

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Confirmation of male well-being indicators in Malaysia

Siti Zaiton Mohd Ajis ^{1,2}, Emma Mohamad ^{1,2} and Arina Anis Azlan ^{1,2}

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

² UKM x UNICEF Communication for Development Centre in Health, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia

* Corresponding author

E-mail: arina@ukm.edu.my (AAA)

36 **Abstract**

37

38 **Background**

39 Assessing well-being can be tricky due to its subjective nature which may result in inaccurate
40 or incomplete evaluations. This is particularly challenging in measuring male well-being, as
41 traditional gender roles and expectations often discourage normalising discussions about men's
42 health concerns. Studies reveal notable obstacles in the way men perceive, behave, and hold
43 beliefs about their health and well-being which may result in underreporting of health issues
44 among men. A gender-specific measurement of well-being for men is therefore essential and
45 merits further examination.

46

47 **Methods**

48 This study aims to validate a male well-being instrument in the context of Malaysian men using
49 confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). An online cross-sectional survey involving a total of 651
50 Malaysian men aged 18 and above was conducted utilising a 33-item male well-being
51 instrument developed in a preliminary study.

52

53 **Results**

54 The analysis resulted in a satisfactory 24-item model with six dimensions: self-confidence (4
55 items); family/close relationships adaptation (5 items); physical health (3 items); living
56 environment adaptation (4 items); autonomy and agency (4 items); and economic stability (4
57 items). There were high correlations among the 24 items. The internal consistency reliability
58 was robust, with no floor or ceiling effects. These results represented equivalence and
59 consistency among the responses to items, suggesting that the items were homogenous in
60 measuring Malaysian male well-being.

61

62 **Conclusions**

63 This study confirms the suitability of a 24-item instrument measuring male well-being in
64 Malaysia. The instrument may possibly be used in similar Asian cultures as it achieved strong
65 reliability, structural validity and construct validity that fulfilled goodness-of-fit criteria.

66

67 **Introduction**

68 Well-being is an expression that is often used to describe what is good or bad for an
69 individual's life. Aspects of well-being such as a being comfortable, content, and happy have
70 subjective definitions. This makes the concept of well-being difficult to define, encompassing
71 various aspects with various techniques in its measurement. Until now, the measurement of the
72 concept of well-being is still a matter of discussion because it involves many dimensions of
73 life that can be measured from various angles [1].

74 The measurement of well-being is an important subject to discuss because a country
75 uses the measurement of well-being to measure the effectiveness of the implementation of a
76 country's social and economic development policies whether on individuals, families, or
77 communities. Measuring well-being can also be used specifically as a guide for government
78 programs to improve the quality of life among specific groups [2].

79 The subjective and objective measurement of well-being has been widely discussed in
80 forming well-being indexes abroad and in Malaysia. There are also debates surrounding

81 objective and subjective measures of well-being because the differences between the two are
82 distinct [3–9].

83

84 The concept of quality of life is considered as an objective measurement, while well-
85 being is aimed at subjective measurement of quality of life and is better known as subjective
86 well-being [10]. The relationship between the two is also sometimes seen from various points
87 of view, for example, there are parties who accept and use them interchangeably [11]. There
88 are even researchers who use the term life satisfaction to describe the state of quality of life
89 and subjective well-being [12,13].

90

91 Self-assessment is often used to gauge the level of individual well-being. However,
92 with the use of self-assessment measurement methods, questions arise about the exact method
93 of determining well-being such as whether self-assessment or objective assessment from a third
94 party is more appropriate to use. In addition to that, the assessment of perception by different
95 genders gives different perceived values of well-being [14].

96

97 The assessment of the perception of well-being also varies according to culture [15].
98 Therefore, the formation of standards or well-being benchmarks need to take into account
99 gender and cultural norms of the group being studied. This study focuses on well-being in the
100 context of men because it recognizes that gender and sociocultural influences that emphasize
101 aspects of masculinity affect men's behaviour in daily life and understanding of their
102 environment.

103

104 In addition, norms that shape men's responsibilities affect men's perceptions of
105 masculinity, the value they place on well-being and their behaviour in seeking that well-being
106 [16]. In the traditional norms setting, men are considered leaders in family as well as in the
107 social community and the country. Studies have found that conventional Malay men express
108 their feelings of love through their commitment as academic supervisors, personal advisors,
109 financial contributors, educators, positive role models, maintainers of discipline, and spiritual
110 leaders [17,18]. From an Islamic perspective, studies have shown that culturally-bound
111 veterans in Malaysia come from a collectivistic culture, where Islam as their religion and the
112 way of life affects the Malay culture. As Islam is embedded in a Muslim's way of life and
113 beliefs, it also permeates their values, behaviour, and way of thinking [19,20]. This matter is
114 often debated when it comes to measuring well-being because of the existence of gender
115 differences and norms in individuals, society, and even the country itself. Therefore,
116 understanding the influence of social norms on communication and behaviour is crucial for
117 promoting positive health outcomes and supporting men in their unique needs and preferences.

