



TS220

Gender Disparity of Household Composition Predicts Poor with High Well-Being Community Member and Climate Change Experience (CCE) in Sabak Bernam

Zumilah Zainalaludin

Osman, S., Saidi, N., Jamaluddin, A., Zainal Badari, S.A., Jaafar, N.A.A & Zainudin, N

Universiti Putra Malaysia





1. Introduction
2. Objective
3. Methods
4. Findings & Discussion
5. Conclusion



Cockle Farmers in Sabak Bernam, FGD, 6 MAY 2025



- Climate change caused **loss of productivity** (Jalal et al., 2021) in **fisheries** (Yin et al., 2025)
- Fisheries and Aquaculture Economic Sector inclines to **masculine activities high work risk** (Zainalaludin et al., 2023; Saidi et al., 2021)
- Thus, total number of **productive men** in a household is crucial to ensure the households out of poverty (Esteve et al., 2024) and the household in high wellbeing (Grevenstein et al., 2019)
- At the same time unhappy family due to irresponsible men **may reduce** due to divorce or death of husband (Wallin, 2023)
- Regardless age **poor females** may suffer low wellbeing, especially if they are single mothers (Zainalaludin et al, 2025)



Cockle Industry in Sabak Bernam



- Sex
- Gender Disparity:
 - Male=Female
 - Male>Female
 - Male<Female



- Poor (USD613.58 - PLI)
- High Wellbeing (WHO-5)
- Climate Change Experience (CCE)



Methods

- Location - **Sabak Bernam**, a coastal district in Selangor state located at Malacca Strait of Peninsular Malaysia.
- Data sources - the **SURVEY** ($n=274$); and $n=230$ (83.94%) of respondents with **CCE & respondents with household income data**



Location of Study : Sabak Bernam



- **Respondents** - coastal communities who are assumed vulnerable to climate change impact, and they are also vulnerable group - disabled, older adults, day pay workers and youth
- **Equal Distribution** - between male and female
- Malaysia **PLI=RM2589** (USD613.58) - was used to classify the poor category of household income (DOSM, 2023)
- Select cases on respondents with **CCE & high wellbeing score**
- **WHO5** wellbeing scale (scale 4, 5 & 6 = high wellbeing score)

WHO-Five Well-Being Index (WHO-5)

Please indicate for each of the five statements which is closest to how you have been feeling over the past two weeks. Notice that higher numbers mean greater well-being.		All of the time	Most of the time	More than half of the time	Less than half of the time	Some of the time	At no time
1	I have felt cheerful and in good spirits	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
2	I have felt calm and relaxed	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
3	I have felt active and vigorous	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
4	I woke up feeling fresh and rested	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
5	My daily life has been filled with things that interest me	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>

Total raw score on WHO-5 goes from 0 to 25. To obtain a percentage score ranging from 0 to 100, the raw score is multiplied by 4. A percentage score of 0 represents worst possible, whereas a score of 100 represents best possible quality of life.

Total raw score x 4 =
 (0-25) (0-100)

WHO5 Scale



Question in the SURVEY on **CCE - Q3 (Part G[i])** :-

What type of disasters that you use to experience at your place?

1. flood
2. high tide
3. drought
4. storm
5. others

**$n=238$ (86.86%) (n multiple responses=441) with
CCE=yes**

(answer 1-4 from climate change, answer in 5 will be categorised as CCE YES/NO)



- Data collected through a special developed questionnaire
- $n=274$ data collected in Jan 2025 (50% males and 50% females)
- $n=274$ (46.4%) poor households (household income \leq than USD613.58 a month)
- $n=238$ (86.86%) reported experiencing climate change reported in this paper (55.9% males and 44.1% females)

Table 1: Sampling Table

District	Sabak		Pasir Panjang		Sungai Panjang		Bagan Nakhoda Omar		Panchang Bedena		Total
Gender	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Sabak Bernam	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	300



FINDINGS



Gender of respondent	Household Income	Well-being
Male	Male	$r = .185^*$
	Headed	$p\text{-value} = 0.040$
		$N = 123$
	Female	$r = -0.347$
	Headed	$p\text{-value} = 0.360$
		$N = 9$
Female	Male	$r = 0.092$
	Headed	$p\text{-value} = 0.430$
		$N = 76$
	Female	$r = 0.105$
	Headed	$p\text{-value} = 0.641$
		$N = 22$

Table 2: Relationship between wellbeing and household income by sex disaggregation.

