

1 Associations between health literacy and sociodemographic factors: A cross-sectional study
2 in Malaysia utilising the HLS-M-Q18

3
4
5
6

7 Arina Anis Azlan^{1,2}, Mohammad Rezal Hamzah³, Tham Jen Sem⁴, Suffian Hadi Ayub⁵,
8 Abdul Latiff Ahmad¹, Emma Mohamad^{1,2*}

9
10
11
12

13 ¹Centre for Research in Media and Communication, Faculty of Social Sciences and
14 Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

15
16
17
18

16 ²HEALTHCOMM UKM x UNICEF C4D Centre, Faculty of Social Sciences and
17 Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

18
19
20
21

19 ³Centre of Excellence for Social Innovations and Sustainability, Faculty of Applied and
20 Human Sciences, Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Kangar, Perlis, Malaysia

21
22
23
24

22 ⁴Department of Communication, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication,
23 Universiti Putra Malaysia, Seri Kembangan, Selangor, Malaysia

24
25
26
27

25 ⁵Faculty of Communication and Media Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam,
26 Selangor, Malaysia

27
28
29
30

30 * Corresponding author

31 E-mail: emmamohamad@ukm.edu.my

32

33 **Abstract**

34 Health literacy is progressively seen as an indicator to describe a nation's health status. To
35 improve health literacy, countries need to address health inequalities by examining different
36 social demographic factors across the population. This assessment is crucial to identify and
37 evaluate strengths and limitations of a country in addressing health issues. By addressing
38 these health inequalities, a country would be better informed to take necessary steps to
39 improve the nation's health literacy. This study examines health literacy levels in Malaysia
40 and analyses socio-demographic factors that are associated with health literacy. A cross-
41 sectional survey was carried out using the HLS-M-Q18 instrument which was validated for
42 the Malaysian population. Multi-stage random sampling strategy was used in this study
43 utilising several sampling techniques including quota sampling, cluster sampling and simple
44 random sampling to allow random data collection. A total of 855 respondents were sampled.
45 Results found significant associations between health literacy and age, health status and
46 health problems. Findings also suggest that lower health literacy levels were found to be
47 associated with the younger generation. The findings of this study have provided baseline
48 data of the health literacy of Malaysians and provide evidence toward potential areas of
49 intervention.

50

51 **1. Introduction**

52 Worldwide interest in studying health literacy is increasing as health promoters and
53 practitioners recognise its significance in reducing illness [1] and improving quality of life
54 [2]. The benefits of health literacy extend beyond individual health care to include effective
55 disease prevention in society, as well as improving health promotion in general. Health
56 literacy is a concept that extends beyond health education. It addresses social and
57 environmental factors that influences individual ability to engage with health information to
58 make informed decisions and to utilise health services to benefit them and their surroundings.

59

60 Studies have emphasised a variety of health literacy benefits to society [3] and have reported
61 risks of populations with low health literacy [4]. Higher health literacy has also been
62 associated with positive health outcomes [5], health behaviours [5,6] and lower health cost
63 [7]. It is plausible to expect that the way forward to better global health management is
64 through improvement of society's health literacy levels.

65

66 As awareness on the importance of health literacy increases, more instruments are being
67 developed to accurately measure health literacy rates among general populations, as well as
68 in specific groups. A 2017 systematic review revealed 36 instruments used to measure health
69 literacy [8] while another systematic review in 2018 reported 29 health literacy instruments
70 used on children and adolescents [9].

71

72 In Malaysia, several tools have been utilised to measure health literacy [10], however an
73 extensive study across six Asian countries including Malaysia has demonstrated that the
74 European Health Literacy Survey Questionnaire (HLS-EU-Q47) instrument has good
75 construct validity, satisfactory goodness-of-fit to the three health literacy domains (health
76 care, disease prevention and health promotion), as well as high internal consistency and
77 satisfactory item-scale convergent validity [11]. This suggests that the HLS-EU-Q47
78 instrument may serve as a good indicator to measure health literacy for the Malaysian
79 society. A recent study has further compressed the HLS-EU-Q47 into a short scale
80 instrument, the HLS-M-Q18, consisting 18 items to accommodate for the Malaysian National
81 Health Morbidity Survey in 2019 [12]. The HLS-EU-Q47 and HLS-M-Q18 instruments
82 operationally defined health literacy as the ability to access, understand, appraise and apply
83 health information across three domains; health care, disease prevention and health
84 promotion. This model was conceptualised by an extensive systematic review which
85 integrated health literacy definitions and models with the aim to develop a comprehensive
86 evidence-based dimensions of health literacy.