118

119 This study focuses on well-being in the context of men because it acknowledges that
120 gender and sociocultural influences emphasizing aspects of masculinity affect men's behaviour
121 in daily life and understanding of their environment. The aim of the study is to address this gap
122 by developing a comprehensive instrument tailored to the context of well-being among men in
123 Malaysia. By focusing on specific dimensions and indicators that are culturally and
124 contextually appropriate, the instrument seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of personal
125 well-being experiences among Malaysian men. Thus, in the context of this study, the
126 researchers use a self-rated, 33-item male well-being instrument proposed by Ajis et al. [21] to
127 observe how men subjectively view their lives and propose a set of items suitable to measure
128 male well-being in the Malaysian context. Consequently, well-being dimensions and indicators
129 appropriate for use among Malaysian men were identified and tested.

130 **Materials and method**

131 **Study design**

132

133 An earlier population-based cross-sectional study [21] has assessed the suitability of
134 male well-being indicators for the Malaysian context. The researchers developed and tested a
135 33-item male well-being scale in Bahasa Melayu and English. Adapted measures from this
136 instrument were utilized in the present study. A two-level face validation process was
137 conducted to validate the 33 items measuring Malaysian male well-being. Some items were
138 also reworded upon recommendation by health communication experts through the face
139 validation stage to allow for better comprehension and reduce confusion for respondents. A
140 cross-sectional survey was conducted among the Malaysian male population to validate the
141 male well-being indicators and ensure that the instrument reflects the country's male citizens.
142 Participants were aged 18 and above and resided in Malaysia.

143

144 **Ethical approval**

145

146 This study was submitted for ethical review and received approval from the Research
147 Ethics Committee from the National University of Malaysia (UKM) which governs all
148 medical/health/science/social-related research in UKM. The ethical approval number is UKM
149 PPI/111/8/JEP-2020-43.

150 All respondents were above 18 years old and therefore the study involved no minors.
151 All respondents also agreed with the online written consent form that clearly stated their rights
152 and the nature of participation in the study before being asked to answer the survey. This online
153 consent form was also submitted and approved by the Research Ethics Committee, UKM.

154

155 **Sampling method**

156

157 The present study involved the Malaysian male population aged 18 and above. Data
158 collection was conducted online during the COVID-19 period which limited the study's
159 sampling technique. In order to obtain respondents, the study utilised convenience and
160 snowball sampling techniques based on several inclusion criteria (i.e., male, Malaysian, aged
161 18 and above, residing in Malaysia) and used professional and personal networks to reach as
162 many male respondents as possible.

163 The sample size was calculated based on the number of items formed and the total male
164 population in Malaysia. By using sample size calculation based on total items by Chua [22]
165 and sample size determination by Krejcie and Morgan [23] and Bukhari [24], a minimum
166 sample size of N=549 respondents was required in this study. In addition, the sample
167 calculation also considers an 80 percent response rate, so at least 659 questionnaires were
168 distributed to obtain a minimum of 549 respondents. This sample size is sufficient to perform
169 confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with a 95% confidence level on the model formed and is
170 sufficient to represent the Malaysian male population.

171 Data collection was conducted for four months between 1st January 2021 to 30th April
172 2021 using the Survey Monkey platform. Respondents took an average of 10–15 minutes to
173 fill in the questionnaire.

174

175 **Instrument**

176

177 The Ajis et al. [21] male well-being instrument was adapted to obtain respondent
178 assessment of personal well-being. The questionnaire contained 33 items measuring personal
179 well-being on a seven-point bipolar scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). Respondents
180 answered the questions by indicating their level of agreement with each statement. The 33-item
181 male well-being model was formed through exploratory factor analysis and obtained a very
182 good level of internal consistency where the Cronbach's alpha of all well-being dimensions
183 were at values above .70 [21], meeting the level of reliability suggested by Bond and Fox (25).
184 The dimensions and items that make up the construct of personal well-being (Fig 1) are self-
185 confidence (8 items); family/close relationships adaptation (8 items); physical health (3 items);
186 living environment adaptation (5 items); autonomy and agency (4 items); and economic
187 stability (5 items) and will be referred to hereafter as the original measurement model in this
188 study.

189

190 **Fig 1. Original Measurement Model hypothesized (Ajis et al. 2021).**

191

192 **Participant recruitment and data collection procedure**

193

194 Professional and personal networks were used to distribute the self-reported
195 questionnaire to respondents during the COVID-19 pandemic. The two main platforms used in
196 disseminating these online survey links were social media (Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram)
197 and messaging platforms (WhatsApp). A general overview of the questionnaire was first given
198 in a WhatsApp/social media message post followed by online survey links to Malay and
199 English versions of the questionnaire. A digital consent form was included in the survey and
200 each participant needed to click the agreement button as a sign of consent to participate in the
201 survey. Although the researchers aimed to collect 659 responses, a total of 851 respondents
202 participated in the online questionnaire throughout the data collection period. However, the
203 data cleaning process found that 200 respondents did not meet the study criteria and were
204 removed (female [n=143], non-Malaysian citizen [n=43], answered all questions with the same
205 answer [n=12] and extreme outliers in the normality test [n=2]). A total of 651 complete
206 responses with no missing data were obtained and analyzed.

