CHILDREN'S
SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL
WELL-BEING
IN SINGAPORE

Research Monograph No. 7

Children's Social and Emotional Well-Being in Singapore

SHUM-CHEUNG HOI SHAN
TAN ANNIE
CHUA YEE SIAN
RUSSELL HAWKINS
ALEX LEE KA BUT
MARIA SHIU
DANIEL FUNG

June 2008

We welcome your comments, feedback and suggestions.

Contact	:	Research Officer
Address	:	Singapore Children's Society
		9 Bishan Place
		#05-02
		Singapore 579837
Telephone	:	(65) 6358 0911
Facsimile	:	(65) 6358 0936
Email	:	info@childrensociety.org.sg

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

This Monograph is the seventh published by the Singapore Children's Society, and continues to reflect the Society's concern with the well-being of children generally, in its widest sense. There is no shortage of research done around the world on the factors that affect the development of children, and their essential psychological needs are well understood. However, knowing what kind of care is developmentally good for children is one thing. Discovering whether it is being provided is another. This cannot be ascertained from research done elsewhere. It has to be done locally. This Monograph is thus an essential contribution to our understanding of the state of well-being of children in Singapore.

The authors have taken care to design the study to include parents and children in the same family. Few studies have been able to do this, yet it is a design that makes the comparison of parent and children's responses especially meaningful. The responses were obtained independently and concurrently, so do not reflect an effort by children to mirror their parents replies. It is therefore reassuring to discover that on most counts there is relatively little discrepancy between responses from parents and children, who both tend to report positively on relationships within the family. As the authors say in their summary of results, "Almost all the children liked their family members and friends, and had good relationships with these significant persons in their lives" (p.4).

This reassuring finding suggests that a proper concern with children who, for one reason or another have difficulties, needs to be kept in perspective. Children can be the victims of bullying, or maltreatment; or they may be lonely; or live anxiously in homes torn by parental disharmony; or they may be simply neglected by parents who are too busy with the necessities of work and daily life. Anyone actually working with children in need can testify to the existence of all these and other problems. Many readers will think of children they know who do not fit the optimistic pattern of the results. However, the findings in this monograph, while they should not lead to complacency, should help us realise that these difficulties tend to be the exception rather than the rule. Furthermore, because good family relationships are a means to buffer the inevitable stresses of life, the prognosis for coping with such stresses is much improved when children like their family members. Families, for such children, are part of the solution rather than part of the problem.

To bring relief and happiness to children in need is the core mission of the Singapore Children's Society. This Monograph is a step in implementing that mission, for by measuring the range of responses it will help to define such children and their needs. They are those children whose responses do not fit the reassuring pattern of the majority, and they will alert us to problems. The authors are to be congratulated for a comprehensive piece of work, which I believe will be of use to a wider readership, and, as the Chair of the Research Committee, it is my pleasure also to thank the Society for its far-sighted commitment to research of this nature. Knowledge of the state of the family in general is very necessary to ground specific service provisions and efforts to realise the mission of the Society, and this Monograph is, I believe, a worthy step in that direction.

Dr John Elliott
Chairman, Research Committee
Singapore Children's Society
13 April 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Mrs Shum-Cheung Hoi Shan received her Bachelor of Social Sciences (Honours in Psychology) degree from the National University of Singapore. She is a Senior Research Officer at the Singapore Children's Society, and has co-authored another monograph entitled *The Parenting Project: Disciplinary Practices, Child Care Arrangements and Parenting Practices in Singapore* published in 2006. Her other research interests include parental and peer social support for adolescents and maternal attachment among preschoolers.

Ms Tan Annie received her Bachelor of Social Sciences (Honours in Economics) degree from the National University of Singapore. She was a Research Officer at the Singapore Children's Society from 2004 to 2007. She is currently a Behavioural Sciences Research Officer at the Behavioural Sciences Unit of Home Team Academy. Her other research interests include resilience and well-being in children and adults, as well as school and organisational bullying.

Mr Chua Yee Sian received his Bachelor of Social Sciences (Honours in Sociology) degree from the National University of Singapore. He was a Research Officer at the Singapore Children's Society from 2001 to 2004. He has co-authored two other monographs entitled *Emotional Maltreatment of Children in Singapore: Professional and Public Perceptions* published in 2002, and *Child Sexual Abuse in Singapore: Professional and Public Perceptions* published in 2003. His other research interests include voluntary childlessness and parenting styles.

Professor Russell Hawkins is the Associate Dean and the Director of Clinical Programs (Psychology) at the James Cook University Singapore. He is also a member of the Research Committee at the Singapore Children's Society.

Mr Alex Lee Ka But is a former Chief Executive Officer of the National Council of Social Service from 1994 to 1997. He was also a member of the Ministry of Community Development, Youth and Sports Juvenile Homes Community Link from 2000 to 2006, and has been an advisor to the Juvenile Court since 2002. Mr Lee has been an Executive Committee member of the Children's Society since 1999, being involved in the Society's direct services through its various standing committees.

Mrs Maria Shiu is a member of the Research & Advocacy Standing Committee and Research Committee member at the Singapore Children's Society.

Associate Professor Daniel Fung is a Senior Consultant Psychiatrist and Chief of the Department of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry in the Institute of Mental Health Singapore. He is also an Adjunct Associate Professor at both Duke-NUS Graduate Medical School and Division of Psychology, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Nanyang Technological University. A/Prof Fung is currently a member of the Research & Advocacy Standing Committee and Research Committee at the Singapore Children's Society.

LIST OF TABLES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview of the study

In Singapore, children's physical, mental and cognitive development and even education on the arts have attracted research and planning efforts. What seems to be lacking is research into social and emotional well-being. As part of its mission to bring relief and happiness to children in need, the Singapore Children's Society has decided to champion children's social and emotional well-being. If children grow up to become happier and more sociable adults, Singapore will also become a better home for all.

This study examined children's social and emotional well-being, as perceived by children and their parents. According to Keyes (1998), social well-being refers to one's circumstance and functioning in society. Individuals with a high degree of social well-being are usually able to connect with others and to form and maintain relationships (Donnelly et al., 2001). As such, social well-being in our study was judged in relation to the quality of relationships between the child and his or her family members and friends. Family members included the mother, father, siblings and grandparents. Friends included all of the child's friends in and out of school.

Emotional well-being was defined as a balance of positive over negative feelings (Keyes, 1998). In the present study, we examined children's experiences of both positive and negative feelings.

We have assumed that if self-reports were favourable (relations were perceived as good, feelings were rated in positive ways) and problems were not mentioned, then social and emotional well-being could be regarded as good. This is not to deny the possibility that some adverse perceptions may exist and be concealed, so that an appearance of greater harmony was presented than really existed. But as other studies have found children and parents very willing to indicate sources of difficulty, it was unlikely that there was enough bias to socially desirable answers to create a limitation on interpretation. This is especially so as there was a general independent agreement among parents and children on most items.

It should also be stressed that because these results were averaged across a large and representative sample, they were likely to be typical, though there will be many individual departures from the average family.

Methodology

Participants were drawn from 906 families, and comprised parents (mother or father) and one of their children, a total of 1812 respondents. Face-to-face interviews were conducted at the participants' homes by trained interviewers from a private research company. There were separate questionnaires for parents and children, and the interviews were conducted separately. It is a particular strength of the methodology of this study that children and

parents were from the same families, yet were interviewed separately; so the analysis is based on data from parent-child dyads. It was stressed to respondents that information was sought in confidence and that identities of participating families would neither be disclosed nor reported.

A systematic random sampling method was adopted. Households were randomly selected from the Residential Listings 2005/2006 (Yellow Pages (Singapore) Limited, 2005). Selected households were included in the study if the following criteria were met:
1. the parent to be interviewed was a Singaporean or Singapore Permanent Resident
2. the child was between the age of six and 12 years, and was a student in a local primary school (excluding special schools or homeschooling).

The sample aimed to be representative of Singapore school children and free from bias by over-representation from particular ethnic groups, schools, catchment areas or socio-economic classes. Quota restrictions based on ethnicity, gender and education level of the child were therefore used, having been determined by reference to census data in the General Household Survey 2005 (Department of Statistics, 2006) and the educational statistics digest (Ministry of Education, 2006).

The questionnaire consisted of both quantitative and open-ended questions, with items related to the quality of the children's relationships with friends, siblings, parents and grandparents, as well as items on children's general feelings and emotions, a total of six scales. Reliability coefficients for these scales ranged from .45 to .79.

Key Findings
The findings suggested that overall, the state of children's social and emotional well-being was positive. Children generally reported good relationships with their family and friends. A vast majority of the children said they often felt happy and had fun, and they seldom cried. Parents' perceptions of their children's state of social and emotional well-being were by and large similar to their children's self-reports.

On parent-child relations, children generally thought that their parents were right to scold or punish them when they did. For instance, 68.9% of the children (608 of them) felt that their fathers were right to do so sometimes or more often, and 90.2% of the children (812 of them) felt the same way with mothers. These findings demonstrated that most of the children did perceive the scolding or punishment as being just.

On the other hand, 49 fathers (10.9%) and 33 mothers (7.3%) seldom or never thought that they were right in scolding or punishing their children. Perhaps for these parents, it was more important to remain objective and calm and to understand more about the situation before deciding how best to discipline their children, so they saw scolding and punishment as failure on their part. As expected, 86.6% of the parents who never or seldom thought that they were right in scolding or punishing children indicated that they never or seldom meted out punishment (71 of them indicated so). Only 13.4% or 11 parents said that they did so sometimes.

Another point to note was that a handful of parents (less than 1%) did not know if they were right in scolding or punishing their children. This reflected the dilemma facing some parents, who struggled to strike a healthy balance between disciplining their children and maintaining a good parent-child relationship.

Two parents (a father and a mother) in the present study felt that their children did not like them, and six parents (four fathers and two mothers) said that they had poor relationships with their children. However, the children of these parents almost always said that they liked their parents and had good relationships with them. This observation was not specific to families belonging to any particular income or ethnic group, though a common characteristic was that there was more than one child in these families. This finding underscored the importance of effective parent-child communication, and also highlighted the problem of a lack of parental insight and confidence of the quality of parent-child relationship.

The finding that an overwhelming majority of the parents (98.3% or 442 fathers; 97.8% or 445 mothers) said they taught their children about good manners and politeness sometimes or more often is heartening, the more so since the children's perspectives were consistent with their parents' self-report.

When the responses of children who had no siblings were compared with those who had siblings, no difference in social or emotional well-being was observed, except that children with no siblings tended to share secrets and feelings with grandparents more frequently, and also argued with grandparents more. The finding suggests that in families with more than one child, the children's social and emotional well-being was neither compromised nor enhanced.

Although children's social and emotional well-being seemed to be good in general, the study has found that 6.4% of the children (58 of them) did not find it easy to make friends. Moreover, 9.6% of the children (87 of them) felt very sad often or very often and 8.4% of the children (76 of them) worried about things very often. Although the percentages were relatively small, they are large numbers in absolute terms if extrapolated nationally. Therefore, it is still a cause for concern that some children in Singapore have problems relating to others, or harbour negative feelings and emotions on a fairly regular basis.

Children's emotional well-being was mostly unrelated to the ethnicity, income or the employment status of the parents, but some income and ethnic differences were observed. Parents from higher income families tended to help their children with homework more frequently than parents from low income families. On ethnic differences, Indian children indicated that their mothers (average frequency 4.1) helped them with homework more frequently compared with Chinese children (average frequency 3.6). Indian children also tended to share secrets and feelings with their mothers (average frequency 3.2), spend time with their fathers more frequently (average frequency 4.2), and have better sibling relations (average frequency 3.7) than Chinese children (average frequencies 2.8, 4.0 and 3.3 respectively). Although the ethnic differences between the Indians and the Chinese were statistically significant, they were very small in absolute figures.

Differences in parents' employment status were also compared. The findings showed that mothers from single-income families spent comparatively more time with their children than mothers from dual-income families. Note that 92.3% of the mothers (409 of them) from these 443 single-income families were stay-at-home mothers, which explains why they could spend more time with their children. However, it is important to emphasise that although a significant difference was observed in statistical terms, children from *both* single-and dual-income families reported that their mothers often spend time with them. Perhaps this finding could ease some of the guilt working mothers can feel about not being able to spend more time with their children. The children in this study clearly did not perceive themselves as being deprived of time with their mothers just because the latter were in the workforce.

Conclusion

In summary, parents and children in the present study had mainly positive perceptions of the children's social and emotional well-being. Almost all the children liked their family members and friends, and had good relationships with these significant persons in their lives. It could be that good social well-being may in some ways contribute to a child's emotional well-being, since having a strong supportive network of family and friends usually does have a buffering effect. However, this study did not address causal factors in these relationships.

On the other hand, our study has also shown that a small proportion of children in Singapore did seem to have relationship issues and experience negative feelings and emotions often. These findings suggest that programmes for enhancing the social and emotional well-being of children are both relevant and needed. For instance, the StrengthKidz programme by the Daybreak Family Service Centre, and the Let Every Aspect Progress programme (LEAP) by the Singapore Children's Society focus on developing positive self-esteem and social skills among children (Singapore Children's Society, 2007).

With the findings of the current study, the Children's Society will be looking at planning more programmes, both preventive and developmental in nature, as well as expanding our public education effort in further enhancing the social and emotional well-being of children in Singapore. This study suggests that identifying the children in need of help might be important, to avoid diluting our efforts by extending them indiscriminately.

Children's Society has compiled the CSEW (Children's Social & Emotional Well-being) Directory in 2004 (which was subsequently updated in 2007) that lists programmes and publications available from non-profit organisations in Singapore. These are programmes that aim at enhancing the social and emotional well-being of children. Organisations may find the CSEW Directory useful as a point of reference to identify possible service gaps to enhance children's social and emotional well-being, and to find out if the needs identified by this study are being met. A copy of the CSEW Directory can be downloaded from the Children's Society's website at http://www.childrensociety.org.sg.

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION: THE SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL WELL-BEING OF CHILDREN

This monograph on children's social and emotional well-being in Singapore is another research publication by the Singapore Children's Society. Table 1 shows a list of monographs published by the Children's Society. These monographs can be freely downloaded from the Society's website at *http://www.childrensociety.org.sg*.

Table 1:   List of previous monographs published by the Singapore Children's Society

Monograph No.	Titles & Descriptions
1	*Public Perceptions of Child Abuse and Neglect in Singapore* published in December 1996 confronts the average Singaporean's thinking towards child abuse and neglect.
2	*Professional and Public Perceptions of Child Abuse and Neglect in Singapore: An Overview* published in April 2000 focuses on the attitudes of professionals towards abuse or neglect, and their opinions on the experience and reporting of child abuse and neglect.
3	*Professional and Public Perceptions of Physical Child Abuse and Neglect in Singapore* published in April 2000 focuses specifically on the attitudes of professionals and the public towards physical child abuse and neglect.
4	*Emotional Maltreatment of Children in Singapore: Professional and Public Perceptions* published in February 2002 focuses on the attitudes of professionals and the public towards emotional child maltreatment.
5	*Child Sexual Abuse in Singapore: Professional and Public Perceptions* published in June 2003 focuses specifically on the attitudes of professionals and the public towards child sexual abuse.
6	*The Parenting Project: Disciplinary Practices, Child Care Arrangements and Parenting Practices in Singapore* published in October 2006 looks into how children are disciplined, who their main caregivers are and how parents interact with their children in general.

Since 2003, the research focus of the Children's Society has moved from child abuse and neglect to broader and more mainstream issues relating to children's well-being. The monograph on parenting published in 2006 was a step towards gathering descriptive information about ordinary Singaporean family life and how parents raise their children. The current study is yet another initiative, in this case to aid understanding of the state of local children's social and emotional well-being in general. The research findings from these studies are intended to assist the Children's Society in its mission to improve the well-being of children.

The Importance of Children's Perspectives

As with our previous research on parenting (Shum-Cheung et al., 2006), the present study was interested in hearing the views of children by involving them as participants in the research. Ironically, research on child-related issues has typically included persons other than the child as informants, such as the parents, teachers or other caregivers. This could have stemmed from a belief that children may not be accurate or reliable informants. However, researchers in the field have increasingly come to acknowledge the value of children's perspectives (Ennew, 2006; Milkie et al., 1997; Oppenheim et al., 1997), especially on issues which directly concern them. In particular for issues related to well-being, most researchers prefer to grant their participants "best-expert status of their own phenomenological experience" (Kelly, 1955; Lent, 2004; McGregor & Little, 1998, p.508). Some researchers have also cautioned against the assumption that parents' responses are necessarily "true" responses (Kaufman et al., 1991, in Milkie et al., 1997).

Because of the value of hearing the voice of the child, both children's and parents' views on children's well-being were obtained in the present study. The children in the sample were also the offspring of the parent participants, making the data from parents and children directly comparable.

Definitions of Social and Emotional Well-being

The measurement of human health or well-being is a complex issue, with it being a multifaceted concept. Well-being is usually described and measured based on five dimensions: physical, social, mental, emotional and spiritual (Donnelly et al., 2001). The present study examined two aspects of well-being of children, namely social and emotional well-being.

According to Keyes (1998), social well-being is the positive appraisal of one's circumstance and functioning in society. Individuals with a high degree of social well-being are usually able to connect with others and form and maintain relationships (Donnelly et al., 2001). On the other hand, emotional well-being is related to the feelings and reactions of an individual, and is defined as a balance of positive over negative feelings (Keyes, 1998).

The association between social and emotional well-being is well-documented. According to Bowlby (1988), the "capacity to make intimate emotional bonds with other individuals [is] a principal feature of effective personality functioning and mental health" (p. 121). Having positive relations with others is also thought to be a "primary good in life, central to positive human health" (Ryff, 1995). For instance, research has shown that socially involved persons are happier, healthier and live longer than people who are socially isolated (Berscheid & Reis, 1998). In addition, the theory of social provisions (Weiss, 1974) posits that relationships exist to meet the various social needs of individuals, such as affection, companionship, enhancement of self-worth, and guidance. Without good, supportive relationships that do meet these needs, a person will invariably experience negative emotions, which is a manifestation of poor emotional well-being.

Conversely, emotional well-being may also affect one's social well-being. For example, people who are happy or have a good self-concept may find it easier to form and maintain relationship with others, as they are usually desirable partners in a relationship. After all, it is easier to make friends and sustain the friendship with people who are happy, or at least have stable moods most of the time; rather than with people who are perpetually depressed and anxious. Interestingly, the same principle seems to apply for parent-child relationships, as research has shown that parents tended to treat their children differently, depending on the children's personality or even physical attractiveness (see Harris, 1995).