87

88 The objectives of this study are to (1) measure society's health literacy and (2) observe socio-
89 demographic factors that are associated with health literacy in Malaysia. In order to improve
90 health inequalities in the community, an assessment of individual health literacy is crucial to
91 identify and evaluate the strengths and limitations in addressing health issues in a diverse
92 society [13]. In order for health care providers and policy makers to respond efficiently, they
93 need to understand the diverse factors that affect health literacy before facilitating access to
94 health information, providing services and devising health intervention that does not
95 discriminate against health literacy limitations [14].

96

97 **2. Methods**

98 **Study design**

99 A nationally representative cross-sectional survey was employed to address the research
100 objectives. The survey was administered by well-trained enumerators who were also staff
101 working for the Ministry of Health Malaysia. Three states were selected (Selangor, Kuala
102 Lumpur and Sarawak) to represent the distribution of multiple ethnicities, as well as the
103 distribution of urban and rural areas. The selection of areas was made based on referral and
104 advice by the District of Jurisdiction Malaysia, Rural Master Plan Malaysia, and previous
105 literature [15].

106

107 **Ethical approval**

108 The National Medical Ethics Committee Malaysia under the Ministry of Health Malaysia
109 approved our study protocol, procedures, information sheet and consent statement (NMRR-
110 18-1320/41882). All respondents were above 18 years old and therefore involved no minors.
111 All respondents also signed a written consent form clearly stating their rights and nature of
112 participation in the study before being asked to answer the questionnaire. The confidentiality
113 of the information and privacy of the respondents were protected throughout the study.

114

115 **Recruitment procedure**

116 Multi-stage random sampling was used in this study. In detail, there were three stages
117 involved, utilising several sampling techniques (quota sampling, cluster sampling and simple
118 random sampling) to allow random data collection. The three stages are illustrated in Figure
119 1.

120

121 **Fig 1. The multi-stage random sampling procedure.**

122

123 In stage 1, quota sampling based on ethnicities and urban or rural distribution were used to
124 select three Malaysian states. Ethnic distribution should be a standard in sampling multiracial
125 populations to ensure inclusivity of the sample [16]. States from both Peninsular Malaysia
126 and Borneo were selected to represent the diverse ethnicities in Malaysia. For the purpose of
127 urban and rural distribution, Kuala Lumpur and Sarawak were selected to represent the urban

128 and rural areas respectively. This is justified as Kuala Lumpur has the highest urban
129 population while Sarawak has the highest rural population in Malaysia. In selecting the state
130 of Sarawak, a more balanced representation of the minority ethnic groups could be obtained
131 (i.e., Bumiputera). Selangor represents both urban and rural areas and has a balanced ratio in
132 ethnic group distribution.

133

134 In stage 2, cluster sampling was utilised to determine districts of choice. District sampling for
135 Selangor was determined based on the demographic distribution list published by the
136 Selangor Economic Development Unit, as well as extant literature [17]. For selection of
137 districts in Kuala Lumpur, researchers used data provided by the Department of Information,
138 Ministry of Communications and Multimedia Malaysia; and for Sarawak, the selection of
139 districts was guided by data provided by the State Director of the Fire and Rescue
140 Department. The definitions of rural and urban were determined by the National Department
141 of Statistics and The Rural Master Plan, published by the Ministry of Rural Development
142 Malaysia [18].

143

144 In stage 3, respondents were selected using a simple random sampling technique based on
145 several criteria (i.e., Malaysian, aged 18 and above, resident in the chosen state, able to make
146 health decisions for themselves). The respondent recruitment method used in this study
147 mirrors the method and protocol criteria used by the Asian Health Literacy Consortium and
148 previous literature [19]. If there were no eligible respondents in the household who met the
149 selection criteria, household members were thanked for their time and the enumerator
150 approached the next selected household. Only one respondent from any given household was
151 interviewed, in which the eldest household member would be chosen if there was more than
152 one household member who met the respondent selection criteria.