207

208 **Data analysis**

209

210 The data collected in this study were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the
211 Social Sciences (SPSS) software and AMOS version 26.0. In this study, the research data was
212 normally distributed with all variables obtaining skewness and kurtosis values between -1.107
213 to 1.507. In the context of this study, the items to be tested are self-assessment items on the
214 dimensions of male well-being construct. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted
215 for all dimensions to validate instruments measuring the male well-being construct in terms of
216 unidimensionality, validity, and reliability [26–28]. The original measurement model must
217 meet three types of validity: convergent validity, construct validity, and discriminant validity
218 [26–31]. The fit of the data to the model was examined using goodness-of-fit indices, including
219 (i) Absolute fit: root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and goodness-of-fit index
220 (GFI); (ii) Incremental fit: adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), comparative fit index (CFI),
221 Tucker–Lewis index (TLI), and normed fit index (NFI); (iii) Parsimonious fit; Chi-
222 Square/Degree of freedom (Chisq/df). To assess reliability, the composite reliability of the
223 construct was examined. Internal consistency was tested with Cronbach's alpha, and values
224 greater than or equal to 0.7 indicate satisfactory reliability.

225 Results and Discussion

226 The purpose of this study was to test and confirm the Ajis et al. [21] 33-item male well-
 227 being instrument and propose a set of items to measure male well-being in the Malaysian
 228 context. The 33-item male well-being instrument was designed to measure the multiple aspects
 229 of male well-being in the Malaysian context, represented by self-assessment of well-being
 230 dimensions, namely self-confidence, physical health, autonomy and agency, economic
 231 stability, family/close relationship adaptation, and living environment adaptation. A total of
 232 651 complete responses with no missing data were obtained and analyzed. Structural equation
 233 modeling was used to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on the dimensions of male
 234 well-being and define its structure.

235 Participant characteristics

236 Table 1 shows that the study respondents consisted of various demographic
 237 backgrounds. Out of the total 651 male respondents, the average age was 33 years, indicating
 238 that most of the respondents were males from the Generation Y (27-44) group, representing
 239 half of the sample at 348 respondents (53.5%). The majority of the respondents were Malay
 240 (76.0%), followed by respondents who were Chinese (13.4%), and Indian (5.2%). The majority
 241 of respondents involved in this study were married (56.2%), had an undergraduate degree
 242 (35.8%), and had an estimated family income below RM4360 (55.9%).
 243
 244

Table 1. Characteristics of participants Variables.

Variables	<i>n</i>	%
Age	Mean = 33.87 (24)	
Generation Z (18-26)	193	29.6
Generation Y (27 – 44)	348	53.5
Generation X (45-55)	95	14.6
Baby Boomers (56 – 71)	15	2.3
Ethnic Group		
Malay	495	76.0
Chinese	87	13.4
Indian	34	5.2
Bumiputera Sabah/Sarawak	33	5.1
Serani	1	2
Bugis	1	2
Highest Education Level		
UPSR / Equivalent	8	1.3
SRP / PMR / PT3 / Equivalent	6	0.9
SPM / SPMV / Equivalent	98	15.1
STPM / Diploma / Equivalent	195	30.0
Skill Certificate	38	5.8
Bachelor Degree	233	35.8
Master Degree/PhD	73	11.2
Marital Status		
Single	270	41.5
Married	366	56.2
Divorced	13	2.0
Widowed	2	0.3
Estimated Household Income		
RM 4360 below	364	55.9
RM 4,361 – RM 9,619	175	26.9
RM 9,621 above	112	17.2

245 **Construct validity of the male well-being instrument**

246 Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to determine the fit of the original
 247 hypothesized model and check the reliability and validity of the measurement items. IBM SPSS
 248 AMOS version 26.0 was used for the procedure analysis of model quality and fit. Fig 2 shows
 249 the CFA output of the original measurement model hypothesized. Based on the output in Fig
 250 2, the study needs to assess the three types of validity: construct validity, convergent validity,
 251 and discriminant validity together with composite reliability for male well-being construct. The
 252 construct must achieve all validity and reliability requirements before it can be released into
 253 practice.

254
 255 **Fig 2. The original measurement model for male well-being construct.**

256
 257 The construct validity is achieved when the model achieves all three types of model fit
 258 categories: Absolute Fit (RMSEA < 0.08; GFI > 0.90), Incremental Fit (AGFI, CFI, TLI, NFI
 259 > 0.90) and Parsimonious Fit (ChiSq/df < 3.0) (26–31).

260 The assessment for construct validity is presented in Table 2. Based on Table 4, the test
 261 results indicate that the model fit does not fully adhere to goodness-of-fit indices. The analysis
 262 resulted in absolute fit; RMSEA = 0.065, GFI = 0.847, incremental fit; AGFI = 0.821, CFI =
 263 0.893, TLI = 0.882, NFI = 0.860, and parsimonious fit $\chi^2/df = 3.735$ showing that the required
 264 levels are not fully achieved. Thus, the study concludes that the convergent validity of the
 265 original measurement model has not been achieved.