Measuring Social and Emotional Well-being
Social and emotional well-being can be measured in a myriad of ways. Some studies have included as a measure of social well-being an evaluation of the quality of one's relationship to society and community as a whole (e.g. Keyes, 1998). According to this view, socially healthy individuals feel that they are a part of society. In other instances, social well-being may be ascertained by looking at whether a person is hopeful about the condition and future of society, and if they care about the kind of world that they live in (Keyes, 1998). However, this latter view is more abstract and would require a deeper understanding of society and its functions. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, where we were interested in the social well-being of primary school children, we focussed on the quality of relationship between the child and significant persons in their lives.

To find out who comprises the network of significant persons in a child's life, Furman and Buhrmester (1985) conducted a pilot study, where they asked a group of 20 children who the most important persons in their lives were. All the children mentioned parents, siblings and friends, while 60% mentioned grandparents. In a more recent local newspaper report, parents, siblings, schoolmates and grandparents were named as persons being closest to the child, in that order (The Straits Times, 2000). As such, the present study examined the quality of children's relationships with their mother, father, siblings, grandparents and friends. Relationships with mothers and fathers were looked at independently as the nature of mother-child and father-child relationships were expected to be different (Milkie et al., 1997; Videon, 2005).

Compared to social well-being, measures of emotional well-being are even more varied, depending on whether one takes the clinical or psychological perspective. In the clinical tradition, emotional well-being is measured by looking at whether a person has signs and symptoms of depression, or is in distress (e.g. Cai et al., 2006; Cudina & Obradovic, 2001; Thoits, 1992; Yeo et al., 2007). For example, in a local study, Yeo and colleagues (2007) measured emotional well-being by administering an emotional distress scale, which included questions like whether the respondents "feel very tense" or "feel like crying for no reason". Another study looked at the presence of depressive symptoms such as whether the child "has headaches" and "is manifesting anxiety" as an indication of poor emotional well-being (Cudina & Obradovic, 2001). In the psychological view, however, emotional well-being is often the subjective evaluation of life in terms of satisfaction and positive feelings (see Keyes, 1998). For instance, some studies have asked participants to specify the extent to which they experienced a range of positive and negative feelings (Watson et al., 1988), and that the prevalence of positive over negative feelings would be an indication

of emotional well-being. In the present study, we adapted items from both the clinical and psychological perspectives as measures of emotional well-being, by including items that reflect the existence of depressive symptoms as well as general positive and negative feelings. Like previous research on emotional well-being, the measure of emotional well-being in the present study was founded on participants' overall judgment of their feelings, based on a "sum-over" of their different life domains and across time periods (Diener et al., 2002). The advantage of gathering information on general feelings, over making reference to a specific event or time period, is that general positive or negative feelings are more trait like, which makes them relatively stable (Diener et al., 1999). That is, general positive and negative feelings are less likely to be susceptible to drastic changes over time.

Social Well-being: Children's Network of Significant Persons

A child's social world is made up of many close relationships with family members and friends. Presumably, children obtain different types of support in different relationships. For instance, parent-child relationship would be characterised mainly by the provision of advice and instrumental aid (although good parent-child relationships are capable of meeting many other needs); while peer relationships would involve mainly companionship, and the opportunity to affirm one's competence or value (Weiss, 1974). In the previous sections, we have looked at how social well-being may contribute to emotional well-being, and vice versa. In the remaining sections of this chapter, we shall explore the nature of children's relationships with significant persons in their lives.

Parent-child relationship

The parent-child relationship is surely one of the most important relationships in a person's life. It surpasses most other relationships in duration, is highly resilient, and it usually endures after the death of parents (Noack & Buhl, 2004). Remarks like "I wonder what my mother would say about this" and "my father would not have approved of that" tell so much about the lasting nature of parental influence on a child. The parent-child relationship is vital also because at its best, it is capable of meeting all of the six basic provisions Weiss (1974) proposes to occur in relationships. A parent-child relationship could provide a sense of security and basis for intimate disclosure, a dependable bond, the enhancement of self-worth, companionship and the sharing of experiences, tangible aid and advice, and the opportunity for nurturance (i.e. taking care of another person, where reciprocity is commonplace in a good parent-child relationship).

It is appropriate to examine relationships with mothers and fathers separately, as the nature and functions of both relationships are inherently different, even across cultures. In both non-Asian and Asian cultures, mothers are believed to specialise in the expressive role, are more person-oriented and focus more on the social and emotional well-being of the family (Videon, 2005; Youniss & Smollar, 1985). Historically, some researchers have taken an extreme view by positing that mothers may "have the sole influence on their children's psychological health" (Videon, 2005, p. 58). On the other hand, fathers are usually portrayed as the ones specialising in the instrumental role. Fathers are primarily involved in meeting the family's financial needs, although increasingly, more of them are being depicted as the "new father", who is nurturant and heavily involved in child care

(Videon, 2005). Local studies have also empirically demonstrated the role differentiation between fathers and mothers, whereby mothers tended to perform more of the child care duties and spend more time interacting with the children (Quah, 1998, 1999; Shum-Cheung et al., 2006). The present study will look into the quality of mother-child and father-child relationships independently.

Grandparent-child relationship

The grandparent-child relationship has undergone major transformations through the decades. In the West in the 1950s, grandparents, particularly grandmothers, purportedly held "stricter and more authoritarian views than mothers" (Smith & Drew, 2002, p. 143). By the 1980s, grandparents seem to have taken a more supportive role, tending to show love and care towards the grandchildren in more explicit ways. Grandparents are also generally more lenient towards the grandchildren compared to parents, who are expected to be fairly strict, even by the grandparents themselves (Smith & Drew, 2002). Therefore, grandparents obviously play a role that is quite distinct from the parents.

Grandparents often feature prominently as child care givers, after the parents (Quah, 1998; Shum-Cheung et al., 2006). The fact that 21.1% of the population lived in three-generation families consisting of grandparents, parents and children in Singapore (Quah, 1998) may have created ample opportunities for grandparent-child bonding, as well as a platform for grandparents to impart values to the grandchildren. Even in instances where the grandparents and grandchildren are living apart, the relationship could still be nurtured through frequent visits or through daytime child care provisions while both parents are at work. This arrangement is typically identified as the modified extended family (Quah, 1998), where the kinship network is kept alive through easy accessibility of grandparents to grandchildren and vice versa. This enables grandparents to exercise their influence on the grandchildren in important ways. In looking at the quality of grandparent-child relationship, the present study focused on the ways in which grandparents play a part in the children's lives.

Sibling relationship, friendship & school bullying

Siblings and friends could be considered as peers, as they are members of the same generation (von Salisch, 2000). Hence, it would make sense to examine sibling relationships vis-à-vis friendships.

Sibling relationships enjoy outstanding longevity after parent-child relationship. The emotional bonds between siblings can be very strong, usually second in strength only to parent-child relationships (Irish, 1964). Siblings can provide companionship, tangible assistance, and emotional support for one another, and in the case of older siblings, they can even compensate for absent or distant parents for their younger siblings (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985). However, to children in particular, friends are no less important than siblings. In fact, one would imagine that friends may play a more vital role than siblings for a child, as the child can still do well without a sibling, but never without a friend. Sullivan's interpersonal theory (1953) views friendship as being crucial to the socialisation

of children, and this view is supported by empirical evidence. For instance, one study (although no causality was established) found that having a close friendship seemed to help preadolescents develop a more positive self-esteem, which persisted into adulthood more than 10 years later (Bagwell et al., 1998).

Together, sibling relations and friendship play an important role in the social and emotional development of children (Bukowski et al., 1996; Dunn, 2005). Being in such relationships between contemporaries create opportunities for developing social skills like conflict resolution and perspective-taking (Dunn, 1993). In the past decade, re-conceptualisation of the process of how children learn about societal norms and acquire desirable values (i.e. the socialisation of children) has put more emphasis on the influence siblings and peers have on children, over and above that of parents (Harris, 1998). The argument, somewhat controversially, is that children, being similar to siblings and peers on most counts such as age, beliefs, and developmental level, are more likely to align themselves with siblings and peers. As such, children usually take on with much ease the values that are prevalent within their community of younger persons. According to Harris (1998), parental influence prevails predominantly within the family, with possibly less influence in contexts outside the family as compared to the peer group.

Just as sibling relations and friendships serve important functions such as being a source of companionship, providing tangible assistance and a sense of security and intimacy, both types of relationships are also characterised by conflict and rivalry. This is especially marked in sibling relationships, where brothers and sisters are often in competition for parental love and attention. In this context, perceived favouritism may well be real rather than only perceived. For example, a study has reported that only one-third of the parents interviewed said that they "feel a similar intensity of affection for their children when they were on average four and seven years old" (Dunn, 1993, p. 83). Research has also shown that parents tended to favour the younger child (see Harris, 1998, for a review). Children, even very young ones, are usually highly sensitive to such differential parental treatment, which could have negative consequences. For instance, children who experienced less parental affection than their siblings were more likely to be depressed or anxious (Dunn et al., 1990). Apparently, what matters is not whether a child feels loved by the parents per se. Rather, it is how loved a child feels relative to his or her siblings that seems to be more important and consequential. Therefore, the present study included an item that explored the extent to which children perceived favouritism, and whether this perception was associated with children's ratings on social and emotional well-being.

Finally, school bullying was an area we looked into briefly, as it is an important aspect of children's peer relations, being closely linked to children's social and emotional well-being. Invariably, the experience of being bullied would be emotionally tormenting for any child. This study adapted items on school bullying from a study by Tan and colleagues (2007), where physical, verbal and relational bullying were included as the main forms of bullying (Rigby, 2003). Of interest would be who the victims sought help from, and whether they found the support rendered to them useful.

Overview of the Study

The study examined parents' and children's perspectives on children's state of social and emotional well-being.

According to Keyes (1998), social well-being is the appraisal of one's circumstance and functioning in society. Individuals with a high degree of social well-being are usually able to connect with others and to form and maintain relationships (Donnelly et al., 2001). As such, social well-being in our study was related to the quality of relationships between the child and his or her family members and friends. Family members included the mother, father, siblings and grandparents. Friends included all of the child's friends in and out of school.

Emotional well-being was defined as a balance of positive over negative feelings (Keyes, 1998). In the present study, we examined children's experiences of both positive and negative feelings. Items were also included to explore the frequency with which children experienced depressive symptoms, such as crying.

We have assumed that if self-reports on items relating to the above dimensions were favourable (relations were perceived as good, feelings were rated in positive ways) and problems were not mentioned, then social and emotional well-being could be regarded as good. This is not to deny the possibility that some adverse perceptions may exist and be concealed, so that an appearance of greater harmony was presented than really existed. But as other studies have found children and parents very willing to indicate sources of difficulty, it was unlikely that there was enough bias to socially desirable answers to create a limitation on interpretation. This is especially when there was generally agreement among parent and children on most of the items in this study, as will be discussed in Chapter 3.

It should also be stressed that because these results were averaged across a large and representative sample, they were likely to be typical, though there will be many individual departures from the average family.

Focus Groups

Preparations for this quantitative study included conducting an exploratory study on the social and emotional status of children from primary three to six in Singapore. The study involved six focus group discussions conducted in 2003 with a convenience sample of 52 participants. The focus groups involved 23 teachers and social workers/counsellors, 22 primary three and six students and seven parents. The objective of the focus group discussions was to find out more about the professionals', parents' and children's perceptions on the state of social and emotional well-being of children from primary three to six. Discussions of this nature were critically important because they guided the subsequent design of the survey component of the study, which could not sensibly rely on already published research elsewhere, but needed to be constructed for the local context.

Results of the focus group discussions showed that parent-child communication centred mostly around schoolwork (e.g. "have you done your homework?") and school-related activities (e.g. "what did you learn at school today?"), or adults' instructions to children (e.g. "have you had your meal/bath?"). Seldom, if ever, did parents and children discuss feelings and emotions.

While children looked forward to being with their friends in school, a number of children were concerned with stress from schoolwork. In isolated cases, some children were so stressed that they had suicidal thoughts. Some of the children's concerns included friendship problems (e.g. friends who betrayed them or refused to befriend them) or bullying issues (e.g. being called names). Interestingly, some children reported not feeling lonely when they were left alone at home for a long time- they actually enjoyed the freedom when their parents were not around.

Based on the findings of the focus group discussions, items pertaining to parent-child relationships in relation to schoolwork as well as school bullying were included in the quantitative study. A separate detailed report of the findings from the focus group discussions is available upon request.

Although a section on school bullying was included in the study, it was not the intention of this study to offer an in-depth description of bullying among children in Singapore. More comprehensive studies on bullying among primary and secondary school students have been done in two separate surveys conducted by the Singapore Children's Society(Koh & Tan, 2008[1]). The reason for including a section on school bullying in the present study was because it is a negative experience that has implications on a child's well-being. The questions on school bullying in this study, which were certainly non-exhaustive, were therefore in place to provide a more complete picture of the children's state of well-being.

Pilot Study
Draft versions of the questionnaires were administered to 17 children who were clients of the Singapore Children's Society. The children were led through the questionnaires and asked to provide feedback on items that they appeared to find ambiguous. The children also commented on whether it was easy to give responses using the rating scale. Subsequently, some of the items as well as the anchors on the rating scale were re-worded to make them comprehensible to the youngest children in the group, who were six-year-olds. None of the participants in the pilot studies were included in the sample for the main study.

---

[1]A monograph on the findings of the two surveys on school bullying, entitled *Bullying in Singapore Schools*, will be available for download at *www.childrensociety.org.sg* from July 2008.

Procedure

Approval to conduct the study was obtained from the Singapore Children's Society Ethics Review Committee.

Face-to-face interviews were conducted at the participants' homes by trained interviewers from a private research company. There were separate questionnaires for parents and children, and the interviews were conducted in the same sitting but separately, allowing the analysis to be based on data from parent-child dyads.

Systematic random sampling was adopted in recruiting participants for the study. Households were randomly selected from the Residential Listings 2005/2006 (Yellow Pages (Singapore) Limited, 2005). The sampling locations included Housing Development Board (HDB) flats (public housing in Singapore), landed properties, private apartments and condominiums subject to security clearance. In all, 180 sampling points (household addresses) were selected and at each sampling point, five interviews were conducted. After each successful interview, the interviewer skipped three doors before approaching the next household to ascertain if it met the sampling criteria. Households were selected to participate in the study if the following criteria were met:

1. the parent was a Singaporean or Singapore Permanent Resident
2. the child was between the age of six and 12, and was a student in a local primary school (excluding special schools or homeschooling).

The sample aimed to be representative of Singapore school children without bias by over-representation from particular ethnic groups, schools, catchment areas or socio-economic classes. Quota restrictions based on ethnicity, gender and education level of the child were used, having been determined with reference to recent census data (General Household Survey 2005, Department of Statistics, 2006) and the educational statistics digest (Ministry of Education, 2006).

The interview involved asking participants a list of questions from a structured questionnaire that required both quantitative and qualitative responses. Consent for the child's participation was obtained from the parent, who was also a participant in the study. The voluntary nature of the study was emphasised to both parents and children, and it was made known to them that they could decline participation at any point of the interview.

To safeguard the confidentiality of the information, the names of the participants were not included in the questionnaires. However, each set of the completed questionnaire was given a code for ease of tracking of the participants who responded. Tracking provision was necessary in the rare event that participants needed to be re-contacted to verify certain responses they had provided. The participant name list and the completed questionnaires were kept separately, so that the participants could not be easily identified. It was stressed at the point of interview that information was sought in confidence and that the identities of participating families would neither be disclosed nor reported.

Before the start of each interview, the purpose of the survey was explained and trained interviewers gave participants a brief description of the format of the questionnaire and the rating scale used. The interviewers then took the participants through every item on the questionnaire and recorded their responses accordingly. Each interview took no more than 30 minutes to complete. At the end of each interview, participants were thanked for their time and were asked if they had any feedback or questions pertaining to the research. The parents then received a token of appreciation for their time.

Sample Description

Participants were 906 parents (456 mothers and 450 fathers) and their respective children (449 girls and 457 boys), a total of 1812 respondents. The range of the parents' age was between 25 and 65 (average = 41.0 years), while the children were between the age of six and 12 (average = 9.3 years).

The sample included the four major ethnic groups in Singapore – Chinese (70%), Malay (19%), Indian (10%) and Others (1%). 61% of the parents interviewed had secondary school education and beyond. 95% of the fathers in the sample was employed, compared with 52% for mothers. Other demographic statistics can be found in Table 22 in Appendix A.

Measures

The questionnaires consisted of both quantitative and open-ended questions, with items related to the quality of the children's relationships with friends, siblings, parents and grandparents. These were thought to be reflections of a child's social well-being. Questions were also asked on a child's general feelings and emotions, which were related to a child's emotional well-being. Attempts were made to find a scale relating to social and emotional well-being that could be administered to young children. However, most of the scales on well-being were designed for adolescents. Therefore, specific items that measured the quality of relationships (social well-being) and aspects of emotional well-being were taken from several established scales, and the wording of the items simplified so that even the youngest participant (six-year-olds) could understand the items. Items that measured social well-being were adapted from the Network of Relationships Inventory (NRI; Furman & Buhrmester, 1985), Multidimenstional Students' Life Satisfaction Scale (MSLSS; Greenspoon & Saklofske, 1997), Parent-Child Relationship Scale (PCR; Vazsonyi & Flannery, 1997) and Friendship Quality Questionnaire (FQQ; Parker & Asher, 1993). Items that measured emotional well-being were adapted from the Singapore Children's Emotional Distress Scale (SCEDS; Cai et al., 2006) and the Piers-Harris Self-Concept (P-H) scale (Piers, 1984), in particular the subscales on happiness and satisfaction and anxiety for the P-H scale.

The parents and children were asked to indicate how frequently each activity described in the items had occurred. All the items were rated on a 5-point scale, with "1" being never, "3" being sometimes and "5" being many times. Responses from all the participants were averaged, such that an average frequency (between 1 and 5) was calculated for each item. The higher the average frequency, the more frequently an activity described in the item had occurred. Parents and children responded to almost identical sets of questionnaires, with minor differences in the wordings. For instance, an item like "how often do you play and have fun with your child" in the questionnaire for parents was phrased as "how often do you play and have fun with your father (or mother)" in the children's questionnaire.

The questionnaires were translated into Chinese and Malay, and back-translations were done to ensure the accuracy of the translated versions. The questionnaires for parents and children, in English, are in Appendices C and D respectively. The Chinese and Malay versions of the questionnaires are available upon request.