153

154 The researchers made the decision to prioritise an inclusive Malaysian sample based on
155 ethnicity and urban/rural strata due to constraints in resources. This was to ensure that the
156 smaller groups were adequately represented in the sample. The list of states, ethnicities and
157 urban/rural distribution required for this study are as presented in Table 1.

158

159 **Table 1. Sample distribution.**

State	Locality	Ethnicity	n	Area
Selangor	Urban	Malay	299	Shah Alam

(6.298 mil = 58.2%) N = 466	(93.3%) N = 435	Chinese	103	
		Indian	33	
	Rural (6.7%) N = 31	Malay	21	Hulu Langat
		Chinese	7	
		Indian	3	
Kuala Lumpur (1.782 mil = 16.5%) N = 132	Urban (100%) N = 132	Malay	82	Segamat and Lembah Pantai
		Chinese	38	
		Indian	12	
Sarawak (2.741 mil = 25.3%) N = 202	Urban (57.8%) N = 117	Bumiputera	91	Kuching
		Chinese	26	
		Indian	0	
	Rural (42.2%) N = 85	Bumiputera	66	Sarikei (Maradong) and Samarahan (Simujan)
		Chinese	19	
		Indian	0	

160 Note : Location of study is determined by population density and ethnic distribution

161

162 The cross-sectional survey was conducted between 25th June 2018 to 14th July 2018,
 163 involving 18 enumerators. All trained enumerators were working for the Ministry of Health
 164 Malaysia, wore the Ministry's uniform and presented their identity cards to avoid
 165 misunderstanding and protect the interest of both researchers and respondents. Respondents
 166 took an average of 30–40 mins to complete the questionnaire. The target sample size was
 167 470, determined by identifying the smallest acceptable size of a demographic subgroup with
 168 a $\pm 5\%$ margin of error and a confidence level of 95% [20-22]. The enumerators went from
 169 household to household within the selected areas and provided the self-reported questionnaire
 170 to be answered. A consent form was filled in and obtained from each respondent. A total of
 171 866 complete responses with no missing data were obtained and analysed.

172

173 **Study instrument**

174 The survey instrument was adopted from the HLS-M-Q18 short version of health literacy
175 questionnaire which was validated in a study [12]. The questionnaire contained three main
176 sections: 1) demographics, which surveyed respondents' socio-demographic information,
177 including gender, age, race, marital status and income; 2) personal health information; 3) 18-
178 item measure of health literacy. The questionnaire was constructed in the English and Malay
179 languages. A backward-translation approach was used in translating the items between
180 English and Malay, so as to ensure linguistic and conceptual equivalence [22]. Discrepancies
181 between the two versions were rectified, and equivalence of measuring on all items was
182 ensured through consultation with bilingual researchers.

183

184 Personal health information was measured by three items. First, respondents were asked to
185 rate their health condition from "bad" coded as "1" to "good" coded as "2". The second item
186 asked respondents to identify if they suffered from long-term illness: "Do you have any long-
187 term illness or health problems? Long-term illness means problems which have lasted, or you
188 expect to last, 6 months or more". Two answer options were provided (1 = No and 1 = Yes,
189 one or more than one). The third item asked respondents to identify their frequency of
190 involvement in physical activities such as lifting and carrying heavy objects, hoeing,
191 mopping the floor or exercise (such as cycling, walking or jogging) for at least 10 minutes in
192 the past 7 days.

193

194 To measure respondents' health literacy, 18 items were adopted from a validated Malaysian
195 version of the HLS-EU-Q47 [12]. Respondents were asked to identify the level of difficulty,
196 ranging from 1 = very difficult to 4 = very easy. An index was created based on the above 18
197 items (S1 Appendix).