266
 267 **Table 2. Construct validity of original measurement model.**

Name of category	Name of index	Index value	Comments
1. Absolute Fit	RMSEA	0.065	The required level is achieved
	GFI	0.847	The required level not achieved
	AGFI	0.821	The required level not achieved
2. Incremental Fit	CFI	0.893	The required level not achieved
	TLI	0.882	The required level not achieved
	NFI	0.86	The required level not achieved
3. Parsimonious Fit	Chisq/df	3.375	The required level not achieved

268 RMSEA: Root Mean Square of Error Approximation

269 GFI: Goodness of Fit Index

270 AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit

271 CFI: Comparative Fit Index

272 TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index

273 NFI: Normed Fit Index

274 Chisq/df: Chi Square/Degrees of Freedom

275 Next, the assessment for the convergent validity and composite reliability are shown in
 276 Table 3, while the discriminant validity among dimensions is shown in Table 4. The model had
 277 validity concerns due to AVE values for two dimensions (economic stability and self-
 278 confidence) not exceeding the threshold value of 0.5 which indicates the convergent validity
 279 for the original measurement model has not been achieved. However, the values of CR in Table
 280 3 exceeded 0.6 which indicates that composite reliability for the original measurement model
 281 has been achieved [26–31]. The values for discriminant validity in Table 4 indicate that MSV
 282 and ASV values are smaller than AVE value and this indicates good discriminant validity for
 283 the original measurement model.

284 **Table 3. Convergent validity and composite reliability of original measurement model for male well-being.**

Dimensions	CR	AVE
Economic stability	0.809	0.464 ¹
Family and close relationships adaptation	0.91	0.56
Self-confidence	0.883	0.488 ¹
Physical health	0.846	0.649
Living environment adaptation	0.876	0.589
Autonomy and agency	0.858	0.603

285 ¹: AVE less than 0.50.

286 CR: Composite reliability

287 AVE: Average variance extracted

288

289 **Table 4. Discriminant validity among dimensions of original measurement model for male well-being.**

Dimensions	AVE	MSV	ASV
Economic stability	0.464 ¹	0.399	0.314
Family and close relationships adaptation	0.56	0.41	0.325
Self-confidence	0.488 ¹	0.41	0.351
Physical health	0.649	0.28	0.23
Living environment adaptation	0.589	0.483	0.332
Autonomy and agency	0.603	0.483	0.364

290 ¹: AVE less than 0.50.

291 AVE: Average variance extracted

292 MSV: Maximum shared variance

293 ASV: Average shared variance

294 Fig 3 presents the measure of correlation among the six dimensions measuring male
 295 well-being. The analysis found none of the correlation values between any two dimensions, as
 296 indicated by double-headed arrows, exceeded 0.85. Thus, the model does not have
 297 multicollinearity problems.

298 **Fig 3. Correlation between dimensions measuring male well-being.**

299

300 The correlation among dimensions obtained from Fig 3 are tabulated in Table 5. The
 301 diagonal values are the square root of the respective AVE while other values are the correlation
 302 between any two dimensions. Since all diagonal values are greater than any other values in the
 303 rows and columns, it can be concluded that the discriminant validity for the construct has been
 304 achieved [26–31].

305

306 **Table 5. Discriminant validity index summary for the original measurement model.**

Dimensions	ES	FCRA	SC	PH	LEA	AA
ES	0.681					
FCRA	0.539	0.748				
SC	0.632	0.640	0.699			
PH	0.445	0.465	0.529	0.805		

LEA	0.558	0.629	0.539	0.424	0.768	
AA	0.610	0.559	0.613	0.525	0.695	0.776

- 307 EC: Economic Stability
 308 FCRA: Family and close relationships adaptation
 309 SC: Self-confidence
 310 PH: Physical health
 311 LEA: Living environment adaptation
 312 AA: Autonomy and agency

313
 314 Even though the original measurement model indicates good discriminant validity and
 315 achieved composite reliability, the model fit needs to be improved to comply with the goodness
 316 of fit indices and display good construct and convergent validity. Since model fitness indexes
 317 did not meet the requirement level, the researchers examined the factor loadings for item
 318 removal. As shown in Fig 3, the factor loadings for item C1.7 (from dimensions self-
 319 confidence) and item C6.3 (from dimensions economic stability) were below the minimum
 320 value of 0.6 [26–28] and were therefore removed. A CFA was run for the second time with
 321 these items excluded. Fig 4 shows the new CFA findings. Only fitness indexes for RMSEA
 322 achieved the required level, even though the factor loading values for all items exceeded 0.6.

323
 324 **Fig 4. Factor loading and new fitness indexes after two items removed.**

325
 326 The model fitness indexes still had not met the required levels after selected items were
 327 removed. Therefore, the researchers identified redundant pairs of items through the
 328 modification index (MI). Table 6 indicates the highest covariance value, MI = 58.277 occurs
 329 between the errors e13 and e11; M= 57.27 occurs between the errors e28 and e27; M = 41.95
 330 occurs between the errors e21 and e20; M = 40.766 occurs between the errors e10 and e9; M =
 331 30.174 occurs between the errors e16 and e14; M = 28.423 occurs between the errors e8 and
 332 e3; M = 22.688 occurs between the errors e6 and FCRA; and M = 15.836 occurs between the
 333 errors e5 and FCRA. Based on the high covariance values in Table 6, the researchers
 334 constructed eight of modification models individually until the modification model complied
 335 with the goodness of fit indices.