In this study, we have collected information on what children's and parents' perspectives were in relation to children's state of social and emotional well-being. However, for the purpose of reporting the findings, the emphasis will be on the children's perspectives, unless otherwise specified; and we shall mention the parents' perspectives in instances where it is necessary to compare them with the children's.

Preliminary Data Analyses

The demographic characteristics of the children and parents in the sample, as shown in Table 22 in Appendix A, were compared with those of the Singapore population census statistics (Department of Statistics, 2006; 2007). The composition of the gender of the parents and children, and the ethnicity and the education levels of the children in the present study were similar to that of the Singapore population. The proportion of residents in Singapore having attained secondary education and beyond was the same as that for the parents in the present study at 61%.

However, for the housing types, there were slight deviations from the national population. There were more families living in 4- and 5-room/executive flats compared in the present study, and fewer families living in 3-room or smaller flats and private housing. There was no comparable statistics for parents' income, as the present study obtained information on individual parents' monthly income, instead of monthly household income of working persons in the household as presented in the census. Nonetheless, housing type could still be a useful indication of the socio-economic status of the families, as parents' combined monthly income was found to increase with bigger housing types in the present study.

As shown in Table 2, there seemed to be under-representation of families from the lowest and highest income brackets. However, given that the present study interviewed families with children between the age of six and 12 years, it may not be unusual to find few families with young children from the highest and lowest income groups. Firstly, there could be few parents of young children under 12 years old who are earning very high salaries, assuming income rises with seniority and experience, and therefore age. Secondly, families in the lowest income bracket in Singapore could be made up of mostly elderly singles or elderly couples with no children. For instance, according to the General Household Survey (2005), the majority of the singles lived in 3-room flats, and elderly persons above 75 years old are more likely to live in 1- or 2-room flats than Singaporeans from the other age groups. Therefore, the deviation from proportions found in the national population may not imply a lack of representativeness of our sample, given that we had focussed on families with young children.

Table 2: Housing types of parents in the present study, compared with the Singapore population census statistics

Demographic Variables		The Present Study		National Population[2]
		N	%	%
Housing Types	1- or 2-room flat	19	2.1	4.4
	3-room flat	164	18.1	20.7
	4-room flat	368	40.6	32.5
	5-room/Executive flat	309	34.1	26.9
	Condominium/Private Flat	18	2.0	9.4
	Landed Property	28	3.1	5.5
	Others	-	-	0.6
	Total	906	100	100

[2] Figures were calculated for this study using data from the Yearbook of Statistics Singapore 2007, based on the housing types of adults between 25 and 64 years old, which is the approximate age range of parents in this study.

Reliability analyses were carried out separately for the parents' and children's datasets, on the scales that measured the quality of relationships with friends, siblings, father, mother and grandparents, as well as emotional well-being. Only the reliability coefficients for the scales on friendship and sibling relationships were found to be satisfactory (close to or above .70). The reliability coefficients for all the scales ranged from .45 to .79, which are shown in Table 23 in Appendix B.

In view of the less-than-desirable reliability coefficients, separate principal component analyses with varimax rotation were performed using the parents' and children's datasets. The purpose of the factor analyses was to see if individual items forming the different scales could be re-categorised differently and meaningfully, such that higher reliability coefficients could be yielded. Results of the factor analyses saw two or three distinct factors emerge for each of the scales on social and emotional well-being. However, the proportion of variance explained by the factors from each scale was only moderate (between 43% and 62%), and the reliability coefficients of most of these factors were still unsatisfactory at less than .70. The results are shown in Tables 24 to 34 in Appendix B.

Principal component analyses with varimax rotation were then carried out with all the 52 individual quantitative response items in the parents' questionnaire, and with all of the 63 quantitative response items in the children's questionnaire. This was regardless of the scale to which they belonged, with separate analyses for the parents' and children's datasets. This resulted in 14 factors being extracted from the parents' dataset, and 17 factors from the children's dataset. The proportion of variance explained by these factors was again only moderate (60% of the variance explained for the children's data; 58% of the variance explained for the parents' data). The results are shown in Tables 35 and 36 in Appendix B. In view of these, it was decided that the factors will not be used in subsequent analyses. Instead, further analyses were done by examining the responses scale-by-scale. That is, the quality of each relationship (parent-child, friendship etc) and the children's general feelings and emotions were examined independently.

Consequently, composite scores were calculated only for the items on sibling relationship and friendship, as the high reliability coefficients[3] in these sections allowed for a single score to be derived for the quality of those relationships. Having a composite score as a descriptor of the quality of the relationship in question was presumably simpler than having to look at and describe each item representing the scale. Composite scores were calculated by taking the average of the responses for all the items given on a 5-point scale in that section. A composite score thus had a value of between 1 and 5. The higher the score, the better the relationship was deemed to be.

The scales that measured the quality of relationships with parents, grandparents and emotional well-being had less desirable reliability coefficients. As such, data analyses for these could only be done item-by-item.

---

[3] A set of items with a high reliability coefficient can be treated as a scale that measures consistently the same concept, e.g., children's friendship. In such a case all the items in that section can be averaged to give an average frequency that reflects the quality of friendship, taking all the items in the scale into consideration.

Data Analyses

One-way ANOVAs[4] (Analyses of Variance) were done for the parents' and children's ratings. For the parents' dataset, parents' gender, ethnicity, income, housing type, employment status, education level and whether the parents have more than one child were entered as the independent variables. Dependent variables were the composite scores for friendship, sibling relationships and the individual items on relationships with parents, grandparents and emotional well-being. For the children's dataset, information on children's gender, ethnicity, education level, parents' income and whether the children came from single- or dual-income families and have any siblings were entered as independent variables. Dependent variables were the same as in the parents' dataset.

As shown in Table 3, additional one-way ANOVAs were done with selected items as independent variables and dependent variables. These variables were identified to be relationships of interest.

Table 3: Additional analyses done for selected variables

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Rationale
1. Is it easy for the child to make friends?	1. Quality of friendship (Composite score) 2. Individual items on emotional well-being	To see if the ease of making friends had implications on the quality of friendship and emotional well-being.
2. Does the child think that the mother gives more love to the siblings?	1. Quality of sibling relationship (Composite score) 2. Individual items on emotional well-being	To see if the perceived favouritism by mothers had implications on the quality of sibling relationship and emotional well-being.
3. Does the child think that the father gives more love to the siblings?	1. Quality of sibling relationship (Composite Score) 2. Individual items on emotional well-being	To see if the perceived favouritism by fathers had implications on the quality of sibling relationship and emotional well-being.

One-way ANOVAs were also performed to compare between parents' and children's responses on the quality of relationships and emotional well-being.

Reports on statistical analyses (e.g. F and p values for ANOVAs) have been taken out of the main report for simplicity. For readers who would like to understand more about the statistical analyses used and the results obtained, please refer to Tables 37 to 58 in Appendix B.

Children's Social Well-Being

Parents and children in the study reported that children had good relationships with their family and friends in general. This translated into good social well-being, which is chracterised by the ability to "connect with others and to form and maintain relationships

---

[4] A single MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) could have been used. However, given that there were many dependent variables, we decided that it may be more simplistic and meaningful to run individual one-way ANOVAs, but set a more stringent criterion by accepting p < .01 instead of .05.

(Donnelly et al., 2001). We shall examine children's relationships with their parents, grandparent, siblings and friends in turn, by looking at parents' and children's perspectives on the quality of these relationships.

Comparing children's and parents' perspectives on social well-being
Children's and parents' ratings on the social well-being of children were by and large similar. In cases where there were differences in statistical terms (i.e. the differences were large enough to be picked up when statistical tests were done), the absolute differences between them were only marginal. The figures are shown in Table 4. The F statistics are shown in Table 37 in Appendix B. The key findings were:
• Parents tended to rate children's relationship with siblings more positively.
• Parents tended to rate children's friendship less positively.
• Parents reported spending time and having fun with children more frequently.
• Parents felt that they got angry and argued with their children more frequently.

Table 4:   Comparing children's and parents' ratings on social well-being

Items related to social well-being	Interviewee[#]	N	Av Freq[^]
Composite on Friendship	Children	906	3.5
	Parents	906	3.2
Composite on sibling relationship	C	790	3.4
	P	790	3.6
How often does the parent get angry with the child?	C	906	3.0
	P	906	3.2
How often does the child tell the parent secrets and feelings?	C	906	2.6
	P	903	3.0
How often does the parent play and have fun with the child?	C	906	3.6
	P	906	3.8
How often do the parent and child argue with each other?	C	906	2.4
	P	906	2.7
How often does the parent pay attention to what the child says?	C	906	3.7
	P	906	3.9
How often does the parent teach the child about good manners and politeness	C	906	4.2
	P	905	4.3
How often does the child spend time with the parent?	C	906	4.2
	P	905	4.3
How often do the child and his/her grandparent argue with each other?	C	795	1.6
	P	796	1.8

[#]C = Children   P = Parent   [^]Av Freq = Average Frequency

Relationship with Parents
Almost all the children in our study said that they liked their parents, and had good relationship with them. Consistent with the children's views, parents reported spending time with their children often, and they also frequently showed that they liked or loved their children, with both having an average frequency of above 4. The average frequencies and percentages relating to children's relationships with their fathers and mothers can be found in Tables 5 and 6 respectively.

Table 5: Children's and parents' ratings on children's relationship with father

Relationship with father	Inter-viewee	N	Av Freq	Never (%)	2 (%)	Some-times (%)	4 (%)	Many Times (%)	Don't Know (%)
Help with the child's homework	C*	883	3.0	17.0	11.9	37.5	18.3	15.3	-
	P	450	3.2	12.9	14.7	32.2	22.4	17.8	-
Show love towards the child	C	883	4.2	1.4	1.9	16.1	34.0	46.7	-
	P	449	4.3	0.9	1.6	12.5	35.6	49.4	-
Get angry with the child	C	883	2.9	6.5	19.3	55.4	10.9	8.0	-
	P	450	3.0	4.7	19.6	56.0	12.7	7.1	-
Tell father about secrets and feelings	C	883	2.3	33.5	23.6	27.1	10.3	5.5	-
	P	449	2.7	21.4	20.7	33.0	16.9	8.0	-
Play and have fun with father	C	883	3.6	4.4	8.9	34.9	26.0	25.7	-
	P	450	3.8	0.7	4.9	31.1	38.9	24.4	-
Child and father argue with each other	C	883	2.2	27.1	32.5	31.6	6.7	2.2	-
	P	450	2.6	13.6	34.9	36.4	12.0	3.1	-
Pay attention to what the child says	C	883	3.6	1.8	7.9	36.0	33.0	21.3	-
	P	450	3.9	0.2	4.7	29.3	38.4	27.3	-
Scold or punish the child	C	883	2.8	8.0	23.1	51.5	11.6	5.8	-
	P	449	3.1	6.5	22.3	49.0	17.4	4.9	-
Think father is right to scold or punish	C	883	3.5	5.3	10.4	37.3	20.0	27.0	-
	P	450	3.6	4.0	6.9	36.4	25.3	26.7	0.7
Teach the child good manners and politeness	C	883	4.1	1.4	4.3	20.8	32.8	40.7	-
	P	450	4.3	0.2	1.6	13.8	37.6	46.9	-
Spend time with the child	C	883	4.0	0.8	3.1	23.7	38.4	34.1	-
	P	450	4.2	0	0.9	14.0	47.6	37.6	-

			Yes (%)		No (%)		N.A/Don't Know (%)		
Does the child like his/her father?	C	883	99.2		0.8		0		
	P	450	99.3		0.2		0.5		
Is child's relationship with the father good?	C	883	96.6		0.5		2.9		
	P	450	99.1		0.9		0		
Does the child think father gives more love and care to siblings#?	C	883	13.9		73.6		12.5		
	P	450	14.2		70.4		4.4		

* 23 children did not respond to this section as they did not live with their fathers.
# 11% or 49 fathers did not respond to this question as they were fathers to children without siblings.

Table 6: Children's and parents' ratings on children's relationship with mother

Relationship with mother	Inter-viewee	N	Av Freq	Never (%)	2 (%)	Some-times (%)	4 (%)	Many Times (%)	Don't Know (%)
Help with the child's homework	C*	900	3.7	5.8	6.7	31.0	25.8	30.8	-
	P	456	3.7	8.6	8.3	25.2	19.5	38.4	-
Show love towards the child	C	900	4.4	0.3	1.3	11.0	30.0	57.3	-
	P	453	4.5	0.7	1.1	9.5	26.3	62.5	-
Get angry with the child	C	900	3.1	3.1	13.7	60.1	12.9	10.2	-
	P	456	3.4	1.3	10.5	55.5	15.8	16.9	-
Tell mother about secrets and feelings	C	900	2.8	20.6	17.3	31.8	20.6	9.8	-
	P	454	3.3	8.1	12.1	37.4	23.8	18.5	-
Play and have fun with mother	C	900	3.7	4.4	6.8	31.9	28.6	28.3	-
	P	456	3.8	1.5	5.7	32.0	30.7	30.0	-
Child and mother argue with each other	C	900	2.6	17.9	25.6	41.8	10.2	4.4	-
	P	456	2.9	10.5	21.9	44.3	14.0	9.2	-
Pay attention to what the child says	C	900	3.8	1.8	5.6	32.0	33.1	27.6	-
	P	456	3.9	0.7	2.9	32.2	31.6	32.7	-
Scold or punish the child	C	900	3.1	4.3	14.0	55.0	16.4	10.2	-
	P	456	3.2	3.5	17.3	52.0	14.3	12.9	-
Think mother is right to scold or punish	C	900	3.7	2.6	7.2	39.3	21.3	29.6	-
	P	456	3.8	1.8	5.5	34.9	22.1	35.3	0.4
Teach the child good manners and politeness	C	900	4.2	0.9	1.1	17.1	35.9	45.0	-
	P	455	4.4	0	2.2	14.5	28.4	54.9	-
Spend time with the child	C	898	4.4	0.4	1.3	11.8	31.5	54.9	-
	P	455	4.4	0	0.9	11.4	31.2	56.5	-

			Yes (%)		No (%)		N.A/Don't Know (%)	
Does the child like his/her mother?	C	900	99.7		0.3		0	
	P	456	99.3		0.2		0.4	
Is child's relationship with the mother good?	C	900	96.9		0.2		2.9	
	P	456	99.6		0.4		0	
Does the child think mother gives more love and care to siblings#?	C	900	15.2		72.0		12.8	
	P	456	22.8		57.7		4.8	

* Six children did not respond to this section because they did not live with their mothers.
# 14.7% or 67 mothers did not respond to this question as they were mothers to children without siblings.

Good parent-child relationship was also reflected by the frequency with which the children played and had fun with their parents, with 51.7% of the children indicating that they played and had fun with their fathers often or many times, while 56.9% indicated so with their mothers. Children also seldom argued with their parents, with only 8.9% indicating that they argued with their fathers often or many times and 14.6% saying the same of mothers.

The finding that an overwhelming majority of the parents (98.3% fathers; 97.8% mothers) said they taught their children about good manners and politeness sometimes or more often is heartening, more so since the parents' self-report were consistent with the children's perspectives (94.3% for fathers; 98.0% for mothers). While it is reassuring that about 98% of the parents taught their children good manners and politeness at least sometimes, we should hope that all parents would do so. Parents should be encouraged to continue to focus on this aspect in their parenting as well as to be good role models for their children.

Like their parents, children in the study also generally felt that their parents were right in scolding or punishing them. These findings suggested that most of the children did perceive the scolding or punishment as being just. However, children tended to think that mothers were more often right to scold or punish them compared to fathers[5] (average frequency for fathers = 3.5, versus average frequency for mothers = 3.7). Interestingly, mothers reported scolding or punishing the children more frequently than fathers (average frequency 3.2 vs. 2.8). Children's and parents' views were consistent in this aspect.

On the other hand, some parents (10.9% fathers; 7.3% mothers) never or seldom thought that they were right to scold or punish their children. Perhaps for these parents, it was more important to remain objective and calm and to understand more about the situation before deciding how best to discipline their children, which may not necessarily involve scolding or punishment. The findings also suggested that parents' practices seemed to be consistent with their beliefs, as 86.6% of the parents who never or seldom thought they were right to scold or punish children indicated that they never or seldom meted out punishment. Only 13.4% of these parents indicated that they scolded or punished children sometimes.

Another point to note was that a small handful of parents (less than 1%) did not know if they were right in scolding or punishing their children. This reflected the dilemma facing some parents, who struggled to strike a healthy balance between disciplining their children and maintaining a good parent-child relationship ratings.

On the whole, children in the study tended not to share secrets and feelings with their parents often. Nonetheless, children seemed to share secrets and feelings with their mothers (average frequency = 2.8) more so than with their fathers (average frequency = 2.3)[6].

---

[5] The findings were based on paired-samples t-tests done on children's ratings on relationship with fathers and mothers. Statistical analyses are reported in Table 38 in Appendix B.

[6] The finding was based on paired-samples t-tests done on children's ratings on relationship with fathers and mothers. Statistics are reported in Table 38 in Appendix B.

A few parents in the present study felt that their children did not like them, and that they had poor relationships with their children. However, on the contrary, all of these children said that they liked their parents and had good relationships with them, which suggests the importance of effective parent-child communication. This observation was not specific to families belonging to any particular income or ethnic group, though a common characteristic was that there was more than one child in these families. However, this did not imply that having more than one child in the family would necessarily compromise the social and emotional well-being of children. As we shall see in a later section in this chapter, having a sibling did not seem to be associated with a child's social and emotional well-being.

In the study, children were asked whether they thought their parents gave more love and care to their siblings than to the children themselves. Of interest was how any perceived favouritism would relate to the parent-child relationship. The findings showed that children who did not think that their parents love their siblings more tended to have better parent-child relationships[7]. These children reported spending more time with their parents, and telling their parents secrets and feelings more frequently. These children also felt that their parents showed that they liked or loved them more frequently, compared with children who thought that their parents favoured their siblings more.

The average frequencies of the items where statistical differences were found are shown in Tables 7 and 8. The F statistics are shown in Tables 40 and 41 in Appendix B.

