were in the low family vulnerability category, with higher vulnerability scores in families whose homes were severely damaged. Vulnerability can lead to conflicts within the family (Sunarti, 2021; Sunarti et al., 2018). Families need strategies to survive during disasters. Those with high family coherence and hardiness, indicating a regenerative typology, cope better with challenges (Ginanjarsari & Sunarti, 2013). Families with regenerative typology can quickly recover from disasters and adapt their coping strategies. The study found that most respondents exhibited high regenerative typology, characterized by resilience and coherence, believing in divine intervention and fate, which helped them maintain postdisaster stability (Sunarti et al., 2021).

The SEM analysis revealed that family environment, vulnerability, and regenerative typology significantly affect marital quality. Higher family vulnerability reduces marital quality, consistent with previous research indicating that increased vulnerability and inability to adapt postdisaster interfere with marital relationships (Banford et al., 2011; Sunarti, 2018). However, supportive interactions between married
couples during crises can help maintain marital quality despite the stressors (Winurini, 2020). Psychological stress can decrease interaction quality and increase marital conflict (Iveniuk et al., 2014).

Regenerative typology positively affects marital quality; families with higher regenerative typology have better marital outcomes. Families face crises differently; those exhibiting regenerative characteristics, such as coherence and hardiness, adapt better and experience higher marital satisfaction (McCubbin et al., 2001; Sunarti, 2012; Ngai & Ng, 2015). The study also found that higher family vulnerability reduced regenerative typology, whereas resilience mitigated vulnerability (Weiss et al., 2013). Resilience acts as a stress buffer and facilitates family adaptation and internal strength (Hackbarth et al., 2012; Raisanen, 2013).

The family environment significantly reduces family vulnerability. Villages with a family-friendly environment exhibit strong social capital, leadership, and community ties, which enhance family perceptions and awareness of vulnerabilities (Sunarti et al., 2019). In crisis conditions, social support from the environment is crucial for accessing resources to meet basic and developmental needs, thus improving family functioning (Sunarti, 2013). Families face lifelong vulnerabilities due to various factors such as economic pressure and inadequate community ties (Sunarti, 2015).

6. Conclusion
The results indicate that family vulnerability significantly and negatively affects marital quality, implying that increased family vulnerability leads to decreased marital quality. Conversely, family environment and regenerative typology significantly and positively affect marital quality, suggesting that enhancing family environment and regenerative typology can improve marital quality. Additionally, higher family vulnerability significantly reduces regenerative typology, whereas a strong family environment significantly decreases family vulnerability.

There is a need for more research on the quality of post-disaster marriages, even though disasters influence changes in family structure and relationships, such as increased number of marriages, births, and divorces. Furthermore, an important aspect also studied in this research is analyzing the differences between families of earthquake survivors who experienced light and heavy house damage. Furthermore, research on the marital quality of disaster survivors’ families in terms of religiosity, family environment, family vulnerability, and regenerative typology is new and essential.

This study suggests that regenerative typology has a positive impact on the marital well-being of disaster survivors. Therefore, families are encouraged to optimize their resilience and cohesion to improve the quality of their marriages following a disaster. Family vulnerability negatively affects marital quality during disasters; thus, it is possible for families to reduce their vulnerability to disasters, particularly in terms of their physical and economic resilience, by enhancing their capacity to meet their daily needs independently. It is hoped that the government, academics, community organizations, and other communities can work together to provide post-disaster psychosocial assistance through counseling and family consultations to improve regenerative typologies so that families can adapt to the environment, thereby reducing negative impacts on marital quality. In disaster-prone areas, disaster risk analysis is necessary for not only physical but also social aspects. There is a need to integrate family development into regional planning to minimize the negative impact of disasters on marriage quality.

7. Limitations and Further Study
This research has several limitations, such as it being conducted in a limited number of villages within Cianjur Regency. Therefore, it is not possible to draw conclusions about the entire Cianjur Regency affected by the disaster. The respondents who completed the questionnaire were exclusively the wives, therefore this research only assessed variables based on the wives/mothers’ perceptions. Future research is anticipated to concentrate on enhancing family resilience as a component of disaster mitigation and optimizing post-disaster socioeconomic outcomes. It is further hoped that the study will also involve the husbands and children of the participants and that studies will be conducted on other variables such as the resilience of families of disaster survivors.
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