336
 337 **Table 6. List of modifications made to the original measurement model.**

Items			MI	Par Change	Comment
e5	<-->	FCRA	15.836	0.079	8th Modification: Delete item C1.5 MI > 15 shows item C1.5 and FCRAadapt are redundant
e6	<-->	FCRA	22.688	0.092	7th Modification: Delete item C1.6 MI > 15 shows item C1.6 and FCRAadapt are redundant
e6	<-->	e3	17.108	-0.089	
e6	<-->	e5	20.253	0.116	
e8	<-->	FCRA	15.021	0.082	
e8	<-->	e3	28.423	-0.126	6th Modification: Delete item C1.8 MI > 15 shows item C1.8 and C1.3 are redundant
e8	<-->	e6	19.787	0.123	

e21	<-->	e20	41.95	0.18	3rd Modification: Delete item C4.1 due to many redundant MI > 15 shows item C4.2 and C4.1 are redundant
e22	<-->	e20	20.018	-0.109	MI > 15 shows item C4.3 and C4.1 are redundant
e24	<-->	e20	20.65	-0.163	MI > 15 shows item C4.5 and C4.1 are redundant
e28	<-->	e27	57.27	0.234	2nd modification: Constrain items C5.4 and C5.3 MI > 15 shows item C5.4 and C5.3 are redundant
e29	<-->	e20	25.712	0.19	MI > 15 shows item C6.1 and C4.1 are redundant
e32	<-->	e20	17.306	-0.152	MI > 15 shows item C6.4 and C4.1 are redundant
e9	<-->	LEA	16.683	0.063	MI > 15 shows item C2.1 and LEAdapt are redundant
e9	<-->	AA	17.949	-0.088	MI > 15 shows item C2.1 and AutAgency are redundant
e9	<-->	e21	18.236	0.085	MI > 15 shows item C2.1 and C4.2 are redundant
e9	<-->	e33	23.347	0.161	MI > 15 shows item C2.1 and C6.5 are redundant
e10	<-->	e9	40.766	0.113	4th modification: Delete item C2.1 due to many redundant MI > 15 shows item C2.5 and C2.1 are redundant
e13	<-->	e24	17.517	0.192	
e13	<-->	e9	17.692	-0.142	
e13	<-->	e11	58.277	0.359	1st Modification: Delete item C2.5. MI > 15 shows item C2.5 and C2.3 are redundant
e16	<-->	AA	22.579	<u>0.117</u>	
e16	<-->	e14	30.174	0.123	5th Modification: Delete item C2.8 MI > 15 shows item C2.8 and C2.6 are redundant

- 338 e: error indicator
339 MI: Modification Indexes
340 FCRA: Family and close relationships adaptation
341 LEA: Living environment adaptation
342 AA: Autonomy and agency

343 As a result, the researchers discarded seven items (C1.5, C1.6, C1.8, C2.1, C2.5, C2.8,
344 and C4.1) and constrained items C5.4 and C5.3. Fig 5 shows the new CFA findings of the final
345 modification model. Based on Fig 5 and Table 7, the test results indicate that the model fit fully
346 adheres to goodness-of-fit indices. The analysis resulted in absolute fit; RMSEA = 0.049, GFI
347 = 0.928, incremental fit; AGFI = 0.909, CFI = 0.957, TLI = 0.950, NFI = 0.932, and
348 parsimonious fit $\chi^2/df = 2.588$ indicating achievement of required levels. Thus, it is concluded
349 that the convergent validity of the modification model has been achieved.

350

351 **Fig 5. The final modification model for the construct of male well-being.**

352

353 **Table 7. Construct validity of the final modification model.**

Name of category	Name of index	Index value	Comments
1. Absolute Fit	RMSEA	0.049	The required level is achieved
	GFI	0.928	The required level is achieved
	AGFI	0.909	The required level is achieved
2. Incremental Fit	CFI	0.957	The required level is achieved
	TLI	0.950	The required level is achieved
	NFI	0.932	The required level is achieved
3. Parsimonious Fit	Chisq/df	2.588	The required level is achieved

354 RMSEA: Root Mean Square of Error Approximation

355 GFI: Goodness of Fit Index

356 AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit

357 CFI: Comparative Fit Index

358 TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index

359 NFI: Normed Fit Index

360 Chisq/df: Chi Square/Degrees of Freedom

361 Based on Table 8, the results of the modification model also show that the CR values are above
 362 0.6 and AVE values exceed 0.5, indicating good convergent validity and composite reliability.
 363 MSV and ASV values that are smaller than AVE indicate good discriminant validity of the
 364 construct. The results shown in Fig 5 illustrate that the final modification model consists of 24
 365 items that retained all six dimensions of the original measurement model by Ajis et al. [21].
 366 For the self-confidence dimension, the model retained only four out of eight items. For the
 367 family and close relationships adaptation dimension, the model retained only five out of eight
 368 items. For the living environment adaptation and economic stability dimensions, the model
 369 retained only four out of five items. The model maintained all three items for the physical
 370 health dimension and four items for the autonomy and agency dimension.

371

372 **Table 8. Composite reliability, convergent validity and discriminant validity among dimensions in the final**
 373 **modification model for male well-being.**

Dimensions	CR	AVE	MSV	ASV
ES	0.813	0.521	0.367	0.304
FCRA	0.881	0.599	0.372	0.286
SC	0.868	0.624	0.352	0.277
PH	0.846	0.649	0.270	0.213
LEA	0.877	0.643	0.471	0.306
AA	0.848	0.585	0.471	0.337

374 EC: Economic Stability

375 FCRA: Family and close relationships adaptation

376 SC: Self-confidence

377 PH: Physical health

378 LEA: Living environment adaptation

379 AA: Autonomy and agency

380 CR: Composite Reliability

381 AVE: Average variance extracted
 382 MSV: Maximum shared variance
 383 ASV: Average shared variance

384
 385 Furthermore, the modification model in Fig 5 also presents the measure of correlation
 386 among six dimensions measuring male well-being, illustrating that none of the correlation
 387 values between any two dimensions exceeded 0.85. Thus, the modification model does not
 388 have multicollinearity problems.