Table 7: **Children's ratings on father-child relationships, differentiated by whether the children perceived favouritism towards the other siblings**

Items	Perceived favouritism towards other siblings	N	Av Freq
Father shows love towards child	Yes	123	4.0
	No	650	4.2
Father gets angry with the child	Yes	123	3.2
	No	650	2.9
Child tells fathers about secrets and feelings	Yes	123	2.0
	No	650	2.3
Father pays attention to what child says	Yes	123	3.4
	No	650	3.7
Father scolds or punishes the child	Yes	123	3.1
	No	650	2.8
Father spends time with the child	Yes	123	3.8
	No	650	4.1

---

[7] The findings were based on one-way ANOVAs done on children's ratings on relationship with parents, differentiated by whether the children thought their parents give more love to their siblings (where applicable). Statistics are reported in Table 39 in Appendix B.

Table 8: Children's ratings on mother-child relationships, differentiated by whether the children perceived favouritism towards the other siblings

Items	Perceived favouritism towards other siblings	N	Av Freq
Child tells mother about secrets and feelings	Yes	137	2.5
	No	648	2.9
Mother plays and has fun with child	Yes	137	3.4
	No	648	3.8
Mother pays attention to what child says	Yes	137	3.5
	No	648	3.8
Child thinks mother is right to scold/ punish	Yes	137	3.4
	No	648	3.7
Mother spends time with the child	Yes	137	4.2
	No	648	4.4

One-way ANOVAs were also done to examine how children's relationship with their parents were related to the children's gender, ethnicity, parents' income and employment status, housing type and children's education levels. Some of the key findings will be presented in turn.

Children's and parents' gender

According to the children, fathers seemed to scold or punish boys (average frequency = 3.0) more frequently than girls (average frequency = 2.7). Girls (average frequency = 3.0) also tended to tell mothers about their secrets and feelings more frequently compared to boys (average frequency = 2.7). The F statistics are found in Table 42 in Appendix B.

According to the parents, mothers reported that they were more connected with their children, compared to fathers. In particular, mothers indicated that they liked or loved their children more compared to fathers. Mothers also reported spending more time with their children and helping more with the children's homework than fathers. The parents' self-reports also showed that children tended to share secrets and feelings more frequently with mothers than fathers; but on the other hand mothers also got angry with their children more, and argued with their children more frequently compared to fathers. The relevant statistics of items with statistical differences are shown in Table 9 below and Table 51 in Appendix B.

Table 9: Parent-child relationships and differences in terms of parents' gender (parents' perspectives)

Items	Gender	N	Av Freq
Help with the child's homework	Father	450	3.2
	Mother	456	3.7
Show love towards the child	Father	449	4.3
	Mother	453	4.5
Get angry with the child	Father	450	3.0
	Mother	456	3.4
Child tells parent about secrets and feelings	Father	449	2.7
	Mother	454	3.3
Child and parent argue with each other	Father	450	2.6
	Mother	456	2.9
Scold or punish the child	Father	449	2.9
	Mother	456	3.2
Think the parent is right to scold/punish the child	Father	450	3.6
	Mother	456	3.8
Spend time with the child	Father	450	4.2
	Mother	455	4.4

Ethnicity

On the whole, Indian children seemed to think that their parents were slightly more involved with them compared to Chinese children. In particular, Indian children tended to tell their parents about their secrets and feelings more than Chinese children. Indian children also reported playing and having fun with their parents more frequently, and Indian fathers also spent time with their children more frequently compared to Chinese fathers. Indian children also received more help from their parents with regards to homework, compared to Chinese children. Similarly, Malay children indicated that their parents helped them with their homework more frequently compared to the Chinese.

Although some ethnic differences between the Indians and Malays versus the Chinese were observed in the statistical terms, it must be noted that the difference in absolute figures were marginal. For instance, while we found that Indian children spent more time with their fathers compared to the Chinese, all children, regardless of ethnicity, often spent time with their fathers, as shown by the average frequencies of at least 4 for all three groups. The average frequencies depicting the ethnic differences are shown in Table 10. The F statistics are shown in Table 43 in Appendix B.

Table 10: Ethnic differences in parent-child relationship (children's perspectives)

Items	Ethnicity	N	Av Freq
Father helps with homework	Indian	88	**<u>3.5</u>**
	Malay	171	3.2
	Chinese	615	**<u>2.9</u>**
Mother helps with homework	Indian	87	**<u>4.1</u>**
	Malay	175	**<u>3.7</u>**
	Indian	87	**<u>4.1</u>**
	Chinese	629	**<u>3.6</u>**
Play and have fun with father	Indian	88	**<u>3.9</u>**
	Malay	171	3.7
	Chinese	615	**<u>3.5</u>**
Play and have fun with mother	Indian	87	**<u>4.1</u>**
	Malay	175	3.7
	Chinese	629	**<u>3.6</u>**
Child tells father about secrets and feelings	Indian	88	**<u>2.7</u>**
	Malay	171	2.4
	Chinese	615	**<u>2.2</u>**
Child tells mother about secrets and feelings	Indian	87	**<u>3.2</u>**
	Malay	175	2.9
	Chinese	629	**<u>2.8</u>**
Father spends time with the child	Indian	88	**<u>4.2</u>**
	Malay	171	4.1
	Chinese	615	**<u>4.0</u>**

Note: Figures that are bold and underlined are significantly different.

Parents' income

Children from high income families tended to receive help with homework from their parents more frequently compared to children from low income families. This finding was in agreement with the parents' ratings. Children from high income families also indicated that their fathers showed that they liked or loved them, more often than children from low income families. However, children from low income families noted that their mothers got angry with them more frequently, compared with children from high income families. The average frequencies depicting these differences are shown in Table 11. The F statistics are shown in Table 44 in Appendix B.

Table 11: Income differences in parent-child relationship (children's perspectives)

Items	Income*	N	Av Freq
Father helps with homework	$1000 or less	35	2.3
	$2001-$3000	195	3.0
	$1000 or less	35	2.3
	$3001-$4000	135	3.1
	$1000 or less	35	2.3
	$4001-$5000	148	3.3
	$1000 or less	35	2.3
	Above $5000	148	3.3
	$1001-$2000	205	2.8
	$4001-$5000	148	3.3
	$1001-$2000	205	2.8
	Above $5000	148	3.3
Mother helps with homework	$1001-$2000	206	3.4
	$4001-$5000	151	4.0
	$1001-$2000	206	3.4
	Above $5000	149	4.0
	$2001-$3000	196	3.6
	$4001-$5000	151	4.0
	$2001-$3000	196	3.6
	Above $5000	149	4.0
Father shows love towards the child	$1000 or less	35	3.9
	$3001-$4000	135	4.4
Mother shows love towards the child	$1000 or less	42	4.1
	$3001-$4000	137	4.5
	$1000 or less	42	4.1
	$4001-$5000	151	4.5
	$1000 or less	42	4.1
	Above $5000	149	4.5
Mother gets angry with the child	$2001-$3000	196	3.3
	Above $5000	149	3.0

* Significant differences were found only between certain income groups for each item, as shown.

Parents' employment status

Children from single-income families spent comparatively more time with their mothers (average frequency = 4.5) than children from dual-income families (average frequency = 4.3). Note that 92.9% (n = 407) of the mothers from these 438 single-income families were stay-at-home mothers, which could explain why they could spend more time with their children. However, it was important to emphasise that although a significant difference was observed in statistical terms, children from *both* single- and dual-income families reported that their mothers often spent time with them, with the average frequencies being more than 4 in both groups. The children in this study clearly did not perceive themselves as being deprived of time with their mothers just because the latter were staying in the workforce. The F statistics are shown in Table 45 in Appendix B.

Housing types

Recall that in the present study, parents' combined monthly income increased with bigger housing types. Therefore, housing types could be treated as an indicator of the family's social-economic status. Results showed that children who lived in bigger flats reported receiving more help with homework from their parents compared with children in smaller dwellings. The parents in the study also shared this view. The F statistics are shown in Tables 46 and 55 in Appendix B.

Education levels of children and parents

The results showed that the education levels of the children were not related to their relationships with their parents. From the parents' perspectives, parents who were more highly educated (i.e. completed University; average frequency = 3.7) reported helping their children with homework more frequently than parents who were less educated (i.e. little or no schooling; average frequency = 2.4). This was not surprising as parents who were more highly educated would tend to have more academic knowledge to be able to help their children with homework. The F statistics are shown in Tables 47 and 56 in Appendix B.

Children with siblings versus children without siblings

When the responses of children who had no siblings were compared with those who had siblings, no difference was found in the quality of parent-child relationship.

Children who do not like their parents or have poor relationship with their parents

Less than 1% of the children in the study said that they did not like their parents, or had poor relationships with them.

For the few children who indicated so, some said that their fathers beat or scolded them, while another child mentioned that he did not like his mother because she seldom showed that she cared about him, and that she spent long hours at work each day.

Relationship with Grandparents

Almost all the children who had grandparents liked them and had good relationships with them. As expected, children were not as close to their grandparents as they were to their parents, in that they spent less time with their grandparents and played and had fun with their grandparents less often than they did with their parents. The children also felt that their grandparents showed that they liked or loved them less, compared to their parents. On the other hand, children's relationship with their grandparents was also less conflictual compared to their relationship with parents. In particular, 56.4% and 40.5% of the children said that they argued with their mother and father respectively sometimes or more often; while only 17.3% of the children said the same of their grandparents.

Most of the children in this study spent time with their grandparents, with 43.5% indicating that they spent time with their grandparents often or very often, while only 19.9% said that they never or seldom spent time with their grandparents. This could have created opportunities for the grandparents to impart values such as good manners and politeness in the children, as three quarters of the children (75.1%) with grandparents mentioned that their grandparents taught them about good manners and politeness sometimes or more often. However, this percentage was still smaller than 98% of the parents who taught their children about good manners and politeness, as discussed earlier. About a quarter (25.6%) of the children mentioned that they played and had fun with their grandparents often or very often, and 58.2% of the children felt that their grandparents showed love towards them often or more.

On discipline, the majority of the children said that their grandparents never or seldom scolded or punished them, with 71.1% of them indicating so. While the grandparents did not always scold or punish their grandchildren, children's views were split as to whether the grandparents were right to scold or punish them, with 39.9% saying that grandparents are never or seldom right, and 34.3% indicating that the grandparents were often or very often right. Interestingly, a similar pattern was observed from the parents' ratings, with 35.1% of them thinking that it was never or seldom right for the grandparents to scold or punish the children, and another 35.3% who felt that the grandparents were often or very often right in meting out punishment.

The relevant statistics are shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Children's and parents' ratings on children's relationship with grandparent

Relationship with grandparent	Inter-viewee	N	Av Freq	Never (%)	2 (%)	Some-times (%)	4 (%)	Many Times (%)	Don't Know (%)
Help with the child's homework	C*	795	1.4	81.8	6.4	8.1	2.3	1.5	-
	P	796	1.3	83.4	6.4	6.4	1.6	1.8	0.4
Show love towards the child	C	795	3.7	4.4	8.7	28.7	29.3	28.9	-
	P	796	3.8	5.0	5.9	28.4	25.8	34.3	0.6
Get angry with the child	C	795	1.9	46.2	23.4	24.3	3.5	2.6	-
	P	796	2.0	44.2	23.2	25.4	4.6	2.3	0.3
Tell grandparent about secrets and feelings	C	795	1.8	57.4	17.4	17.2	6.2	1.9	-
	P	796	1.8	45.0	19.5	20.6	4.8	3.8	6.4
Play and have fun with the child	C	795	2.8	18.9	19.1	36.4	16.2	9.4	-
	P	796	2.9	15.1	18.6	38.3	16.7	11.2	0.1
Child and grandparent argue with each other	C	795	1.6	59.1	23.5	13.8	2.6	0.9	-
	P	796	1.8	54.8	21.6	17.1	4.6	1.5	0.4
Pay attention to what the child says	C	795	3.0	17.0	11.7	37.1	22.1	12.1	-
	P	796	3.1	13.4	11.9	31.7	26.8	13.7	2.5
Scold or punish the child	C	795	1.9	48.6	22.5	21.4	4.4	3.1	-
	P	796	1.9	46.7	26.3	18.5	5.5	2.8	0.3
Think grandparent is right to scold or punish	C	795	2.9	29.3	10.6	25.8	10.9	23.4	-
	P	796	2.8	25.8	9.3	23.9	12.9	22.4	5.8
Teach the child good manners and politeness	C	795	3.4	12.7	12.2	23.8	22.4	28.9	-
	P	796	3.5	11.3	10.6	24.6	21.0	31.8	0.8
Spend time with the child	C	795	3.4	4.7	15.2	36.6	21.4	22.1	-
	P	796	3.5	3.1	16.5	34.5	19.7	26.1	0

				Yes (%)		No (%)		N.A/Don't Know (%)	
Does the child like his/her grandparents?	C	795		98.5		1.3		0.3	
	P	796		96.6		1.3		2.1	
Is child's relationship with the grandparents good?	C	795		95.3		1.8		2.9	
	P	796		97.7		0.8		1.5	

* 110 children did not have living grandparents. One child did not respond to this section.

Analyses were also done to examine how children's relationships with their grandparents were related to the children's gender, ethnicity, parents' income and employment status, housing type and children's education levels. Differences were found only for children's gender and ethnicity. The key findings are presented in turn.

Children's gender
From the children's perspective, grandparents helped girls (average frequency = 1.4) with homework more than boys (average frequency = 1.3). However, grandparents scolded or punished boys (average frequency = 2.0) more than girls (average frequency = 1.8). Although the differences were noted in the statistical terms, the average frequencies were not high, suggesting that grandparents seldom helped their grandchildren with homework, and they also seldom scolded or punished them. The F statistics are shown in Table 42 in Appendix B.

Ethnicity
Indian and Malay children (average frequencies are 3.1 and 3.0 respectively) reported that they played and had fun with their grandparents more frequently than the Chinese children (average frequency = 2.7). The parents held a similar view, with Malay parents (average frequency = 3.1) indicating that their children played and had fun with their grandparents more frequently, compared with what Chinese parents reported (average frequency = 2.8). The F statistics are shown in Tables 43 and 52 in Appendix B.

Parents' employment status
Analyses were also performed to find out if parents' employment status was related to the children's relationships with their grandparents. It was thought that if both parents were employed, the grandparents would usually be asked to help to look after the children. This would have increased the contact between the children and the grandparents, which presumably would have implications on their relationship. However, results showed that children's self-reports of their relationships with grandparents were not related to whether or not they came from single- or dual-income families. The F statistics are shown in Table 45 in Appendix B.

Children with siblings versus children without siblings
Although children generally seldom shared secrets and feelings or argued with their grandparents, children who have no siblings were found to share secrets and feelings with their grandparents more frequently, compared to children with siblings. However, children without siblings also tended to argue more with their grandparents. The statistics of items with statistical differences are shown in Table 13. The F statistics are shown in Table 48 in Appendix B.

Table 13: Grandparent-child relationships of children with or without siblings (children's perspectives)

Items	With siblings	N	Av Freq
Child tells grandparent secrets and feelings	Yes	700	1.7
	No	95	2.1
Child and grandparent argue with each other	Yes	700	1.6
	No	95	1.9

Children who do not like their grandparents or have poor relationship with their grandparents
Less than 2% of the children said that they did not like their grandparents, or had poor relationships with them.

Of the 10 children who said that they did not like their grandparents, two children said their grandparents scolded them, and two others felt that their grandparents were naggy. Another child said that the grandparents were strict and another was seldom in contact with his grandparents.

Of the nine children who explained why they had poor relationships with their grandparents, three children said that the grandparents scolded them. Another felt that the grandparents were naggy and one other child was seldom in contact with his grandparents.

Relationship with Siblings and Friends and School Bullying
In this section, we will be looking at children's relationships with siblings and friends as a whole and make comparisons where appropriate. Although the nature of sibling relationship and friendship could be rather different, it was nonetheless interesting to compare children's views on the quality of these relationships. Unlike a relationship with parents, siblings and friends are closer in age to the child and both sets of relationships presumably have more things in common than with any other relationships a child may have. School bullying will also be examined in this section, as it usually happens among peers.

The scales that measured the quality of sibling relationships and friendships were found to have high reliability coefficients, as mentioned earlier. This warranted the use of composite scores to analyse the data, such that it was not necessary to look at item-by-item analyses as with the other relationships discussed. School bullying was examined item-by-item given that a large number of children had never experienced at least one of the forms of bullying.

The results showed that the vast majority of the children liked their siblings and friends, and had good relationships with them. The figures are shown in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 14: Children's and parents' ratings on children's relationship with siblings

Relationship with siblings	Inter-viewee	N	Never (%)	2 (%)	Some-times (%)	4 (%)	Many Times (%)	Don't Know (%)
Sibling nice to the child	C	790	3.5	6.8	40.6	25.2	23.8	-
	P	790	1.1	2.0	30.0	37.3	29.5	0
Care about the child's feelings	C	790	6.6	10.5	35.7	27.6	19.6	-
	P	790	2.2	4.9	30.8	36.8	24.4	0.9
Have fun with the child	C	790	2.2	4.2	20.6	26.1	47.0	-
	P	790	0.8	1.6	13.4	32.8	51.4	0
Child and sibling argue or quarrel with one	C	790	4.7	13.5	47.6	15.7	18.5	-
	P	790	3.4	10.5	50.8	15.6	19.5	0.3
Sibling helps the child	C	790	6.5	12.7	42.2	23.5	15.2	-
	P	790	3.2	9.4	39.9	32.0	15.2	0.4
Tell one another about problems	C	790	21.6	20.3	32.2	17.0	9.0	-
	P	790	11.3	20.8	33.8	21.4	10.8	0.2
Child and sibling help one another with schoolwork	C	790	20.5	12.2	32.7	20.6	14.1	-
	P	790	16.2	12.5	30.5	25.2	15.4	0.1
Child shares things with sibling	C	790	4.2	7.8	40.9	27.3	19.7	-
	P	790	1.9	5.9	36.8	34.7	20.5	0.1
Sibling pays attention to what the child says	C	790	6.1	9.6	39.5	26.8	18.0	-
	P	790	2.4	4.9	38.4	35.8	17.1	1.4
Sibling spends time with the child	C	790	0.8	3.5	18.0	33.3	44.4	-
	P	790	0.6	2.3	11.1	39.6	46.3	0
Composite score#	C	790	3.4					
	P	790	3.6					

			Yes (%)	No (%)	N.A/Don't Know (%)			
Does the child like his/her siblings?	C	790	96.8	3.2	0			
	P	790	98.5	1.1	0.4			
Is the child's relationship with his/her siblings good?	C	790	93.7	3.3	3.0			
	P	790	98.7	1.1	0.2			

* 116 children did not have siblings and therefore did not respond to this section.
# An average frequency of all items on sibling relationship, with reverse coding done. A higher score suggests a better relationship.