198

199 Demographic variables were controlled to reduce confounding effects. These variables
200 included age, year of birth (1950 to 1965 for Baby Boomers, 1966 – 1976 for Generation X,
201 1977 to 1994 for Generation Y and 1995 to 2012 for Generation Z), gender (0 = female, 1 =
202 male), race (1 = Malay/Bumiputera, 2 = Chinese, 3 = Indian), marital status (1 = not married,
203 2 = married, 3 = separated/divorced, 4 = widowed), and monthly household income (ranging
204 from 1 = below RM3,000, including no income, 2 = RM3,001 to RM9,000 and 3 = RM9,001
205 or more).

206

207 **Statistical analysis**

208 For this study, the collected data were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social
209 Sciences (SPSS), version 26. Descriptive analysis focused on frequencies and percentages.
210 Logistic regression tests, using the Forward: LR method were conducted to examine the
211 relationships between control variables and personal health information and health literacy.
212 For this analysis, the levels of health literacy were re-coded to 1 = limited (inadequate and
213 problematic) and 2 = adequate (sufficient and excellent). Odd ratios (OR), 95% confidence
214 intervals (CI), and their corresponding *P* values are reported as indicators of the magnitude
215 and statistical significance of associations.

216

217 **3. Results**

218 **Demographic characteristics**

219 A total of 866 respondents from different demographic segments and backgrounds
220 participated in this study. The demographics were broadly representative of the Malaysian
221 population with slightly fewer male participants at 34.9 % male and 65.1% female. Almost
222 70% of the study participants were from the young generation (Z and Y). Table 1 shows the
223 distribution of respondents according to selected demographics. The majority of the
224 respondents were female, Malay, generations Y and Z, not married, and had low income
225 levels.

226

227 **Table 1. Distribution of respondent characteristics and health literacy levels using HLS-**
228 **M-Q18 (N=866).**

	n (%)	Health Literacy level n (%)			
		Inadequate	Problematic	Sufficient	Excellent
Respondents	866 (100)	154 (17.8)	348 (40.2)	284 (32.8)	79 (9.1)
Age (mean)	866 (33.6)	33.1	33.8	33.5	33.8
Gen Z (1995 – 2012)	211 (24.4)	33 (15.6)	75 (35.5)	78 (37.0)	25 (11.8)
Gen Y (1977 – 1994)	377 (43.6)	73 (19.4)	162 (43.0)	114 (30.2)	28 (7.4)
Gen X (1966 – 1976)	184 (21.3)	34 (18.5)	77 (41.8)	58 (31.5)	15 (8.2)
Baby Boomers (1950 – 1965)	93 (9.8)	13 (14.0)	34 (36.6)	35 (37.6)	11 (11.8)

Gender					
Male	303 (35)	65 (21.5)	109 (36.0)	105 (34.7)	24 (7.9)
Female	563 (65)	89 (15.8)	239 (42.5)	180 (32.0)	55 (9.8)
Race					
Malay	470 (54.3)	68 (14.5)	188 (40.0)	170 (36.2)	44 (9.4)
Chinese	213 (24.6)	46 (21.6)	89 (41.8)	59 (27.7)	19 (8.9)
Indian	65 (7.5)	15 (23.1)	21 (32.3)	23 (35.4)	6 (9.2)
Bumiputera	115 (13.3)	25 (21.7)	48 (41.7)	32 (27.8)	10 (8.7)
Marital status					
Not married	429 (49.7)	74 (17.2)	163 (38.0)	149 (34.7)	43 (10.0)
Married	394 (45.6)	74 (18.8)	162 (41.1)	125 (31.7)	33 (8.4)
Separated / Divorced	21 (2.4)	4 (19.0)	12 (57.1)	4 (19.0)	1 (4.8)
Widowed	20 (2.3)	2 (10.0)	10 (50.0)	6 (30.0)	2 (10.0)
Income					
Below RM3,000 (including no income)	510 (59.4)	88 (17.3)	220 (43.1)	162 (31.8)	40 (7.8)
RM3,001 – RM9,000	293 (34.1)	58 (19.8)	105 (35.8)	99 (33.8)	31 (10.6)
≥RM9,001	55 (6.4)	7 (12.7)	20 (36.4)	20 (36.4)	8 (14.5)
Exercise (days a week)					
0-2 days	347(40.1)	85 (24.5)	130 (37.5)	111 (32.0)	21 (6.1)
More than 2 days a week	519 (59.9)	69 (13.3)	218 (42.0)	174 (33.5)	58 (11.2)
Health Problems					
1 and more than 1 disease	219 (25.3)	42 (19.2)	84 (38.4)	76 (34.7)	17 (7.8)
No disease	646 (74.7)	17.3 (17.3)	40.9 (40.9)	32.2 (32.2)	9.6 (9.6)
Health status					
Bad	248 (28.7)	70 (28.2)	105 (42.3)	61 (24.6)	12 (4.8)
Good	617 (71.3)	84 (13.6)	242 (39.2)	224 (36.3)	67(10.9)