389 The correlation among dimensions obtained from the modification model in Fig 5 is
 390 tabulated in Table 9. It is concluded that the discriminant validity for constructs in the final
 391 modification model has been achieved since all diagonal values are greater than any other
 392 values in the rows and columns (26–32).

393
 394 **Table 9. Discriminant validity index summary for the final modification model.**

	ES	FCRA	SC	PH	LEA	AA
ES	0.722					
FCRA	0.538	0.774				
SC	0.593	0.541	0.790			
PH	0.441	0.438	0.490	0.805		
LEA	0.561	0.610	0.455	0.408	0.802	
AA	0.606	0.535	0.540	0.520	0.686	0.765

395 ES: Economic stability
 396 FCRA: Family and close relationships adaptation
 397 SC: Self-confidence
 398 PH: Physical health
 399 LEA: Living environment adaptation
 400 AA: Autonomy and agency

401 This study concludes that the final modification model that has been constructed and
 402 tested using CFA has produced a model with good fit indices and a set of items suitable for
 403 measuring male well-being in Malaysia. This finding further illustrates that the 24 items used
 404 to measure male well-being were suitable with the data of the study.

405 406 Instrument reliability

407 Table 10 illustrates the summary for instrument reliability through assessment of
 408 Cronbach’s alpha values. All the dimensions for male well-being in the final modification
 409 model indicate good reliability levels (more than 0.7) across the six dimensions (self-
 410 confidence, family and close relationships adaptation, physical health, living environment
 411 adaptation, autonomy and agency and economic stability). The construct validity has also been
 412 reviewed by observing the Pearson correlation values of each item against the total scores of
 413 the measured variables. The result of this study shows that the correlation value of each item
 414 with their overall dimensions is high (0.585 to 0.804).

415
 416 **Table 10. Cronbach’s alpha values for dimensions in the final modification model.**

Dimensions	24 Item in Modification Model	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach’s Alpha if item deleted	Cronbach’s Alpha values
Self-confidence	C1.1	0.642	0.857	0.865
	C1.2	0.745	0.814	

	C1.3	0.774	0.803	
	C1.4	0.699	0.833	
Family and close relationships adaptation	C2.2	0.731	0.841	0.874
	C2.3	0.635	0.871	
	C2.4	0.697	0.848	
	C2.6	0.734	0.839	
	C2.7	0.752	0.837	
Physical health	C3.1	0.715	0.768	0.839
	C3.2	0.752	0.730	
	C3.3	0.653	0.835	
Living environment adaptation	C4.2	0.682	0.848	0.869
	C4.3	0.804	0.799	
	C4.4	0.763	0.816	
	C4.5	0.654	0.866	
Autonomy and agency	C5.1	0.711	0.816	0.858
	C5.2	0.734	0.806	
	C5.3	0.662	0.835	
	C5.4	0.703	0.819	
Economic stability	C6.1	0.643	0.752	0.809
	C6.2	0.662	0.742	
	C6.4	0.585	0.78	
	C6.5	0.631	0.763	
Modification Model				0.841

417

418 The final modification model for measuring male well-being was reliable, with high
419 internal consistencies. All sub-scales achieved Cronbach's alpha of 0.80 and above, and the
420 overall instrument achieved 0.841. These results represent equivalence and consistency among
421 the responses to items of the final modification model, suggesting that these items are suitable
422 for measuring male well-being compared to the original measurement model in the Malaysian
423 context. The internal consistency reliability was robust, with no floor/ceiling effects.

424 The original measurement model was developed via an exploratory factor analysis
425 (EFA) procedure using pilot study data. Ajis et al. [21] suggested that the instrument should be
426 further validated with additional data from the field. In the present study, the researchers
427 utilised CFA as a procedure for validating this instrument as per common practice [28,32,34–
428 38].

429 Conclusion

430 The modification model developed through this study has resulted in 24 items
431 measuring male well-being in the Malaysian context. This instrument may be used in
432 measuring male well-being in Malaysia as it achieved robust reliability and structural validity
433 that fulfilled goodness-of-fit criteria. It is also deemed suitable to measure male well-being in
434 similar cultural contexts.

435

436 This study is a new finding in furthering research related to well-being in the context
437 of gender and cultural norms. It is the first study conducted to develop an instrument for the
438 measurement of male well-being in Malaysia. Dimensions of well-being developed specifically
439 for men can be used to measure and potentially unravel problems involving men's well-being.
440 Self-report assessments used as a tool in measuring men's well-being provide insight into the
441 importance of social perspectives that have an impact on men's well-being. Furthermore, this
442 study adds new knowledge about the construct and conceptualization of men's well-being in
443 Malaysia. The instrument may be used by individuals, organizations, and government agencies,
444 specifically those with a focus on understanding well-being from the male perspective.