Table 15: Children's and parents' ratings on children's relationship with friends

Relationship with friends	Inter-viewee	N	Never (%)	2 (%)	Some-times (%)	4 (%)	Many Times (%)	Don't Know (%)
Friends nice to the child	C	906	0.9	2.2	30.2	29.4	37.3	-
	P	906	0.3	2.3	29.1	35.8	25.4	7.1
Care about the child's feelings	C	906	5.0	5.6	42.2	30.2	17.0	-
	P	906	2.5	4.1	36.4	30.6	14.9	11.5
Have fun with the child	C	905	0.7	0.8	15.9	29.2	53.5	-
	P	906	0.4	2.1	19.9	34.8	40.7	2.1
Child and friends argue or quarrel with one another	C	906	23.5	25.5	39.5	8.6	2.9	-
	P	906	12.5	27.8	40.7	10.8	2.9	5.3
Friends help the child	C	906	3.6	9.9	44.5	26.7	15.2	-
	P	906	2.3	10.7	41.5	30.7	9.6	5.2
Tell one another about problems	C	906	15.8	19.0	36.6	18.5	10.0	-
	P	906	8.4	17.7	34.0	16.4	6.7	16.8
Child and friends help one another with schoolwork	C	906	10.2	11.9	39.3	24.1	14.6	-
	P	906	10.6	14.8	36.1	24.2	9.7	4.6
Child shares things with friends	C	905	3.3	5.9	42.2	26.0	22.7	-
	P	906	2.0	6.0	39.6	32.2	16.0	4.2
Friends pay attention to what the child says	C	906	3.8	7.4	40.5	30.6	17.8	-
	P	906	1.7	4.7	36.2	31.2	12.9	13.2
Friends spend time with the child outside school	C	906	30.7	15.5	27.3	13.4	13.2	-
	P	906	27.8	20.8	24.7	16.3	9.8	0.6
Composite score#	C	906	3.5					
	P	906	3.2					

			Yes (%)	No (%)	N.A/Don't Know (%)			
Does the child have enough friends?	C	906	97.5	2.5	0			
	P	906	91.1	6.3	2.6			
Is it easy for the child to make friends in school?	C	905	93.6	6.4	0			
	P	906	92.7	4.9	2.4			
Does the child like his/her friends?	C	906	98.9	1.1	0			
	P	906	98.0	0.6	1.4			
Does the child like his/her school?	C	906	96.5	3.5	0			
	P	906	96.9	2.0	1.1			
Is the child's relationship with his/her friends good?	C	906	96.4	0.1	3.5			
	P	906	98.3	0.4	1.3			

An average frequency of all items on friendship, with reverse coding done. A higher score suggests a better relationship.

When children's relationship with siblings and friends were compared, it was found that children tended to rate the quality of their friendships more positively than sibling relations[8] (average frequencies of 3.5 and 3.4 respectively). On the other hand, parents tended to rate the quality of children's sibling relations more positively than friendships[9] (average frequencies of 3.6 and 3.2 respectively).

Notably, in our interviews of over 900 parents, most of them were able to tell us about their children's relationships with their friends, although they were given the option of saying that they "do not know". Parents in this study also seemed to be in touch with how their children spent their time outside the home, in particular with friends. For instance, 26.1% of the parents said that their children often or very often spent time with friends outside school, and 26.6% of the children said the same. These findings suggested that parents in the study did take a personal interest in knowing more about their children, even in aspects of their children's lives that took place outside the home.

While the majority of the children seemed to have good relationships with their friends, it is important to note that 6.4% (n = 58) of the children did not find it easy to make friends in school. It is a cause for concern that those who did not find it easy to make friends in school also tended to have less positive friendships (average frequency = 3.2) compared to children who found it easy to make friends in school (average frequency = 3.5). Children who did not find it easy to make friends also tended to worry about things more (average frequency = 3.2), compared to those who felt otherwise (average frequency = 2.7). The F statistics are shown in Table 50 in Appendix B.

Overall, 56.1% of the children interviewed (n = 509) said they had never experienced any form of bullying. For those who had experienced at least one of the five forms of bullying included in the questionnaire, 73.8% (n = 293) had told someone about the bullying, of which 91.5% (n = 268) felt that the person they told helped them. The relevant statistics are shown in Table 16.

In the case of children who did not tell anyone about the bullying, they were usually scared, or felt that the bullying was not serious enough to tell someone about it. A few children also did not want others to know about the bullying, while others felt that it was useless to tell anyone. A small handful were either not bothered by the bullying or said that telling someone would make matters worse.

---

[8] The finding was based on paired-samples t-tests done on children's ratings on relationship with siblings and friends. Statistics are reported in Table 49 in Appendix B.

[9] This finding was based on paired-samples t-tests done on parents' ratings on children's relationships with siblings and friends. Statistics are shown in Table 58 in Appendix B.

Table 16: Children's and parents' ratings on children's experience with school bullying

School Bullying	Inter-viewee	N	Never (%)	2 (%)	Some-times (%)	4 (%)	Many Times (%)	Don't Know (%)
Pulls child's hair, hits, pinches, bites or pushes child	C	906	75.1	7.1	14.5	1.4	2.0	-
	P	906	73.7	6.8	14.3	0.8	1.8	2.5
Takes money or things and refuses to return them	C	906	85.7	6.0	6.8	1.0	0.6	-
	P	906	81.8	6.0	8.1	1.1	0.9	2.2
Makes child scared or fearful	C	906	87.0	4.5	7.0	0.3	1.2	-
	P	906	87.5	3.6	5.8	0.4	0.4	2.1
Calls child bad names	C	906	72.5	5.4	17.8	2.0	2.3	-
	P	906	77.5	5.1	12.0	1.7	1.1	2.6
Does not let others be child's friend	C	906	85.3	3.6	8.3	1.1	1.7	-
	P	906	84.5	3.1	7.1	0.7	0.7	4.0

			Yes (%)		No (%)		N.A/Don't Know (%)	
Has the child told anybody about the bullying?	C	397	73.8		26.2		-	
	P	342	86.3		10.5		3.2	
Did the person the child told help him/her?	C	293	91.5		8.5		-	
	P	299	90.6		6.7		2.7	

Analyses were done to examine how children's relationships with their siblings and friends were related to the children's gender, ethnicity, parents' income and employment status, housing type and children's education level. For children's friendship, additional analyses were also performed to see whether the child had siblings made a difference. Analyses were also done to see if children's relationships with siblings were associated with whether they thought their parents showed more love towards their siblings (perceived favouritism). Differences were found only for children's ethnicity, education levels and perceived favouritism. The key findings are presented in turn.

Ethnicity

Indian children reported having better sibling relationships compared to the Chinese, and parents held the same view. No ethnic difference was found for children's or parents' views on friendship. The average frequencies are show in Table 17. The F statistics are shown in Tables 43 and 52 in Appendix B.

Table 17: Ethnic differences in sibling relationships (children's perspectives)

Composite	Interviewee	Indian Children N = 79 Parents N = 81	Malay Children N = 165 Parents N = 162	Chinese Children N = 538 Parents N = 535
Sibling relationship	Children	**3.7**	3.4	**3.3**
	Parents	**3.7**	3.6	**3.5**

Note: Figures in each row that are bold and underlined are statistically different.

Children's education levels

The findings showed that children from the upper primary levels (Primary 5 and 6) had more positive relationship with friends than children from the lower primary levels (Primary 1 to 3). The average frequencies are shown in Table 18. The F statistics are shown in Table 47 in Appendix B.

Table 18: Children's ratings on their relationship with friends, differentiated by education

Composite	Education Level*	N	Av Freq
Children's friendship	Primary 1	151	3.4
	Primary 5	147	3.6
	Primary 1	151	3.4
	Primary 6	149	3.6
	Primary 2	148	3.4
	Primary 5	147	3.6
	Primary 2	148	3.4
	Primary 6	149	3.6
	Primary 3	155	3.4
	Primary 5	147	3.6
	Primary 3	155	3.4
	Primary 6	149	3.6

* Significant differences were found only between certain education levels, as shown.

Perceived favouritism towards siblings

The children who thought that fathers gave more love to their siblings tended to rate their relationship with siblings less positively (average frequency = 3.2) than children who did not think so (average frequency = 3.4). However, note that the absolute average frequencies were only marginally different. On the other hand, children's relationships with siblings were not related to whether or not they thought their mothers showed more love towards their siblings. The F statistics are shown in Tables 40 and 41 respectively in Appendix B.

Children with siblings versus children without siblings

When the responses of children who had no siblings were compared with those who had siblings, no difference was found in the quality of relationship with their friends.

Emotional Well-Being

In this study, we explored both positive and negative feelings and emotions of children as indicators of the children's state of emotional well-being. Questions were also asked about the child's physical state, such as the child being sick or forgetting things often, as these were also considered to be a reflection of the child's emotional well-being.

For the purpose of reporting, we focussed on the positive feelings occurring at least sometimes (ratings of above 3), as we felt that children were generally doing fine as long as they have experienced these positive emotions sometimes. However, on the negative feelings and emotions, we were more concerned with children who said they have experienced negative feelings more than sometimes (ratings of 4 and 5), as this would be a clear indication that the child was not doing well. The figures will be reported as such in this section.

The results suggested that overall, the state of children's emotional well-being seemed to be good. Children often had fun and felt happy, with almost all of the children having fun (97.9%) and feeling happy (98.2%) at least sometimes. The vast majority of them also thought of themselves as good persons at least sometimes (91.8%). On the negative feelings and emotions, 19.1% of the children worried about things often or very often. 9.6% of the children also felt very sad often or very often. The statistics are in Table 19.

Comparing children's and parents' perspectives on emotional well-being
Children's and parents ratings on children's emotional well-being were mostly similar, except for the item on whether children thought of themselves as good persons; with parents giving a higher rating (average frequency = 4.0) compared to children (average frequency = 3.8). The similarity was an encouraging sign that parents were in touch with their children's feelings and emotions. The F statistics are shown in Table 37 in Appendix B.

Table 19: Children's and parents' ratings on children's emotional well-being

Emotional Well-Being	Inter-viewee	N	Av Freq	Never (%)	2 (%)	Some-times (%)	4 (%)	Many Times (%)	Don't Know (%)
Worry about things	C	906	2.8	16.9	18.5	45.5	10.7	8.4	-
	P	906	2.7	19.2	17.8	40.1	13.7	7.8	1.4
Feel very sad	C	906	2.4	22.5	28.1	39.7	6.1	3.5	-
	P	906	2.3	21.1	33.0	35.8	6.8	2.2	1.1
Have fun	C	906	4.4	0.6	1.5	13.1	27.7	57.1	-
	P	906	4.4	0.2	1.1	10.7	32.3	55.5	0.1
Cry when doing things	C	906	2.2	32.1	29.8	30.9	3.9	3.3	-
	P	906	2.2	28.1	31.0	31.8	5.6	3.0	0.4
Child is sick	C	906	2.4	11.5	42.9	38.7	5.4	1.4	-
	P	906	2.3	12.4	54.0	27.5	5.2	1.0	0
Child quarrels with others	C	905	2.4	19.7	32.3	39.4	5.1	3.5	-
	P	906	2.2	22.1	36.0	32.2	6.2	1.8	1.8
Want to be alone	C	906	2.1	36.5	29.0	26.9	5.0	2.5	-
	P	906	2.0	32.5	32.8	23.0	6.8	1.9	3.1
Forget things	C	905	3.0	10.1	19.1	45.4	16.0	9.4	-
	P	906	2.9	7.6	22.8	42.8	18.1	8.1	0.6
Feel happy	C	906	4.3	0.3	1.5	15.7	32.7	49.8	-
	P	906	4.4	0.1	0.4	10.3	37.7	51.1	0.3
Think of self as a good person	C	906	3.8	3.2	5.1	30.4	31.7	29.7	-
	P	906	4.0	0.6	3.1	21.1	34.3	37.9	3.1

Analyses were done to examine how children's emotional well-being was related to the children's gender, ethnicity, parents' income and employment status, housing type and children's education levels. Differences were found only for children's education level. This suggested that children's emotional well-being was not related to the ethnicity of the children, combined income of the parents, parents' employment status, or whether or not the children have siblings. Additional analyses were also performed to see whether a child found it easy to make friends would be related to his or her emotional well-being; or if perceived favouritism towards the other siblings mattered in terms of emotional well-being. The key findings are presented in turn.

Children's education levels

While children generally worried about things less than sometimes, with an average rating of less than 3, children from the upper primary levels tended to worry about things more frequently, compared with children from primary one. Children from primary three and four were also found to quarrel with others more compared to children from primary one and two. The average frequencies are shown in Table 20. The F statistics are shown in Table 47 in Appendix B.

Table 20: Children's emotional well-being, differentiated by children's education levels (children's perspective)

Items	Education Level*	N	Av Freq
Worry about things	Primary 1	151	2.5
	Primary 4	156	2.9
	Primary 1	151	2.5
	Primary 5	147	2.9
Quarrel with other	Primary 1	151	2.2
	Primary 3	155	2.6
	Primary 1	151	2.2
	Primary 4	156	2.6
	Primary 2	148	2.2
	Primary 3	155	2.6
	Primary 2	148	2.2
	Primary 4	156	2.6

* Significant differences were found only between certain education levels, as shown.

Ease of making friends in school
The results showed that children who found it easy to make friends in school tended to worry about things less frequently (average frequency = 2.7), compared with children who did not find it easy to make friends in school (average frequency = 3.2). The F statistics are shown in Table 50 in Appendix B.

Perceived favouritism towards siblings
Children who thought that their mothers gave more love to their siblings tended to worry about things more, felt very sad more often, and thought of themselves as good persons less frequently, compared to children who thought otherwise. The average frequencies are found in Table 21. However, note that in general, the frequencies with which children worried about things or felt very sad, regardless of whether they perceived favouritism towards their siblings, were not high. The F statistics are shown in Tables 40 and 41 in Appendix B.

No relationship was found between perceived favouritism by fathers towards siblings and children's social and emotional well-being.

Table 21: Items on children's emotional well-being, differentiated by whether they perceived favouritism by mothers towards their siblings (children's perspective)

Items	Perceived favouritism	N	Av Freq
Worry about things	Yes	137	3.0
	No	648	2.7
Feel very sad	Yes	137	2.7
	No	648	2.4
Think of self as a good person	Yes	137	3.6
	No	648	3.8

This study found that children in Singapore seemed, in the main, to have good social and emotional well-being. Children generally reported good relationships with their family and friends, who made up the children's core social support network. Moreover, the vast majority of the children experienced positive feelings at least sometimes, although a small percentage of them also experienced negative feelings frequently. Parents' and children's perceptions on children's social and emotional well-being were similar on most counts, which is encouraging as this suggested that parents were aware of their children's state of well-being.

Parent-Child Relationship

The findings of this study suggested that mothers were more connected with their children compared to fathers, in that mothers showed more love towards their children, spent more time with them, and helped children with homework more frequently than fathers did. This is consistent with the typical role differentiation between mothers and fathers, where mothers take on more of the tangible child care responsibilities as well as being more nurturing and caring towards the children (Quah, 1998; Videon, 2005). Fathers, on the other hand, regarded themselves as the breadwinner in the family and focussed mainly on that, leaving child care duties within the purview of the mother. However, it may be apt to rethink the role of the father in the family, as increasingly more mothers are taking on employment outside the home (Quah, 1998). Although women "are largely assumed to have unique capabilities for nurturing and caring for children" (Videon, 2005, p.58), research in the field is beginning to show that fathers are valued by their children not for their financial contribution to their family, but for things such as cooking for the children or engaging in sports activities together (Milkie et al., 1997). As a study by Videon (2005) has shown, fathers do have a significant and substantial impact on children's psychological well-being, beyond the influence of mothers.

The present study found that mothers tended to scold or punish their children more compared to fathers. This finding is interesting, as it is inconsistent with the widely-held belief that fathers are the disciplinarians in the household, reflected in the popular saying of the "strict father" and "kind mother" that is predominant in Asian societies. However, recent research on disciplinary practices seemed to suggest that a role reversal is evolving, in that mothers are now "strict", and fathers are "kind". For instance, a study by Shek (2005) has found that adolescents reported mothers as being exerting more behavioural control than fathers in general. In a recent local study on parenting, it was also found that mothers tended to use physical punishment more than fathers when disciplining their children (Shum-Cheung et al., 2006). However, the fact that mothers were often the disciplinarian in the household did not make them less well-liked by the children. Apparently, children in this study also tended to think that their mothers were often right in scolding or punishing them, more so than their fathers. Perhaps this is again related to the role differentiation between fathers and mothers (which the children are aware of), whereby mothers are typically charged with the roles of the caregiver, responsible for teaching the child. Therefore, it all appears legitimate for mothers to be in a position of authority to discipline children.

Interestingly, research done in the West (predominantly the United States) has shown that a high level of mutuality is taking shape in modern father-child relationships, whereby father-child relationships are more peer-like. This is evident from children mentioning that "my father and I do a lot of things together" (Milkie et al., 1997, p. 232). It seems that the traditional aloof relationship between the father and child is morphing into one that is more companionate. It certainly needs further research focusing on the father-child relationship to find out if this trend is taking shape in multicultural Singapore, which is also heavily exposed to Western ideals.

Children from both single- and dual-income families reported spending time with their mothers often, with non-working parents being a mother in almost all of the single-income families in this study. One may question how it was possible for working mothers to spend as much time with the children as non-working mothers, since the former would have spent a good portion of her waking hours at work instead of being with the children. It is however important to note that this study was about the perceptions of children and their parents. Most often, it is the perception that truly matters in relation to well-being, as the perception that things are well and fine (e.g. relationships with others are good; support or help will be available if needed) often offer a certain amount of comfort in itself (e.g. Wethington & Kessler, 1986). Children in this study perceived their mothers (working or otherwise) as spending time with them often, even though quantitatively different mothers may differ. Perhaps this finding could ease some of the guilt working mothers can feel about not being able to spend more time with their children.

The supposed dilemma of the working mother has long been in existence. In 1984, a study showed that 71% of married women between the ages of 15 and 64 mentioned that a full-time housewife is a better mother than one who works, as non-working mothers could dedicate more time for their children (Ministry of Social Affairs, 1984). This view, at that time, was pervasive among working and non-working women from all socioeconomic and educational backgrounds. This belief must have persisted to some extent in today's society, as even today one often gets to read news articles debating whether a mother's place is in the home or workplace, and whether working mothers are spending enough time with children (e.g. The Straits Times, 14/05/2006). However, it must be emphasised that the decision to return to the workforce is very much a personal and conscious choice, made in consideration of the family circumstances. Family circumstances may include whether there is good child care support at home, or whether the family could cope well financially on a single income. This points to the fact that parents are experts on their families' circumstances, and most parents are able to make sound decisions in the best interest of their children and their families.