230 Over 28% of the respondents perceived their general health was bad, but over 70% perceived
 231 their health status to be very good or fairly healthy. Of the 866 respondents, 277 (17.8%) had
 232 inadequate health literacy, another 40.4% had marginal health literacy, 32.9% had adequate
 233 health literacy and 9.1% had excellent or very good health literacy. On the average, the
 234 results of the study show that the younger generation (aged 33.1.-33.8 years) crossed all
 235 levels of health literacy.

236

237 Several socio-demographic characteristics were associated with health literacy level and are
 238 shown in Table 2. Characteristics associated with health literacy level included health status,
 239 health problems, and age. The logistic regression model was statistically significant, $\chi^2(4) =$
 240 49.285, $p < .000$. The model explained 7.6% (Nagelkerke R²) of the variance. Hosmer and
 241 Lemeshow Test showed that the model is a good fit to the data as $p=0.954 (>.05)$.

242

243 **Table 2. Odds ratios (95% confidence intervals) of having limited health literacy vs.**
 244 **adequate health literacy (N=866).**

	Adequate health Literacy (yes =1)			
	P value	Exp (B)	95% C.I for Exp(B)	
			Lower	Upper
^a Gender- Male	.843	.969	.709	1.324
^b Age				
Gen Z	.478	.793	.417	1.505
Gen Y	.031	.549	.319	.946
Gen X	.179	.682	.390	1.191
^c Race				
Chinese	.115	.751	.526	1.073
Indian	.886	.960	.553	1.667
Bumiputera	.177	.735	.470	1.149
Others	.724	.638	.053	7.720
^d Health Status				
Bad	.000	.431	.301	.618
^e Health Problem				
One or more than one	.050	1.447	1.000	2.096
^f Marital status				
Not married	1.000			
Married	.269	.814	.565	1.173
Separated / Divorced	.076	.381	.131	1.105
Widowed	.383	.631	.224	1.775
^g Income				
Below RM3,000 (include no income)				

	RM3,001 – 9000	.122	1.281	.936	1.754
	≥RM9,001	.126	1.580	.879	2.841
	^b Exercise (days a week)				
	More than 2 days a week	.252	1.186	.885	1.590

245 ^aFemale respondents used as a reference.

246 ^bRespondents aged >60 years (Baby Boomers) used as a reference.

247 ^cRespondents who stated their ethnicity as “Malay” used as a reference.

248 ^dRespondents who stated their health status as “Good” used as a reference.

249 ^eRespondents who stated their health problem as “No disease” used as a reference.

250 ^fRespondents who stated their marital status as “Not married” used as a reference

251 ^gRespondents whose income was below RM3,000 /month used as a reference.

252 ^hRespondents who stated their daily exercise as “ ≤2 days a week” used as a reference.

253

254 In terms of age, the findings revealed that there was a significant relationship between age
 255 and health literacy. Generation Y participants (aged 23-37) were less likely to be associated
 256 with adequate health literacy (expected beta less than 1, C.I = 0.319 - 0.946, P= 0.031 <
 257 p=0.05). Respondents who had perceived bad health status were less likely to be associated
 258 with adequate health literacy (expected beta less than 1, C.I = 0.301 - 0.618, P= 0.000 <
 259 p=0.05) compared to those who rated their health as good. This indicates that if the level of
 260 perceived bad health status increases, the odds of being associated with adequate health
 261 literacy will decrease. The association of health problems with the level of health literacy
 262 was statistically significant. Respondents who had reported that they have ‘One or more than
 263 one’ were nearly 1.5 more likely to be associated with adequate health literacy compared to
 264 those who had no disease (expected beta more than 1, C.I = 1.000 - 2.096, P= 0.05 < p=0.05).
 265 The logistic regression results also showed that the other characteristics such as gender, race,
 266 marital status, income and daily exercise remained not significantly associated with health
 267 literacy level.