445

446 Even so, this study has several limitations. First, the study was conducted through a
447 convenience and snowball sampling strategy using network chains from the research team and
448 spread through different social media platforms (Whatsapp, Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram).
449 As a result, there is a possibility of bias because disadvantaged populations or those with
450 limited access to the internet may not have been able to participate in this study. In addition,
451 when compared to the current statistical population in Malaysia, the study sample
452 overrepresents Malay males. Thus, the findings of this study must be interpreted with caution.
453 A more systematic and inclusive sampling method is needed to improve findings in terms of
454 population representation and generalization.

455

456 Secondly, the original study [21] formed indicators of male well-being based on
457 elements of self-concept theory, which may have limited the scope of its definition of the well-
458 being concept. Triangulation of the findings through qualitative interviews would allow
459 respondents to provide more specific details and potential areas of improvement to the
460 instrument. This would be a useful addition to understanding the subjective evaluation of well-
461 being among men for future studies.

462

463 To improve the generalizability of findings, more validation studies should be
464 conducted considering this study's limitations. The model should also be tested in different
465 cultural settings to observe its validity and reliability in different contexts.

466 Acknowledgements

467

468 This study was funded by research grant, Center for Research and Instrument Management,
469 Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (GUP-2016-064) and also the Ministry of Women, Family
470 and Community Development Malaysia (SK-2016-002). We also like to express our thanks to
471 Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mohammad Rezal Hamzah and Mr. Andi Muhammad Tri Sakti for their
472 assistance throughout this study.

473

474 References

- 475 1. Ruggeri K, Garcia-Garzon E, Maguire Á, Matz S, Huppert FA. Well-being is more than
476 happiness and life satisfaction: A multidimensional analysis of 21 countries. *Health Qual Life*
477 *Outcomes*. 2020;18(1):1–16.
- 478 2. CDC. Well-Being Concepts | HRQOL | CDC [Internet]. Well-Being Concepts. 2018. p. 1–1.
479 Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/hrqol/wellbeing.htm>
- 480 3. Ventegodt S, Merrick J, Andersen NJ. Quality of life theory I. The IQOL theory: an integrative
481 theory of the global quality of life concept. *ScientificWorldJournal*. 2003;3:1030–40.
- 482 4. Kahneman D, Krueger AB, Schkade DA, Schwarz N, Stone AA. A survey method for
483 characterizing daily life experience: The day reconstruction method. *Science*.
484 2004;306(5702):1776–80.
- 485 5. Costanza R, Fisher B, Ali S, Beer C, Bond L, Boumans R, et al. Quality of life: An approach
486 integrating opportunities, human needs, and subjective well-being. *Ecol Econ*. 2007;61(2–
487 3):267–76.

- 488 6. Lavrakas PJ. Encyclopedia of survey research methods. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications;
489 2008.
- 490 7. Biswas-Diener R. Practicing positive psychology coaching: assessment, activities and
491 strategies for success. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons; 2010.
- 492 8. Huppert FA. The state of wellbeing science: concepts, measures, interventions and policies.
493 Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons; 2014.
- 494 9. Barrington-Leigh C, Escande A. Measuring progress and well-being: a comparative review of
495 indicators. Soc Indic Res. 2018;135(3):893–925.
- 496 10. Skevington SM, Böhnke JR. How is subjective well-being related to quality of life? Do we
497 need two concepts and both measures? Soc Sci Med [Internet]. 2018;206:22–30. Available
498 from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.04.005>
- 499 11. Galloway AT, Fiorito L, Lee Y, Birch LL. Parental pressure, dietary patterns, and weight
500 status among girls who are “picky eaters.” J Am Diet Assoc. 2005;105(4):541–8.
- 501 12. Camfield L, Skevington SM. On subjective well-being and quality of life. J Health Psychol.
502 2008;13(6):764–75.
- 503 13. Samsurijan MS, Awang A, Arifin K, Aiyub K, Syed Zakaria SZ, Razman MR. The conceptual
504 framework for the quality of life urban village inhabitants’ assessment. J Food, Agric Environ.
505 2014;12(2):910–5.
- 506 14. Odimegwu C, Pallikadavath S, Adedini S. The cost of being a man: social and health
507 consequences of Igbo masculinity. Cult Heal Sex. 2013;15(2):219–34.
- 508 15. Diener E, Oishi S, Tay L. Advances in subjective well-being research. Nat Hum Behav.
509 2018;2(4):253–60.
- 510 16. Croft A, Atkinson C, May AM. Promoting gender equality by supporting men’s emotional
511 flexibility. Policy Insights from Behav Brain Sci. 2021;8(1):42–9.
- 512 17. Manap J, Hoesni SM, Hamzah MR. Family communication amongst conventional Malay man.
513 J Komun Malaysian J Commun. 2018;34(1):238–52.
- 514 18. Idris IB, Syed Soffian SS, Baharom M, Baharuddin UM, Hashim S, Nawi AM. Influence of
515 sociocultural beliefs and practices on contraception: a systematic review. Women Heal.
516 2022;62(8):688–99.
- 517 19. Mastor KA, Jin P, Cooper M. Malay culture and personality: a big five perspective. Am Behav
518 Sci. 2000;44(1):95–111.
- 519 20. Ngamal AZM, Amir R, Kutty FM, Mastor KA, Hisham RRIR. Exploratory factor analysis on
520 Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) with army veterans sample in Malaysia. Int J Acad Res
521 Bus Soc Sci. 2018;8(9).
- 522 21. Ajis SZM, Azlan AA, Mohamad E. Development of male well-being indicators in Malaysia
523 from intrapersonal communication perspective: exploratory factor analysis (EFA). J Komun
524 Malaysian J Commun. 2021;37(4):199–219.
- 525 22. Chua YP. Advanced research statistics: regression test, factor analysis and SEM analysis. Shah
526 Alam: McGraw-Hill Education; 2009.