However, one should still refrain from being complacent, as we are not assuming that every family could do well with a working mother arrangement. For example, in our study, one child has said that he did not like his mother because she spent long hours at work, and did not seem to care much about him. However, research studies have rarely found direct effects of mother's employment status on children. The family environment, such as father's participation in childcare and the mother's sense of well-being, were found to play important roles in affecting children (Hoffman, 2000).

Grandparent-Child Relationship

The findings of this study suggested that after the parents, grandparents played an important role in imparting values to the children. A particular limitation of the study was that we had not looked into whether the grandchildren were living with their grandparents. But going by the 1990 census data, 21.2%[10] of the population lived in three-generation families consisting of grandchildren, parents and grandparents. This may have created ample opportunities for grandparents and grandchildren to interact with one another and teaching could occur in the process. But it may not be a cause for concern even in instances where grandparents do not live with the grandchildren, as accessibility is usually not affected, at least by distance, in Singapore. As Quah (1998) observed, the modified extended family, whereby two-generation nuclear families maintain the kinship network with grandparents and other relatives through "frequent visits and exchange of mutual aid" (p. 214), is a typical phenomenon in Singapore. In fact, this study has found that almost half of the children reported spending time with their grandparents often or very often. Hence, the grandparental relationship could still grow and be nurtured even in instances where the grandparents neither lived with nor were the main caregivers of their grandchildren.

The majority of the children in this study said that their grandparents never or seldom scolded or punished them. Children in this study also felt that their relationships with grandparents were less ridden with conflict compared with their relationships with parents. This finding is consistent with the view that grandparents in general tended to be more lenient with grandchildren compared to parents (Drew & Smith, 2002). Most of the grandparents may see disciplining as being the responsibility of the parents, while they are given a free hand to indulge the grandchildren. Perhaps grandparents' leniency towards grandchildren could partially account for the less conflictual grandparental relationships as observed in the study, although we would also like to believe that grandparents, being the most senior members in the household, are accorded more respect by the grandchildren. Further research will be needed to delve more deeply into the nature of grandparental relationships with children.

Sibling Relationship and Friendship

The findings of this study suggested that whether children had siblings did not seem to be related to their social and emotional well-being. Particularly, the qualities of parent-child relationship and friendship were no different for children with or without siblings, although children without siblings tended to share secrets and argue with their grandparents more frequently. There was also no difference in children's experiences of positive and negative feelings and emotions.

Despite the parents having to care for more than one child, the children's social and emotional well-being was not compromised, as a rule. One reason for this could be that the families in this study tended to be small – parents interviewed in this study only had an average of two children; therefore family resources were not spread too thinly to the extent that children's well-being was jeopardised. Similarly, the social and emotional well-being of children was not adversely affected by a lack of siblings. This is possibly because pre-school education may in a way serve to level up opportunities from a tender age

---

[10] This statistic was calculated from data from Census 1990 (Department of Statistics (1991c), quoted in Quah (1998). A check with the Department of Statistics confirmed that similar statistics have not been calculated based on Census 2000.

for those children without siblings, in terms of learning about social skills and interacting with peers in school. According to data from the Ministry of Education, some 95% of the children attend pre-school in Singapore (Ministry of Education, 2007), where they are expected to develop important life skills such as the ability to relate to others, be willing to share and take turns with others, and be comfortable and happy with themselves (Ministry of Education, 2008).

However, for children with siblings, the results of the present study showed that children's perceived favouritism of mothers towards other siblings seemed to be related to less positive sibling relationship, children worrying more about things, feeling very sad more often, and thinking of themselves as good persons less often; although in general the frequency with which these negative feelings and emotions were experienced was not high. Note that causation was not implied in this study, or in most other studies done on parental differential treatment towards siblings (e.g. McHale et al., 1995), in that one cannot be sure whether the perceived favouritism has caused children to fare worse in terms of social and emotional well-being, or whether the less-than-optimal well-being has resulted in children thinking that mothers favour their siblings more. Carefully planned longitudinal studies will be needed to tease apart cause from effect.

While most of the children liked their friends and had good relationships with them, it is still cause for concern that a small proportion of children did not find it easy to make friends in school. This is worrying especially when the results showed that children who did not find it easy to make friends tended to have less positive friendships and worried about things more frequently. This highlighted the relevance of programmes targeted at improving children's social skills. Examples of these programmes include the StrengthKidz programme by the Daybreak Family Service Centre and the Let Every Aspect Progress (LEAP) programme by the Singapore Children's Society, both of which focus on developing positive self-esteem and social skills among children (Singapore Children's Society, 2007). These programmes serve to equip children with important skills that would improve their social well-being, possibly with implications on their emotional well-being as well. However, it is also necessary to determine the reasons behind difficulties in school, which might arise from other causes than lack of social skills, for example, bullying in school.

Emotional Well-being
While the vast majority of the children often felt happy and had fun, it should be noted that about 10% of the children felt very sad more than sometimes and worried about things very often. Although the percentages were relatively small, it is still a cause for concern that some children in Singapore experienced negative feelings and emotions on a fairly regular basis. Though not explored in this study, many Singaporeans, adult and children alike, attribute these negative feelings and emotions to the pressures of performing well academically in meritocratic Singapore. While it is impossible (and also unhealthy to some extent) to create a stress-free environment for our children, parents could encourage their children to learn to cope with the stress, and to create opportunities for their children to discuss their feelings with them. Opening a supportive communication channel may be of great importance for children, as it was found in our focus group discussions (mentioned in Chapter 3) that most of the parent-child communication revolved around school work, with little focus on children's feelings. On the parent level, workshops such as Project Invest by the Children's Society serve to educate parents on effective parent-child

communication and positive parenting. For children, the Tinkle Friend Helpline by the Children's Society is also useful in providing a listening ear and emotional support to lonely and distressed children.

Ethnic Differences
While some statistical ethnic differences were found in this study, they were in fact minute effects that were unlikely to reflect important differences in the community. Children's relationship with significant others tended to be rather similar across ethnic groups, and the similarities were consistent by past local research on families. For example, according to a study by Quah (1998), based on data from Census 1990, Chinese, Malay and Indian parents tended to take care of children on their own to almost the same extent (about 68% for Chinese and about 72% for the Malays and Indians). Three-generation families consisting of grandparents, parents and children also seemed to be equally prevalent among the Chinese, Malays and Indians (between 20% and 25%). The greater proximity between children and parents and grandparents across ethnic groups may have contributed to good relationships regardless, although one may also argue that proximity may open more avenues for conflict at times.

Limitations of the Study
There were two main limitations to this study. Firstly, social desirability, which is a bias to respond to self-evaluative questions in a socially approved manner, may pose a problem to the validity of our findings. However, given that other studies have found children and parents very willing to indicate sources of difficulty, it is unlikely that there was enough bias to create a limitation on the interpretation of our findings, especially as there was generally agreement among parents and children (who responded to the questionnaires independently) on most of the items. Nonetheless, the inclusion of a social desirability scale, such as the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1998) or the Crowne-Marlow Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlow, 1960) would have enabled us to identify participants who are likely to give socially desirable ratings. However, it was felt that imposing an additional scale might have made the study too time-consuming for the participants.

Secondly, the design of this study was such that causation could not be assumed from our findings. For instance, we could not say for sure if children's perceived favouritism of their mothers towards the siblings has resulted in children feeling very sad often, or whether the negative emotions experienced by children has contributed to the perceived favouritism. Longitudinal studies tracking the state of social and emotional well-being of the same group of children over time would be required to ascertain the causes and effects.

Directions for Future Research
This study examined the quality of relationship between grandparents and children, but did not look into children's relationships with grandmothers and grandfathers separately, and also had not made a distinction between maternal and paternal grandparents. Just like in mother-child and father-child relationships, children may relate differently to grandmothers and grandfathers (Kornhaber & Woodward, 1985), and it may be interesting to see if the distinction is similar to what one would expect between mothers and fathers. Some researchers also believed that maternal grandparents may be closer to the children than paternal grandparents because maternal grandparents are certain that they are

related to the grandchildren genetically, whereas the certainty of relatedness is less clear for paternal grandparents (Smith & Drew, 2002). It would also be interesting to find out if the children lived with their grandparents, as this may have implications for the quality of the relationship.

As for the section on sibling relations and friendship, future studies interested in how these relationships are associated with children's well-being may take into consideration the age difference between siblings. It may also be worthwhile distinguishing very close friends from acquaintances or ordinary friends.

This study has focused on children's experiences with positive and negative feelings and emotions as a measure of emotional well-being, but did not explore the reasons behind those feelings. For example, it will be insightful to look into what makes children happy, or what children worry about. Identifying the reasons behind their emotive states will be useful for parents or caregivers in teaching children how to cope with situations that give rise to the negative emotions.

Last but not least, this study did not look at how the well-being of children from divorced or single-parent families compare with children from intact families. One would expect stressful life events such as parental divorce to have implications on children's well-being. The findings of this study were therefore not generalisable to children from divorced or single-parent families. Future studies could look into how family circumstances as such may have an impact on children's social and emotional well-being.

Conclusion
In summary, parents and children in this study had positive perceptions about children's state of social and emotional well-being. Almost all the children liked their family and friends, and had good relationships with them. The vast majority of the children also often felt happy and had fun. Good social well-being may in some ways contribute to a child's emotional well-being, since having a strong network of supportive family members and friends usually does have a buffering effect. However, causal relationships are not established in this study, as we could not determine which were the factors that caused children to have good social and emotional well-being.

With the findings of the current study, the Children's Society will be looking at planning more programmes, preventive and developmental in nature, as well as expanding our public education effort in further enhancing the social and emotional well-being of children in Singapore.

REFERENCES

Bagwell, C. L., Newcomb, A. F., & Bukowski, W. M. (1998). Preadolescent friendship and peer rejection as predictors of adult adjustment. *Child Development, 69*(1), 140-153.

Berscheid, E., & Reis, H. T. (1998). Attraction and close relationships. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (v4, pp. 193-281). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base*. New York: Basic.

Bukowski, W. M., Newcomb, A. F., & Hartup, W. W. (1996). Friendship and its significance in childhood and adolescence: Introduction and comment. In W. M. Bukowski, A. F. Newcomb & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *The company they keep: Friendship in childhood and adolescence* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cai, Y., Fung, D. S. S., Koh, J. B. K., Parker, G., Chan, Y. H., Teo, J., & Chu, R. (2006). *Functionality and clinical cut-off of the Singapore Children Emotional Distress Scale*. Unpublished.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 349-354.

Cudina, M., & Obradovic, J. (2001). Child's emotional well-being: Parental marriage stability in Croatia. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 32*(2), 247-261.

Department of Statistics (2006). *General Household Survey 2005* [Online]. Available http://www.singstat.gov.sg/pubn/ghs.html#ghsr1 [2008, February 18].

Department of Statistics (2006). *Key annual indicators* [Online]. Available http://www.singstat.gov.sg/stats/keyind.html [2008, February 18].

Department of Statistics (2007). *Yearbook of statistics Singapore, 2007*. Department of Statistics, Ministry of Trade & Industry, Singapore.

Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. (2002). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and life satisfaction. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 63-73). New York: Oxford University Press.

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*, 276-302.

Donnelly, J. W., Eburne, N., & Kittleson, M. (2001). *Mental health: Dimensions of self-esteem and emotional well-being*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Dunn, J. (1993). *Young children's close relationship: Beyond attachment*. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications.

Dunn, J. (2005). Commentary: Sibling in their families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*(4), 654-657.

Dunn, J., Stocker, C. M., & Plomin, R. (1990). Nonshared experiences within the family: Correlates of behaviour problems in middle childhood. *Development and Psychopathology, 2*, 113-126.

Ennew, J. (2006). *Comparative research on corporal punishment in eight countries: What children say*. Paper presented at the Asia-Pacific Childhoods Conference – An 'Ethnography of Childhood' Workshop, Singapore, July 2006.

Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. *Developmental Psychology, 21*(6), 1016-1024.

Greenspoon, P. J., & Saklofske, D. H. (1997). Validity and reliability of the Multidimensional Students' Life Satisfaction Scale with Canadian children. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 15*, 138-155.

Harris, J. R. (1995). Where is the child's environment? A group socialization theory of development. *Psychological Review, 102*(3), 458-489.

Harris, J. R. (1998). *The nurture assumption: Why children turn out the way they do*. New York: Free Press.

Hoffman, L, W. (2000). Maternal employment: Effects of social context. In R. D Taylor & M. C. Wang (Eds.), R*esilience across contexts: Family, work, culture and community* (pp.147-176). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Irish, D. P. (1964). Sibling interaction: A neglected aspect of family life research. *Social Forces, 42*, 279-288.

Kaufman, P., Rasinski, K. A., Lee, R., & West, J. (1991). *Quality of responses of eight-grade students in NELS '88*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Kelly, G. A. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs*. New York: Norton.

Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61*(2), 121-140.

Koh, C. W., & Tan, A. (2008). *Bullying in Singapore schools*. Singapore: Singapore Children's Society.

Kornhaber, A., & Woodward, K. (1985). *Grandparents/grandchildren: The vital connection*. New Brunswick, USA: Transaction Books.

Lent, R. (2004). Towards a unifying theoretical and practical perspective on well-being and psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 482-509.

McGregor, I., & Little, B. R. (1998). Personal projects, happiness, and meaning. On doing well and being yourself. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 494-512.

McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., McGuire, S. A., & Updegraff, K. A. (1995). Congruence between mothers' and fathers' differential treatment of siblings: Links with family relations and children's well-being. *Child Development, 66*, 116-128.

Milkie, M. A., Simon, R. W., & Powell, B. (1997). Through the eyes of children: Youths' perceptions and evaluations of maternal and paternal roles. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 60*(3), 218-237.

Ministry of Education, Singapore (2006). *Education Statistics Digest 2006* [Online]. Available: http://www.moe.gov.sg/esd/ESD2006.pdf [2008, February 18].

Ministry of Education, Singapore (2007). *Levelling up opportunities: Improving the quality of pre-school education and increasing participation in pre-schools* [Online]. Available: http://www.moe.gov.sg/press/2007/pr20070307c_print.htm [2008, February 27].

Ministry of Education, Singapore (2008). *Desired outcomes of pre-school education* [Online]. Available: http://www.moe.gov.sg/preschooleducation/ [2008, February 27].

Ministry of Social Affairs. (1984). *Report on National Survey on Married Women: Their role in the family and society.* Singapore: Research Branch, Ministry of Social Affairs.

Noack, P., & Buhl, H. M. (2004). Child-parent relationships. In F. R Lang & K. L. Fingerman (Eds.), *Growing together: Personal relationships across the lifespan* (pp. 45-75). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oppenheim, D., Emde, R. N., & Warren, S. (1997). Children's narrative representations of mothers: Their development and associations with child and mother adaptation. *Child Development, 68*(1), 127-138.

Paulhus, D. L. (1998). *The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR-7).* Toronto/ Buffalo: Multi-Health Systems.

Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1993). Friendship and friendship quality in middle children: Links with peer group acceptance and feelings of loneliness and social dissatisfaction. *Developmental Psychology, 29*, 611-621.

Piers, E. V. (1984). *Piers-Harris children's self-concept scale.* California: Western Psychological Services.

Quah, S. R. (1998). *Family in Singapore: Sociological perspectives*. (2nd ed.). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Quah, S. R. (1999). *Study on the Singapore family*. Singapore: Ministry of Community Development.

Rigby, K. (2003). *Stop the bullying: Handbook for schools*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.

Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4*, 99-104.

Shek, D. T. L. (2005). Perceived parental control and parent-child relational qualities in Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong. *Sex Roles, 53*, 635-646.

Shum-Cheung, H. S., Hawkins, R., Lim, K. W. (2006). *The parenting project: Disciplinary practices, child care arrangements and parenting practices in Singapore*. Singapore: Singapore Children's Society.

Singapore Children's Society. (2007). *CSEW directory 2007: A directory of programmes and publications that enhances children's social and emotional well-being*. Singapore: Singapore Children's Society.

Smith, P. K., & Drew, L. M. (2002). Grandparenthood. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol 3, Being and becoming a parent* (pp. 141-172). Mahwah, N. J.: Erlbaum.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York: Norton.

The Straits Times. (2000). *Survey on attitudes and lifestyles among Primary 4-6 pupils*. Singapore: Marketing, Planning and Development (Research), Singapore Press Holdings Ltd.

The Straits Times. (2006, May 14). *Experts' tips on coping with motherhood*, pp. 4.

The Straits Times. (2006, May 14). *Sunday Times Poll: Singapore mum rates themselves 7 out of 10*, pp. 3.

Thoits, P. A. (1992). Identity structures and psychological well-being: Gender and marital comparisons. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 55*(3), 236-256.

Vazsonyi, A.T., & Flannery, D.J (1997). Early adolescent delinquent behaviors: Associations with family and school domains. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 17*, 271-293.

Videon, T. M. (2005). Parent-child relations and children's psychological well-being: Do dads matter? *Journal of Family Issues, 26*(1), 55-78.

von Salisch, M. (2000). The emotional side of sharing, social support and conflict negotiation between siblings and between friends. In R. Mills & S. Duck (Eds.), *The developmental psychology of personal relationships* (pp. 49-90). West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANA scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 1063-1070.

Weiss, R. S. (1974). The provisions of social relationship. In Z. Rubin (Ed.), *Doing unto others: Joining, molding, conforming, helping, loving* (pp. 17-26). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Wethington, E., & Kessler, R. C. (1986). Perceived support, received support, and adjustment to stressful life events. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 27*, 78-90.

Yellow Pages (Singapore) Limited. (2005). *Residential listings 2005/2006*. Singapore: Yellow Pages (Singapore) Limited.

Yeo, L. S., Ang, R. P., Chong, W. H., & Huang, V. S. (2007). Gender differences in adolescent concerns and emotional well-being: Perceptions of Singaporean adolescent students. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 168*(1), 63-80.