268

269 **4. Discussion**

270 The results of our study indicate that Malaysians with one or more diseases were significantly
 271 more likely to have higher health literacy levels. The same pattern was observed in a study
 272 conducted among university students in Turkey; health literacy was significantly higher in
 273 those with chronic conditions [23]. A possible explanation for this is that people with
 274 diagnosis of long-term illness(es) were better acquainted with the healthcare system, health
 275 advice and information. However, this raises concerns regarding the point at which people

276 begin to build higher levels of health literacy. Familiarity with health information and
277 services as a result of a long-term illness diagnosis does not benefit the individual in terms of
278 disease prevention, early detection and early treatment.

279

280 On the other hand, the results also showed that people with no long-term diseases were less
281 likely to have adequate health literacy. This suggests that those with no long-term illness may
282 be more complacent in health knowledge and behaviour, while those with long-term illness
283 were more motivated to learn and engage in self health management. Previous studies have
284 found similar results; individuals who were active in maintaining and improving their health
285 were those who had higher motivation to do so [24].

286

287 In terms of health status, our findings reveal that people who perceived themselves to have
288 bad health were less likely to have adequate health literacy. This is consistent with extant
289 literature indicating that those with low self-rated health tend to believe that it is due to
290 insufficient information in managing their health. The study further suggested that this led to
291 low confidence in navigating the healthcare system thus affecting health literacy [25].
292 Another study found that individuals with poor or very poor self-assessment of health were
293 more likely to have lower levels of health literacy [26].

294

295 The present study also found that people between the ages of 23 and 27 were less likely to
296 have adequate health literacy. Research conducted in Denmark found similar results where
297 lower health literacy was recorded among the younger population [26]. In another study,
298 adults aged 25 to 45 years were also found to have more difficulties with health literacy
299 compared to older individuals [27]. This is worrying considering rampant health
300 misinformation on the internet and its widespread use among the young generation. In
301 previous studies, millennials were found to refer to online reviews prior to deciding on a
302 physician for consultation [28]. With negative evidence that social media contributes to the
303 propagation of misinformation [29], this poses a threat to public health systems where
304 accuracy of health-related information is concerned. In Malaysia, studies on eHealth literacy
305 are still in their infancy [30, 31].

306

307 **5. Limitations**

308 A multi-stage sampling procedure was conducted to select the respondents in this survey. The
309 sampling procedure prioritised ethnic group and urban/rural strata, important components in
310 sampling multiracial populations to ensure inclusivity [16]. As a result, the gender and age
311 distribution of the sample does not accurately reflect the current Malaysian population. The
312 respondents of the study consisted of 65% women while current Malaysian population
313 estimates show only 49% of the population are women. Similarly, 51% of the study sample
314 were aged between 25 to 42 years of age; Malaysian population estimates show that only
315 32.9% of Malaysians are between the ages of 25 to 42 years.

316

317 The instrument utilised in this survey was the HLS-M-Q18, the shortened version of HLS-
318 EU-Q47 tested for the Malaysian population. While this is beneficial for the overall
319 assessment of health literacy, this has limitations in that the three health literacy domains
320 were not measured independently.

321

322 **6. Conclusions**

323 Prior to the development of the Malaysian adaptation of the HLS-EU-Q47, health literacy in
324 Malaysia was assessed utilising different instruments ranging from Newest Vital Signs [32] to
325 tools addressing specific disease literacy such as in dentistry [33,34] and mental health [35].
326 The HLS-M-Q18 has enabled the measurement of health literacy in line with current global
327 standards. Our study found that perceived health status and health problems were associated
328 with health literacy levels. Markedly, lower health literacy levels were found to be associated
329 with the younger generation. This is especially concerning considering this generation's wide
330 use of the internet as a source of information. The findings of this study have provided
331 baseline data of the health literacy of Malaysians and provide evidence toward potential areas
332 of intervention.