- 527 23. Krejcie R V, Morgan DW. Determining sample size for research activities. *Educ Psychol*
528 *Meas.* 1970;30(3):607–10.
- 529 24. Bukhari SAR. Sample size determination using Krejcie and Morgan table. *Kenya Proj Organ*
530 [Internet]. 2021;(February):607–10. Available from:
531 <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349118299>
- 532 25. Bond TG, Fox CM. Applying the Rasch model: fundamental measurement in the human
533 sciences. 2nd ed. New York: Psychology Press; 2007
- 534 26. Awang Z. A handbook on SEM for academicians and practitioners: the step by step practical
535 guides for the beginners. Bandar Baru Bangi: Malaysia MPWS Rich Publ; 2014;p1–2.
- 536 27. Awang Z. SEM made simple: a gentle approach to learning structural equation modelling.
537 Bandar Baru Bangi: Malaysia MPWS Rich Publ. 2015;p.214.
- 538 28. Awang Z, Lim SH, Zainudin NFS. SEM made simple: a gentle approach to learning structural
539 equation modelling. (1st ed) Bandar Baru Bangi: Malaysia MPWS Rich Publ; 2018;
- 540 29. Hoque M, Awang Z, Jusoff K, Salleh F, Muda H. Social business efficiency: Instruments
541 development and validation procedure using structural equation modelling. *Int Bus Manag.*
542 2017;11(1):222–31.
- 543 30. Kashif M, Awang Z, Walsh J, Altaf U. I’m loving it but hating US: Understanding consumer
544 emotions and perceived service quality of US fast food brands. *Br Food J.* 2015;117(9):2344–
545 60.
- 546 31. Kashif M, Samsi SZM, Awang Z, Mohamad M. EXQ: measurement of healthcare experience
547 quality in Malaysian settings: A contextualist perspective. *Int J Pharm Healthc Mark.*
548 2016;10(1):27–47.
- 549 32. Hair JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, Anderson RE. Multivariate data analysis. 7th ed. Upper Sadle
550 River: Pearson Education; 2014.
- 551 33. Nunnally JC, Bernstein, IH. The assessment of reliability. *Psychom theory.* 1994;3:248–292.
- 552 34. Faruk MO, Alam F, Chowdhury KUA, Soron TR. Validation of the Bangla WHO-5 Well-
553 being Index. *Glob Ment Heal.* 2021;8:1–7.
- 554 35. Mirza E, Mohamad W, Kaundan MK, Hamzah MR, Azlan AA, Ayub SH, et al. Establishing
555 the HLS-M-Q18 short version of the European health literacy survey questionnaire for the
556 Malaysian context. *BMC Public Health.* 2020;1–7.
- 557 36. Lin MH, Chang TH, Lee YH, Wang PY, Lin LH, Hsu HC. Developing and validating the
558 nursing cultural competence scale in Taiwan. *PLoS One.* 2019;14(8):1–14.
- 559 37. Wong Li Li, Kamisah Osman, Siti Mistima Maat. Analisis faktor pengesanan bagi instrumen
560 pengetahuan guru matematik sekolah rendah dalam pentaksiran berasaskan sekolah. *J Pendidik*
561 *Malaysia* [Internet]. 2018;43(03):11–20. Available from:
562 <http://ejournals.ukm.my/jpend/article/view/43.03-02/8947>
- 563 38. Alumran A, Hou XY, Sun J, Yousef AA, Hurst C. Assessing the construct validity and
564 reliability of the parental perception on antibiotics (PAPA) scales. *BMC Public Health.*
565 2014;14(1):1–9.

566

567 **Supporting information**

568

569

570 **Author Contributions**

571 Conceptualization: EM, AAA and SZMA

572 Formal Analysis: SZMA

573 Supervision: EM and AAA

574 Writing - Original Draft Preparation: SZMA

575 Writing - Review & Editing: AAA and EM





Figure 1

Fitness Indexes
 1. ChiSq = 1792.730
 2. df = 480
 3. P-Value = .000
 4. ChiSq/df = 3.735
 5. GFI = .847
 6. AGFI = .821
 7. TLI = .882
 8. CFI = .893
 9. RMSEA = .065
 10. NFI = .860



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.05.23298123>; this version posted November 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 2




Figure 3

Fitness Indexes
 1. ChiSq = 1492.034
 2. df = 419
 3. P-Value = .000
 4. ChiSq/df = 3.561
 5. GFI = .863
 6. AGFI = .838
 7. TLI = .898
 8. CFI = .908
 9. RMSEA = .063
 10. NFI = .877





Figure 4

- Fitness Indexes**
1. ChiSq = 610.678
 2. df = 236
 3. P-Value = .000
 4. ChiSq/df = 2.588
 5. GFI = .928
 6. AGFI = .909
 7. TLI = .950
 8. CFI = .957
 9. RMSEA = .049
 10. NFI = .932



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.05.23298123>; this version posted November 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 5