Youniss, J., & Smollar, J. (1985). *Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Table 22: Demographic statistics of the present study

Age of Participants	Range	Average	
Parents	25-65 years	41.0 years (S.D# = 5.6 years)	
Children	6-12 years	9.3 years (S.D = 1.7 years)	
Citizenship of Parents		**N**	**%**
Singaporean		822	90.7
Permanent Resident		84	9.3
Gender of Parents		**N**	**%**
Father		450	49.7
Mother		456	50.3
Gender of Children		**N**	**%**
Boy		457	50.4
Girl		449	49.6
Ethnicity of Parents		**N**	**%**
Chinese		631	69.6
Malay		173	19.1
Indian		90	9.9
Others		12	1.3
Ethnicity of Children		**N**	**%**
Chinese		634	70.0
Malay		175	19.3
Indian		88	9.7
Others		9	1.0
Approximate Monthly Household Income of Parents		**N**	**%**
$1000 or less		43	4.8
$1001-$2000		207	23.3
$2001-$3000		198	22.3
$3001-$4000		138	15.6
$4001-$5000		152	17.1
Above $5000		149	16.8
Type of Housing		**N**	**%**
1- or 2-room flat		19	2.1
3-room flat		164	18.1
4-room flat		368	40.6
5-room or executive flat		309	34.1
Condominium or private flat		18	2.0
Landed property		28	3.1

Employment Status of Parent Respondents	N	%
Full-time	604	66.7
Part-time	58	6.4
Not working	244	26.9
Employment Status of Fathers Interviewed	**N**	**%**
Full-time	416	92.4
Part-time	11	2.4
Not working	23	5.1
Employment Status of Mothers Interviewed	**N**	**%**
Full-time	188	41.2
Part-time	47	10.3
Not working	221	48.5
Education Levels of Parents	**N**	**%**
Little or no schooling	25	2.8
Completed Primary School	124	13.7
Some Secondary School	157	17.3
Completed "N" or "O" Levels	277	30.6
Completed "A" Levels	60	6.6
Completed Polytechnic	90	9.9
Completed University	124	13.7
Others	49	5.4
Education Levels of Children	**N**	**%**
Primary 1	151	16.7
Primary 2	148	16.3
Primary 3	155	17.1
Primary 4	156	17.2
Primary 5	147	16.2
Primary 6	149	16.4

[#] Standard Deviation

Reliability

Table 23: Reliability coefficients of the scales on social and emotional well -being

Section	Cronbach Alpha	
	Parents	**Children**
Parent-child relationship	.49	Mother: .56 Father: .52
Grandparental relationship	.59	.61
Sibling relationship	.77	.82
Friendship	.78	.69
Emotional well-being	.63	.61
School bullying	.79	.76

Factor Analysis

Table 24: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on items on mother-child relationship (children's responses), and the corresponding reliability coefficients

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	**%Var**	**Cum%**	**Total**	**%Var**	**Cum%**	**Total**	**%Var**	**Cum%**
1	2.73	24.84	24.84	2.73	24.84	24.84	2.51	22.83	22.83
2	1.79	16.27	41.11	1.79	16.27	41.11	1.86	16.95	39.78
3	1.05	9.50	50.61	1.05	9.50	50.61	1.19	10.83	50.61

Items	Rotated Components		
	1	**2**	**3**
Spend time with child	.71		
Shows that she likes/loves child	.68		
Teach child good manners and politeness	.65		
Pay attention to what child says	.59		
Play and have fun with child	.57		
Help with homework	.45		
Scold/punish child		.83	
Get angry with child		.73	
Think it is right to scold/punish child		-.60	
Child tells mother secrets and feelings			.73
Argue with child			-.60
Reliability coefficients	.69	-.16	-.37

Table 25: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on items on father-child relationship (children's responses), and the corresponding reliability coefficients

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	2.64	24.01	24.01	2.64	24.01	24.01	2.15	19.50	19.50
2	1.66	15.07	39.08	1.66	15.07	39.08	1.79	16.24	35.74
3	1.16	10.56	49.64	1.16	10.56	49.64	1.53	13.90	49.64

Items	Rotated Components		
	1	2	3
Shows that he likes/loves child	.68		
Teach child good manners and politeness	.68		
Spend time with child	.66		
Pay attention to what child says	.58		
Play and have fun with child	.48		
Scold/punish child		.82	
Get angry with child		.73	
Think it is right to scold/punish child		-.53	
Argue with child		.49	
Child tells father secrets and feelings			.79
Help with homework			.61
Reliability coefficients	.67	.18	.48

Table 26: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on items on grandparent-child relationship (children's responses), and the corresponding reliability coefficients

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	3.74	33.97	33.97	3.74	33.97	33.97	2.96	26.95	26.95
2	1.68	15.28	49.25	1.68	15.28	49.25	2.12	19.23	46.17
3	1.11	10.05	59.30	1.11	10.05	59.30	1.44	13.13	59.30

Items	Rotated Components		
	1	2	3
Pay attention to what child says	.77		
Shows that he likes/loves child	.76		
Teach child good manners and politeness	.73		
Play and have fun with child	.68		
Spend time with child	.61		
Think it is right to scold/punish child	.56		
Scold/punish child		.82	
Get angry with child		.79	
Argue with child		.78	
Help with homework			.78
Child tells grandparent secrets & feelings			.76
Reliability coefficients	.80	.75	.51

Table 27: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on items on sibling relationship (children's responses), and the corresponding reliability coefficients

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	3.96	39.59	39.59	3.96	39.59	39.59	2.87	28.74	28.74
2	1.15	11.45	51.04	1.15	11.45	51.04	2.01	20.07	48.81
3	1.07	10.73	61.77	1.07	10.73	61.77	1.30	12.97	61.77

Items	Rotated Components		
	1	2	3
Help one another with schoolwork	.81		
Tell one another about problems	.75		
Siblings help the child	.72		
Pay attention to what child says	.59		
Child shares things with siblings	.52		
Nice to the child	.49		
Care about child's feelings	.48		
Child spends time with siblings		.82	
Child has fun with siblings		.81	
Quarrel with the child			.91
Reliability coefficients	.83	.64	-

Table 28: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on items on friendship (children's responses), and the corresponding reliability coefficients

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	2.93	29.34	29.34	2.93	29.34	29.34	2.47	24.67	24.67
2	1.40	14.05	43.39	1.40	14.05	43.39	1.87	18.72	43.39

Items	Rotated Components	
	1	2
Help one another with schoolwork	.70	
Tell one another about problems	.64	
Child spends time with friends outside school	.64	
Child shares things with friends	.63	
Friends help the child	.63	
Pay attention to what child says	.46	
Nice to the child		.73
Care about child's feelings		.67
Child has fun with friends		.55
Quarrel with the child		.44
Reliability coefficients	.70	.47

Table 29: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on items on emotional well-being (children's responses), and the corresponding reliability coefficients

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	2.31	23.06	23.06	2.31	23.06	23.06	1.90	18.97	18.97
2	1.56	15.64	38.70	1.56	15.64	38.70	1.63	16.27	35.24
3	1.06	10.60	49.30	1.06	10.60	49.30	1.41	14.06	49.30

Items	Rotated Components		
	1	2	3
Child feels very sad	.72		
Child cries when doing things	.70		
Child worries about things	.68		
Child is sick	.48		
Child is happy		.82	
Child has fun		.67	
Child thinks he/she is a good person		.65	
Child forgets things			.77
Child wants to be alone			.64
Child quarrels with others			.51
Reliability coefficients	.58	.55	.46

Table 30: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on items on parent-child relationship (parents' responses), and the corresponding reliability coefficients

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	2.78	25.23	25.23	2.78	25.23	25.23	1.90	17.31	17.31
2	1.64	14.90	40.12	1.64	14.90	40.12	1.85	16.85	34.16
3	1.18	10.71	50.83	1.18	10.71	50.83	1.83	16.67	50.83

Items	Rotated Components		
	1	2	3
Scold/punish child	.77		
Get angry with child	.74		
Argue with child	.67		
Pay attention to what child says		.70	
Teach child good manners and politeness		.65	
Spend time with child		.56	
Think it is right to scold/punish child		.55	
Help with homework			.68
Child tells parent secrets and feelings			.65
Play and have fun with child			.62
Parent shows that he/she likes/loves child			.63
Reliability coefficients	.64	.57	.59

Table 31: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on items on grandparent-child relationship (parents' responses), and the corresponding reliability coefficients

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	4.03	36.62	36.62	4.03	36.62	36.62	3.08	28.01	28.01
2	1.53	13.89	50.51	1.53	13.89	50.51	2.05	18.62	46.63
3	1.00	9.12	59.63	1.00	9.12	59.63	1.43	13.00	59.63

Items	Rotated Components		
	1	2	3
Shows that he/she likes/loves child	.77		
Teach child good manners and politeness	.76		
Pay attention to what child says	.76		
Play and have fun with child	.67		
Spend time with child	.66		
Think it is right to scold/punish child	.56		
Scold/punish child		.80	
Get angry with child		.79	
Argue with child		.76	
Help with homework			.77
Child tells grandparent secrets & feelings			.73
Reliability coefficients	.82	.75	.47

Table 32: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on items on sibling relationship (parents' responses), and the corresponding reliability coefficients

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	3.56	35.56	35.56	3.56	35.56	35.56	2.51	25.08	25.08
2	1.22	12.17	47.73	1.22	12.17	47.73	2.17	21.71	46.79
3	1.05	10.50	58.23	1.05	10.50	58.23	1.15	11.45	58.23
Items	**Rotated Components**		
	1	2	3
Tell one another about problems	.80		
Help one another with schoolwork	.79		
Siblings help the child	.76		
Pay attention to what child says	.53		
Child has fun with siblings		.79	
Child spends time with siblingss		.72	
Nice to the child		.57	
Child shares things with siblings		.52	
Care about child's feelings		.48	
Quarrel with the child			.85
Reliability coefficient	.75	.72	-

Table 33: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on items on friendship (parents' responses), and the corresponding reliability coefficients

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	3.53	35.33	35.33	3.53	35.33	35.33	3.53	35.30	35.30
2	1.14	11.36	46.68	1.14	11.36	46.68	1.14	11.38	46.68

Items	Rotated Components	
	1	2
Nice to the child	.71	
Friends help the child	.70	
Pay attention to what the child says	.69	
Care about child's feelings	.67	
Help one another with schoolwork	.66	
Tell one another about problems	.64	
Child shares things with friends	.61	
Child has fun with friends	.50	
Child quarrels with friends		-.70
Child spends time with friends outside school		.68
Reliability coefficients	.81	-.19

Table 34: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on items on emotional well-being (parents' responses), and the corresponding reliability coefficients

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	2.38	23.82	23.82	2.38	23.82	23.82	1.86	18.56	18.56
2	1.33	13.34	37.16	1.33	13.34	37.16	1.47	14.71	33.28
3	1.03	10.29	47.45	1.03	10.29	47.45	1.42	14.18	47.45

Items	Rotated Components		
	1	2	3
Child feels very sad	.74		
Child worries about things	.72		
Child cries when doing things	.66		
Child is sick	.43		
Child wants to be alone		.76	
Child quarrels with others		.64	
Child forgets things		.39	
Child is happy			.76
Child has fun			.69
Child thinks he/she is a good person			.58
Reliability coefficients	.59	.44	.45

Table 35: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on all items (children's responses)

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	8.36	13.27	13.27	8.36	13.27	13.27	4.18	6.63	6.63
2	4.03	6.40	19.67	4.03	6.40	19.67	3.12	4.96	11.59
3	3.09	4.90	24.58	3.09	4.90	24.58	2.73	4.33	15.92
4	2.52	4.01	28.58	2.52	4.01	28.58	2.71	4.31	20.23
5	2.27	3.60	32.18	2.27	3.60	32.18	2.69	4.27	24.49
6	2.22	3.52	35.70	2.22	3.52	35.70	2.34	3.71	28.20
7	2.08	3.31	39.00	2.08	3.31	39.00	2.27	3.60	31.81
8	1.63	2.59	41.59	1.63	2.59	41.59	2.06	3.27	35.08
9	1.56	2.47	44.06	1.56	2.47	44.06	1.94	3.09	38.17
10	1.47	2.33	46.39	1.47	2.33	46.39	1.86	2.96	41.12
11	1.42	2.25	48.64	1.42	2.25	48.64	1.82	2.89	44.01
12	1.32	2.09	50.73	1.32	2.09	50.73	1.81	2.87	46.89
13	1.23	1.96	52.69	1.23	1.60	52.69	1.80	2.85	49.73
14	1.15	1.82	54.51	1.15	1.82	54.51	1.69	2.68	52.41
15	1.11	1.77	56.27	1.11	1.77	56.27	1.61	2.56	54.97
16	1.05	1.67	57.94	1.05	1.67	57.94	1.50	2.38	57.35
17	1.02	1.62	59.56	1.02	1.62	59.56	1.39	2.21	59.56

Table 36: Principal component analysis (with varimax rotation) on all items (parents' responses)

Components	Initial eigenvalues			Extraction sums of squared loadings			Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%	Total	%Var	Cum%
1	6.66	12.57	12.57	6.66	12.57	12.57	3.56	6.72	6.72
2	3.46	6.52	19.09	3.46	6.52	19.09	3.38	6.37	13.09
3	3.01	5.67	24.75	3.01	5.67	24.75	2.82	5.32	18.41
4	2.65	5.00	29.75	2.65	5.00	29.75	2.31	4.36	22.76
5	2.18	4.11	33.86	2.18	4.11	33.86	2.09	3.94	26.70
6	1.75	3.31	37.17	1.75	3.31	37.17	1.99	3.76	30.46
7	1.63	3.08	40.25	1.63	3.08	40.25	1.96	3.70	34.16
8	1.48	2.80	43.05	1.48	2.80	43.05	1.96	3.70	37.85
9	1.39	2.61	45.66	1.39	2.61	45.66	1.85	3.49	41.34
10	1.19	2.25	47.90	1.19	2.25	47.90	1.76	3.32	44.66
11	1.17	2.21	50.11	1.17	2.21	50.11	1.66	3.13	47.79
12	1.15	2.17	52.28	1.15	2.17	52.28	1.51	2.86	50.64
13	1.07	2.02	54.30	1.07	2.02	54.30	1.50	2.82	53.47
14	1.05	1.98	56.28	1.05	1.98	56.28	1.32	2.50	55.96
15	1.01	1.91	58.18	1.01	1.91	58.18	1.18	2.22	58.18

One-way ANOVAs, Posthoc Analyses and Paired-Samples T-tests

Table 37: Comparing children's and parents' ratings on social and emotional well-being*

Items/Composite	Inter-viewee	N	Av Freq	S.D[#]	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Composite on Friendship	Children	906	3.5	.54	$F(1,1810) = 90.28$,	.048
	Parents	906	3.2	.74	MSE = .42, $p < .01$	
Composite on Sibling Relationship	C	790	3.4	.67	$F(1,1578) = 30.25$,	.019
	P	790	3.6	.58	MSE = .39, $p < .01$	
Parents gets angry with the child	C	906	3.0	.76	$F(1,1810) = 11.25$,	.006
	P	906	3.2	.93	MSE = .72, $p < .01$	
Child tells parents secrets and feelings	C	906	2.6	1.05	$F(1,1807) = 68.32$,	.036
	P	903	3.0	1.22	MSE = 1.30, $p < .01$	
Parents play and have fun with the child	C	906	3.6	.93	$F(1,1810) = 15.70$,	.009
	P	906	3.8	.93	MSE = .87, $p < .01$	
Parents and child argue with each other	C	906	2.4	.86	$F(1,1810) = 51.50$,	.028
	P	906	2.7	1.03	MSE = .91, $p < .01$	
Parents pay attention to what the child says	C	906	3.7	.83	$F(1,1810) = 21.77$,	.012
	P	906	3.9	.89	MSE = .74, $p < .01$	
Parents teach the child about good manners and politeness	C	906	4.2	.76	$F(1,1809) = 21.70$,	.012
	P	905	4.3	.79	MSE = .61, $p < .01$	
Child spends time with the parents	C	906	4.2	.68	$F(1,1809) = 12.92$,	.007
	P	905	4.3	.73	MSE = .49, $p < .01$	
Child and grandparents argue with each other	C	795	1.6	.88	$F(1,1589) = 7.28$,	.005
	P	796	1.8	1.00	MSE = .89, $p < .01$	
Child is sick	C	906	2.4	.82	$F(1,1810) = 13.65$,	.007
	P	906	2.3	.78	MSE = .64, $p < .01$	
Child quarrels with others	C	905	2.4	.97	$F(1,1809) = 12.54$,	.007
	P	906	2.2	.98	MSE = .96, $p < .01$	
Child thinks that he/she is a good person	C	906	3.8	1.03	$F(1,1810) = 11.34$,	.006
	P	906	4.0	1.12	MSE = 1.15, $p < .01$	

* Only statistically significant results are shown.
[#] S.D = Standard Deviation

Children's Responses

Table 38: Children's perspectives on comparing their relationships with father and mother

Items	Parent	N	Av Freq	S.D	t statistics	Cohen's d
Help with the child's homework	Father	877	3.0	1.26	t(876) = 12.66, p < .01	.86
	Mother	877	3.7	1.14		
Show love towards child	Father	877	4.2	.88	t(876) = 6.75,p < .01,	.46
	Mother	877	4.4	.77		
Get angry with the child	Father	877	2.9	.94	t(876) = 5.46, p < .01,	.37
	Mother	877	3.1	.88		
Tell mother about secrets and feelings	Father	877	2.3	1.19	t(876) = 12.11, p < .01	.82
	Mother	877	2.8	1.25		
Play and have fun with mother	Father	877	3.6	1.09	t(876) = 2.49, n.s	-
	Mother	877	3.7	1.09		
Child and mother argue with each other	Father	876	2.2	1.00	t(875) = 9.42, p < .01,	.64
	Mother	876	2.6	1.04		
Pay attention to what the child says	Father	877	3.6	.96	t(876) = 4.49, p < .01,	.30
	Mother	877	3.8	.97		
Scold or punish the child	Father	877	2.8	.93	t(876) = 8.70, p < .01,	.59
	Mother	877	3.2	.93		
Think the mother is right to scold or punish	Father	877	3.5	1.15	t(876) = 4.66, p < .01,	.31
	Mother	877	3.7	1.05		
Teach the child good manners and politeness	Father	877	4.1	.95	t(876) = 4.64, p < .01,	.31
	Mother	877	4.2	.83		
Spend time with the child	Father	875	4.0	.88	t(874) = 11.46, p < .01	.78
	Mother	875	4.4	.78		

Table 39: **Children's perspectives on parent-child relationship, differentiated by whether children perceived favouritism towards other siblings***

Items	Perceived favouritism	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Father shows love towards child	Yes No	123 650	4.0 4.2	1.10 .83	$F(1,771) = 8.12$, MSE = .77, p < .01	.016
Father gets angry with the child	Y N	123 650	3.2 2.9	1.02 .90	$F(1,771) = 7.03$, MSE = .85, p < .01	.014
Child tells father about secrets and feelings	Y N	123 650	2.0 2.3	1.18 1.18	$F(1,771) = 8.95$, MSE = 1.39, p < .01	.013
Father pays attention to what child says	Y N	123 650	3.4 3.7	1.05 .94	$F(1,771) = 9.85$, MSE = .92, p < .01	.011
Father scolds or punishes the child	Y N	123 650	3.1 2.8	1.06 .90	$F(1,771) = 13.09$, MSE = .86, p < .01	.016
Father spends time with the child	Y N	123 650	3.8 4.1	1.01 .84	$F(1,771) = 12.65$, MSE = .75, p < .01	.015
Child tells mother about secrets and feelings	Y N	137 648	2.5 2.9	1.26 1.25	$F(1,783) = 10.36$, MSE = 1.56, p < .01	.014
Mother plays and has fun with child	Y N	137 648	3.4 3.8	1.25 1.04	$F(1,783) = 16.11$, MSE = 1.17, p < .01	.018
Mother pays attention to what child says	Y N	137 648	3.5 3.8	1.04 .94	$F(1,783) = 9.94$, MSE = .92, p < .01	.011
Child thinks mother is right to scold/punish	Y N	137 648	3.4 3.7	1.12 1.04	$F(1,783) = 9.25$, MSE = 1.11, p < .01	.010
Mother spends time with the child	Y N	137 647	4.2 4.4	.96 .73	$F(1,782) = 9.83$, MSE = .61, p < .01	.011

* Only statistically significant results are shown.