Note: $p < 0.05$, through Pearson Correlation



**Table 3: Relationship between Wellbeing and Poverty by Sex
Disaggregation of the Respondents**

Sex	Well-being	Non-poor		Poor	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Male	Low	8	6.06%	7	5.30%
	High	61	46.21%	56	42.42%
Female	Low	5	5.10%	13	13.27%
	High	48	48.98%	32	32.65%

Note: $p < 0.5$ through Chi-Square test



Table 4: Relationship between Wellbeing, Poverty and Gender of the Household Head by Sex Disaggregation of the Respondents

	Head of Household	Wellbeing	Non-Poor		Poor	
			n	%	n	%
Male	Male headed	Low	8	6.50	7	5.69
		High	57	46.34	51	41.46
	Female headed	Low				
		High	4	44.4	5	55.6
Female	Male headed	Low	5	6.58	10	13.16
		High	42	55.26	19	25.00
	Female headed	Low			3	13.6
		High	6	27.3	13	59.1

Note: $p < 0.5$ through Chi-square test; PLI=RM2589 (**USD613.58**) as a cut of point



Table 3: Distribution Wellbeing, Poverty and Gender Disparity of Household Composition (M/F) by Sex Disaggregation of the Respondents

Sex	Poverty Status	Low Wellbeing						High Wellbeing					
		=1		male <1		male >1		=1		male <1		male >1	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Male	Nonpoor	*	14.29%	1	14.29%	4	57.14%	14	12.96%	17	15.74%	24	22.22%
	Poor	3	42.86%			3	42.86%	14	12.96%	19	17.59%	20	18.52%
Female	Nonpoor	1	5.56%	3	16.67%	1	5.56%	7	8.75%	18	22.50%	23	28.75%
	Poor	4	22.22%	5	27.78%	4	22.22%	9	11.25%	17	21.25%	6	7.50%

Note: $p < 0.5$ through Chi-Square test



Table 4: Wald Chi-Square Predicts **Poor Respondents with High Wellbeing and CCE (poor respondents with CCE & high wellbeing=1; others=0)**

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
M/F =1			4.906	2	0.086	
M/F >1	0.561	0.367	2.340	1	0.126	1.753
M/F <1	0.708	0.332	4.536	1	0.033	2.030
Gender (Male=1)	0.564	0.290	3.776	1	0.052	1.758
Constant	-1.173	0.304	14.893	1	0.000	0.309

Note: $p < 0.05$ Omnibus



Significant Gender Disparity of Household Composition Predicts **Poor with High Well-Being** Community Member and Climate Change Experience (CCE)

- male to female ratio < 1.0 meaning **more female in the family** regardless gender of the respondents
- male to female ratio < 1.0 is a **significant predictor** of Poor and High Wellbeing respondents with CCE
- **Table 3** shows among poor female respondents, they have high wellbeing if ratio < 1 (more females); but among non-poor female respondents, they have high wellbeing if ratio > 1 (more males)



Share ONE Word on Climate Change Adaptation Strategies
Considering Gender and Poverty from Your Study?

CODE: 1427 2989

<https://www.menti.com/alpeznsfb733>





References

1. Esteve, A., Pohl, M., Becca, F., Fang, H., Galeano, J., García-Román, J., ... & Turu, A. (2024). A global perspective on household size and composition, 1970–2020. *Genus*, 80(1), 2.
2. Grevenstein, D., Bluemke, M., Schweitzer, J., & Aguilar-Raab, C. (2019). Better family relationships—higher well-being: The connection between relationship quality and health related resources. *Mental health & prevention*, 14, 200160.
3. Jalal, M. J. E., Khan, M. A., Hossain, M. E., Yedla, S., & Alam, G. M. (2021). Does climate change stimulate household vulnerability and income diversity? Evidence from southern coastal region of Bangladesh. *Heliyon*, 7(9).
4. Saidi, N., **Zainalaludin, Z.**, & Jamaluddin, A. (2021). Gender Analyses on the Vulnerability Types Suffered by Poor and Older Freshwater Fisheries Community Members in Peninsular Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(12), 2046–2069
5. Wallin, E. (2023). Small-scale farming, gender relations and resource allocation: Barriers to adoption of nature-positive solutions in Western Kenya.
6. Yin, J., Xue, Y., Li, Y., Zhang, C., Xu, B., Ren, Y., & Chen, Y. (2025). Efficacy of fisheries management strategies in mitigating ecological, social, and economic risks of climate warming in China. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 373, 123859.
7. Zainalaludin, Z., Saidi., N., Jamaluddin, A., & Zainuddin, N. (2023) "Who are the B40 Matured and Older Rural Women Related to Freshwater Fisheries Economic Sector in Kuala Krai, Kelantan?." *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, DOI:10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i16/1873
8. Zainalaludin, Z., Foong., H. F., & Abdullah, S. F. Z., (2025). Gender, Ageing, and Poverty Issues among Malaysian Consumer, UPM Press.



zumilah@upm.edu.my
+6019 258 2304