333

334 **Acknowledgments**

335 The authors would like to thank the enumerators from the Ministry of Health Malaysia for
336 their assistance in the data collection process. A special thanks is also extended to Ms.
337 Suraiya Syed Mohamed, Dr. Affendi Isa and Ms. P. Komathi for their invaluable contribution
338 to the study.

339

340 References

- 341 1. Liu L, Qian X, Chen Z, He T. Health literacy and its effect on chronic disease
342 prevention: evidence from China's data. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20:690.
- 343 2. González-Chica DA, Mnisi Z, Avery J, Duszynski K, Doust J, Tideman P, et al.
344 Effect of health literacy on quality of life amongst patients with ischaemic heart
345 disease in Australian general practice. *PLoS One*. 2016;11:e0151079.
- 346 3. Santos P, Sá L, Couto L, Hespanhol A. Health literacy as a key for effective
347 preventive medicine, *Cogent Soc Sci*. 2017;3(1):1407522.
- 348 4. Jandorf S, Nielsen MK, Sørensen K, Sørensen TL. Low health literacy levels in
349 patients with chronic retinal disease. *BMC Ophthalmol*. 2019;19(1):174.
- 350 5. Anwar WA, Mostafa NS, Hakim SA, Sos DG, Abozaid DA, Osborne RH. Health
351 literacy strengths and limitations among rural fishing communities in Egypt using the
352 Health Literacy Questionnaire (HLQ). *PLoS ONE*. 2020;15(7): e0235550.
- 353 6. McCaffery KJ, Dodd RH, Cvejic E, Ayre J, Batcup C, Isautier JMJ, et al. Health
354 literacy and disparities in COVID-19-related knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and
355 behaviours in Australia. *Public Health Res Pract*. 2020;30(4):e30342012.
- 356 7. Haun JN, Patel NR, French DD, Campbell RR, Bradham DD, Lapcevic WA.
357 Association between health literacy and medical care costs in an integrated healthcare
358 system: a regional population based study. *BMC health Serv Res* 2015;15:249.
- 359 8. Lopes-Marques SR, Aguiar-Lemos, SM. Health literacy assessment instruments:
360 literature review. *Audiology Communication Research*. 2017;22. e1757
- 361 9. Guo S, Armstrong R, Waters E, Sathish T, Alif SM, Browne GR, Yu X. Quality of
362 health literacy instruments used in children and adolescents: a systematic review.
363 *BMJ Open* 2018;8:e020080.
- 364 10. Abdullah A, Liew SM, Salim HS, Ng CJ, Chinna K. Health literacy research in
365 Malaysia: A scoping review. *Sains Malaysiana*. 2020;49:5.
- 366 11. Duong TV, Aringazina A, Baisunova G, Nurjannah PTV, Pham KM, Truong TQ, et
367 al. Measuring health literacy in Asia: validation of the HLS-EU-Q47 survey tool in
368 six Asian countries. *J Epidemiol*. 2017;27(2):80-6.
- 369 12. Mohamad EMW, Kaudan MK, Hamzah MR, Azlan AA. Ayub SH, Tham, JS, et al.
370 Establishing the HLS-M-Q18 short version of the European health literacy survey
371 questionnaire for the Malaysian context. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20:580.
- 372 13. Dodson S, Good S, Osborne RH. Health literacy toolkit for low- and middle-income
373 countries: a series of information sheets to empower communities and strengthen
374 health systems. New Delhi: 2015. World Health Organization, Regional Office for
375 South-East Asia.
- 376 14. Trezona A, Dodson S, Osborne RH. Development of the Organizational Health
377 Literacy Responsiveness (Org-HLR) Framework in Collaboration with Health and
378 Social Services Professionals. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2017;17:513.
379 pmid:28764699
- 380 15. Froze S, Arif MT, Saimon R. Does health literacy predict preventive lifestyle on
381 metabolic syndrome? A population-based study in Sarawak Malaysia. *Open J Prev*
382 *Med*. 2018;8(6):169.
- 383 16. Charmaraman L, Woo M, Quach A, Erkut S. How have researchers studied
384 multiracial populations? A content and methodological review of 20 years of
385 research. *Cult Divers Ethn Minor Psychol*. 2014;20(3):336-52.

- 386 17. Berens EM, Vogt D, Ganahl K, Weishaar H, Pelikan J, Schaeffer D. Health literacy
387 and health service use in Germany. *Health Lit Res Pract*. 2018;2(2):115-22.
- 388 18. Ministry of Rural Development. The Rural Master Plan. Putrajaya: Kementerian
389 Kemajuan Luar Bandar dan Wilayah; 2010.
- 390 19. Koran J. Preliminary proactive sample size determination for confirmatory factor
391 analysis models. *Meas Eval Couns Dev*. 2017;49(4):296–308.
- 392 20. Conroy R. Sample size: a rough guide [Internet]. Ethics (Medical Research)
393 Committee; 2015 [cited 2021 Jan 14]. Available from:
394 <http://www.beaumontethics.ie/docs/application/samplesizecalculation.pdf>.
- 395 21. Israel GD. Determining sample size. Gainesville: University of Florida; 1992. Report
396 No.:Fact Sheet PEOD-6.
- 397 22. Brislin RW. Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *J Cross Cult Psychol*. 1970;
398 3(1): 185–216.
- 399 23. Uysal N, Ceylan E, Koç A. Health literacy level and influencing factors in university
400 students. *Health & Social Care in the Community*. 2019:hsc.12883.
- 401 24. Smith SG, Curtis LM, Wardle J, von Wagner C, Wolf MS. (2013). Skill set or mind
402 set? Associations between health literacy, patient activation and health. *PLoS*
403 *One*. 2013;8(9):e74373.
- 404 25. Storey A, Hanna L, Missen K, Hakman N, Osborne RH, Beauchamp A. The
405 association between health literacy and self-rated health amongst Australian
406 university students. *J Health Commun*. 2020;25(4):333-343.
- 407 26. Svendsen MT, Bak CK, Sørensen K, Pelikan J, Riddersholm SJ, Skals RK, et al.
408 Associations of health literacy with socioeconomic position, health risk behavior, and
409 health status: a large national population-based survey among Danish adults. *BMC*
410 *Public Health*. 2020;20:1-12.
- 411 27. Bo A, Friis K, Osborne RH, Maindal HT. National indicators of health literacy:
412 ability to understand health information and to engage actively with healthcare
413 providers - a population-based survey among Danish adults. *BMC Public Health*.
414 2014;14:1095.
- 415 28. Rohrich RJ, Dayan E. Improving communication with millennial patients. *Plast*
416 *Reconstr Surg*. 2019;144(2):533-535.
- 417 29. McKee M, van Schalkwyk MCI, Stuckler D. The second information revolution:
418 digitalization brings opportunities and concerns for public health. *Eur J Environ*
419 *Public Health*. 2019;29:3-6
- 420 30. Azlan AA. Measures of eHealth literacy: options for the Malaysian population. *J*
421 *Komun Malays J Commun*. 2019;35(4):211-228.
- 422 31. Yilma TM, Inthiran A, Reidpath DD, Orimaye SO. Context-based interactive health
423 information searching. *Information Research*. 2019;24(2):1-22.
- 424 32. Norrafizah J, Nor Asiah M, Suraiya SM, Zawaha HI, Normawati A. Assessment of
425 health literacy among people in a rural area in Malaysia using newest vital signs
426 assessment. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*. 2016;16(2):1-7.
- 427 33. Rani H, Su YH, Ding SA, Yahya NA, Jaafar A. Comparison of visual oral health
428 literacy level pre and post oral health education among adolescents. *Journal of*
429 *International Dental and Medical Research*. 2019;12(2):640-644.
- 430 34. Muhd Noor N, Rani H, Zakaria ASI, Yahya NA, Sockalingam SN. Sociodemography,
431 oral health status and behaviours related to oral health literacy. *Pesqui Bras*
432 *Odontopediatria Clin Integr*. 2019;19(1):1-10.
- 433 35. Ibrahim N, Amit N, Shahar S, Wee LH, Ismail R, Khairuddin R, et al. Do depression
434 literacy, mental illness beliefs & stigma influence mental health help-seeking attitude?

435 A cross-sectional study of secondary school and university students from B40
436 households in Malaysia. BMC Public Health. 2019; 1-8:544.