Table 40: **Children's perspectives on sibling relationships and emotional well-being, differentiated by whether children perceived favouritism by fathers towards other siblings**

Items/Composite	Perceived favouritism	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Composite on sibling relationship	Yes No	123 650	3.2 3.4	.73 .65	$F(1,771) = 7.26$, MSE = .44, p < .01	.009
All items on emotional well-being	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-

Table 41: Children's perspectives on sibling relationships and emotional well-being, differentiated by whether children perceived favouritism by mothers towards other siblings

Items/Composite	Perceived favouritism	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Composite on sibling relationship	Yes No	137 648	3.3 3.4	.71 .66	F(1,783) = 6.40, n.s	-
Child worries about things	Y N	137 648	3.0 2.7	1.12 1.09	F(1,783) = 9.53, MSE = 1.20, p < .01	.016
Child feels very sad	Y N	137 648	2.7 2.4	1.08 1.00	F(1,783) = 8.82, MSE = 1.03, p < .01	.013
Child thinks he/she is a good person	Y N	137 648	3.6 3.8	1.07 1.02	F(1,783) = 7.52, MSE = 1.05, p < .01	.013

Table 42: Children's perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by children's gender*

Items	Children's Gender	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Father gets angry with the child	Boy Girl	446 437	3.0 2.9	.94 .92	F(1,881) = 6.81, MSE = .87, p < .01	.008
Father scolds or punishes the child	B G	446 437	3.0 2.7	.94 .91	F(1,881) = 23.66, MSE = .85, p < .01	.026
Child tells mother about secrets and feelings	B G	454 446	2.7 3.0	1.25 1.23	F(1,898) = 14.90, MSE = 1.54, p < .01	.016
Grandparent helps with homework	B G	398 397	1.3 1.4	.74 .92	F(1,793) = 7.19, MSE = .70, p < .01	.009
Grandparent scolds/ punishes child	B G	398 397	2.0 1.8	1.10 1.03	F(1,793) = 6.88, MSE = 1.14, p < .01	.009
Composite on sibling relationship	B G	399 391	3.4 3.4	.66 .67	F(1,788) = .95, n.s	-
Composite on friendship	B G	457 449	3.4 3.5	.56 .52	F(1,904) = 3.16, n.s	-
All items on emotional well-being	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-

* Only statistically significant results are shown.

Table 43: Children's perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by children's ethnicity* (with Bonferroni adjustment)

Items	Children's Ethnicity	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Father helps with homework	Chinese Indian	615 88	2.9 3.5	1.26 1.27	F(3,879) = 6.18, MSE = 1.57,p < .01	.021
Child tells father about secrets and feelings	Chinese Indian	615 88	2.2 2.7	1.16 1.28	F(3,879) = 5.13, MSE = 1.41, p < .01	.017
Father plays and has fun with child	Chinese Indian	615 88	3.5 3.9	1.09 1.07	F(3,879) = 6.77, MSE = 1.18, p < .01	.023
Father spends time with child	Chinese Indian	615 88	4.0 4.2	.90 .79	F(3,879) = 5.19, MSE = .76, p < .01	.017
Mother helps with homework	Chinese Indian Malay Indian	629 87 175 87	3.6 4.1 3.7 4.1	1.18 .93 1.06 .93	F(3,896) = 6.82, MSE = 1.29, p < .01	.022
Child tells mother secrets and feelings	Chinese Indian	629 87	2.8 3.2	1.25 1.20	F(3,896) = 4.97, MSE = 1.54, p < .01	.016
Mother plays and has fun with child	Chinese Indian	629 87	3.6 4.1	1.08 1.01	F(3,896) = 4.89, MSE = 1.17, p < .01	.016
Grandparent plays and has fun with child	Chinese Malay Chinese Indian	563 153 563 72	2.7 3.0 2.7 3.1	1.16 1.21 1.16 1.38	F(3,791) = 5.27, MSE = 1.42, p < .01	.020
Composite on sibling relationship	Chinese Indian	538 79	3.3 3.7	.67 .70	F(3,786) = 7.03, MSE = .44, p < .01	.026
Composite on friendship	Chinese Malay Indian	634 175 88	3.4 3.4 3.6	.54 .51 .48	F(3,902) = 3.77, n.s	-
All items on emotional well-being	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-

* Only statistically significant results are shown.

Table 44: Children's perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by parents' income* (with Bonferroni adjustment)

Items	Parents' Income	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Father helps with homework	$1000 or less $2001-$3000	35 195	2.3 3.0	1.34 1.29		
	$1000 or less $3001-$4000	35 135	2.3 3.1	1.34 1.32		
	$1000 or less $4001-$5000	35 148	2.3 3.3	1.34 1.08	F(5,860) = 6.62, MSE = 1.55, p < .01	.037
	$1000 or less Above $5000	35 148	2.3 3.3	1.34 1.24		
	$1001-$2000 $4001-$5000	205 148	2.8 3.3	1.25 1.08		
	$1001-$2000 Above $5000	205 148	2.8 3.3	1.25 1.24		
Father shows he likes/ loves the child	$1000 or less $3001-$4000	35 135	3.9 4.4	1.19 .81	F(5,860) = 3.92, MSE = .76, p < .01	.022
Mother helps with homework	$1001-$2000 $4001-$5000	206 151	3.4 4.0	1.19 1.02		
	$1001-$2000 Above $5000	206 149	3.4 4.0	1.19 1.01	F(5,875) = 6.95, MSE = 1.26, p < .01	.038
	$2001-$3000 $4001-$5000	196 151	3.6 4.0	1.14 1.02		
	$2001-$3000 Above $5000	196 149	3.6 4.0	1.14 1.01		
Mother shows she likes/loves the child	$1000 or less $3001-$4000	42 137	4.1 4.5	.99 .79		
	$1000 or less $4001-$5000	42 151	4.1 4.5	.99 .65	F(5,875) = 3.79, MSE = .58, p < .01	.021
	$1000 or less Above $5000	42 149	4.1 4.5	.99 .63		
Mother gets angry with the child	$2001-$3000 Above $5000	196 149	3.3 3.0	.85 .70	F(5,875) = 3.18, MSE = .76, p < .01	.018
All items on grandparent-child relationship	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-
Composite on sibling relationship	$1000 or less $1001-$2000 $2001-$3000 $3001-$4000 $4001-$5000 Above $5000	36 183 172 118 134 130	3.3 3.4 3.4 3.5 3.4 3.3	.63 .64 .66 .62 .67 .73	F(5,767) = 2.18, n.s	-
Composite on friendship	$1000 or less $1001-$2000 $2001-$3000 $3001-$4000 $4001-$5000 Above $5000	43 207 198 138 152 149	3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.4	48 .53 .56 .51 .54 .54	F(5,881) = 1.12, n.s	-
All items on emotional well-being	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-

* Only statistically significant results are shown.

Table 45: Children's perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by parents' employment status* (with Bonferroni adjustment)

Items/Composite	Employment Status	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
All items on father-child relationship	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-
Mother spends time with child	Dual-income Single-income	444 438	4.3 4.5	.85 .69	F(4,893) = 4.17, MSE = .60, p < .01	018
All items on grandparent-child relationship	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-
Composite on sibling relationship	Both unemployed Dual-income Single-income	14 383 393	3.4 3.3 3.4	.80 .69 .64	F(5,784) = 2.10, n.s	-
Composite on friendship	Both unemployed Dual-income Single-income	16 447 443	3.3 3.5 3.5	.71 .56 .52	F(5,900) = .86, n.s	-
All items on emotional well-being	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-

* Only statistically significant results are shown.

Table 46: Children's perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by housing type* (with Bonferroni adjustment)

Items/Composite	Housing Type	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Father helps with homework	3-room	157	2.8	1.33	F(5,877) = 3.89, MSE = 1.57, p < .01	.022
	5-room/executive	303	3.2	1.18		
Father argues with child	1- or 2-room	15	1.5	.74	F(5,877) = 3.76, MSE = .97, p < .01	0.21
	5-room	303	2.3	.98		
	3-room	157	2.3	1.04		
	Landed property	28	1.7	.71		
	5-room/executive	303	2.3	.98		
	Landed property	28	1.7	.71		
Father thinks he is right to scold/punish child	4-room	362	3.7	1.11	F(5,877) = 4.20, MSE = 1.29, p < .01	.023
	Landed property	28	2.8	.86		
	5-room/executive	303	3.5	1.14		
	Landed property	28	2.8	.86		
Father spends time with child	1- or 2-room	15	3.3	1.28	F(5,877) = 4.56, MSE = .76, p < .01	.025
	4-room	362	4.0	.86		
	1- or 2-room	15	3.3	1.28		
	5-room/executive	303	4.2	.80		
	1- or 2-room	15	3.3	1.28		
	Landed property	28	4.1	.93		
Mother helps with homework	1- or 2-room	19	3.1	1.24	F(5,894) = 6.90, MSE = 1.27, p < .01	.037
	5-room/executive	309	3.9	1.07		
	1- or 2-room	19	3.1	1.24		
	Landed property	28	4.1	.89		
	3-room	161	3.4	1.26		
	5-room/executive	309	3.9	1.07		
	3-room	161	3.4	1.26		
	Landed property	28	4.1	.89		
	4-room	365	3.6	1.12		
	5-room/executive	309	3.9	1.07		
Mother thinks she is right to scold/punish child	3-room	161	3.6	1.09	F(5,894) = 4.77, MSE = 1.09, p < .01	.026
	Landed property	28	2.9	.79		
	4-room	365	3.8	1.06		
	Landed property	28	2.9	.79		
	5-room/executive	309	3.7	1.01		
	Landed property	28	2.9	.79		
Grandparent gets angry with child	4-room	320	1.8	1.00	F(5,789) = 3.08, MSE = 1.07, p < .01	.019
	5-room/executive	275	2.1	1.10		
Grandparent spends time with child	Condominium	18	2.7	1.07	F(5,789) = 3.10, MSE = 1.25, p < .01	.019
	Landed property	28	3.9	1.07		
Composite on sibling relationship	1- or 2-room	17	3.3	.55	F(5,784) = 2.67, n.s	-
	3-room	142	3.4	.67		
	4-room	311	3.4	.65		
	5-room/executive	281	3.4	.67		
	Condominium	15	2.8	.63		
	Landed property	24	3.6	.84		
Composite on friendship	1- or 2-room	19	3.1	.45	F(5,900) = 3.46, MSE = .29, p < .01	.019
	3-room	164	3.5	.51		
	1- or 2-room	19	3.1	.45		
	5-room/executive	309	3.5	.53		
All items on emotional well-being	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-

* Only statistically significant results are shown.

Table 47: Children's perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by children's education levels* (with Bonferroni adjustment)

Items/Composite	Education Levels	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
All items on parent-child relationships	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-
All items on grandparent-child relationship	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-
Composite on sibling relationship	Primary 1	121	3.4	.72	$F(5,784) = .22$, n.s	-
	P2	129	3.4	.64		
	P3	137	3.3	.70		
	P4	140	3.4	.60		
	P5	132	3.4	.64		
	P6	131	3.4	.71		
Composite on friendship	P1	151	3.4	.62	$F(5,900) = 6.36$, MSE = .28, $p < .01$	.034
	P5	147	3.6	.51		
	P2	148	3.4	.50		
	P5	147	3.6	.51		
	P3	155	3.4	.52		
	P5	147	3.6	.51		
	P1	151	3.4	.62		
	P6	149	3.6	.51		
	P2	148	3.4	.50		
	P6	149	3.6	.51		
	P3	155	3.4	.52		
	P6	149	3.6	.51		
Child worries about things	P1	151	2.5	1.19	$F(5,900) = 4.24$, MSE = 1.22, $p < .01$	.023
	P4	156	2.9	1.13		
	P1	151	2.5	1.19		
	P5	147	2.9	1.10		
Child quarrels with others	P1	151	2.2	.98	$F(5,899) = 5.62$, MSE = .93, $p < .01$	.030
	P3	155	2.6	1.03		
	P1	151	2.2	.98		
	P4	156	2.6	.96		
	P2	148	2.2	.91		
	P3	155	2.6	1.03		
	P2	148	2.2	.91		
	P4	156	2.6	.96		

* Only statistically significant results are shown.

Table 48: Children's perspectives on parent-child and grandparent-child relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by whether children have siblings*

Items	Siblings	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
All items on parent-child relationship	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-
Child tells grandparent secrets and feelings	Y N	700 95	1.7 2.1	1.04 1.13	$F(1,793) = 11.15$, MSE = 1.10, p < .01	.014
Grandparent and child argue with each other	Y N	700 95	1.6 1.9	.86 1.01	$F(1,793) = 7.86$, MSE = .77, p < .01	.010
Composite on friendship	Y N	790 116	3.5 3.4	.54 .56	$F(1,904) = .30$, n.s	-
All items on emotional well-being	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-

* Only statistically significant results are shown for grandparent-child relationship.

Table 49: Children's perspectives on the difference between the quality of sibling relationship and friendship

Composite	N	Av Freq	S.D	t Statistics	Cohen's d
Composite on sibling relationship	790	3.4	.67	$t(789) = 3.11$,	.22
Composite on friendship	790	3.5	.54	p < .01,	

* Only statistically significant results are shown.

Table 50: Children's perspectives on friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by whether children find it easy to make friends in school*

Items	Easy to make friends	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Composite on friendship	Yes No	847 58	3.5 3.2	.53 .57	$F(1,903) = 10.25$, MSE = .29, p < .01	.011
Child worries about things	Y N	847 58	2.7 3.2	1.10 1.25	$F(1,903) = 10.44$, MSE = 1.23, p < .01	.011

* Only statistically significant results are shown.

Parent's Responses

Table 51: Parents' perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by parents' gender*

Items/Composite	Parents' Gender	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Parent helps with the child's homework	Father Mother	450 456	3.2 3.7	1.25 1.29	$F(1,904) = 39.83$, MSE = 1.61, $p < .01$	.042
Parent shows love towards the child	Father Mother	449 453	4.3 4.5	.82 .77	$F(1,900) = 11.16$, MSE = .63, $p < .01$	.012
Parent gets angry with the child	Father Mother	450 456	3.0 3.4	.89 .93	$F(1,904) = 40.35$, MSE = .83, $p < .01$	.043
Child tells parents about secrets and feelings	Father Mother	449 454	2.7 3.3	1.21 1.15	$F(1,901) = 64.12$, MSE = 1.39, $p < .01$	.066
Child and parent argue with each other	Father Mother	450 456	2.6 2.9	.97 1.07	$F(1,904) = 23.99$, MSE = 1.04, $p < .01$	.026
Parent scolds or punishes the child	Father Mother	449 456	2.9 3.2	.92 .98	$F(1,903) = 14.26$, MSE = .90, $p < .01$	.016
Think the parent is right to scold/punish the child	Father Mother	450 456	3.6 3.8	1.11 1.06	$F(1,904) = 8.24$, MSE = 1.18, $p < .01$	.009
Parent spends time with the child	Father Mother	450 455	4.2 4.4	.71 .73	$F(1,903) = 20.29$, MSE = .52, $p < .01$	.022
All items on grandparent-child relationship	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-
Composite on sibling relationship	Father Mother	401 389	3.6 3.5	.57 .58	$F(1,788) = 2.64$, n.s	-
Composite on friendship	Father Mother	450 456	3.1 3.2	.73 .75	$F(1,904) = 3.53$, n.s	-
Child worries about things	Father Mother	450 456	2.5 2.9	1.16 1.21	$F(1,904) = 16.71$, MSE = 1.41, $p < .01$	.018

* Only statistically significant results are shown for parent-child relationship and emotional well-being.

Table 52: **Parents' perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by parents' ethnicity* (with Bonferroni adjustment)**

Items/Composite	Parents' Ethnicity	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Parent helps with homework	Chinese	631	3.3	1.33	F(3,902) = 8.84, MSE = 1.64, p < .01	.029
	Indian	90	3.8	1.21		
	Chinese	631	3.3	1.33		
	Malay	173	3.8	1.13		
Grandparent plays and has fun with child	Chinese	562	2.8	1.14	F(3,792) = 3.88, MSE = 1.39, p < .01	.014
	Malay	151	3.1	1.21		
Composite on sibling relationship	Chinese	535	3.5	.57	F(3,786) = 5.40, MSE = .33, p < .01	.020
	Indian	81	3.7	.48		
Composite on friendship	Chinese	631	3.1	.74	F(3,902) = 2.76, n.s	-
	Malay	173	3.2	.78		
	Indian	90	3.3	.62		
Child is happy	Chinese	631	4.3	.76	F(3,902) = 6.11, MSE = .54, p < .01	.020
	Indian	90	4.6	.59		
Child thinks he/she is a good person	Chinese	631	3.9	1.16	F(3,902) = 5.36, MSE = 1.24, p < .01	.018
	Indian	90	4.4	.93		

* Only statistically significant results are shown for parent-child and grandparent-child relationships and emotional well-being.

Table 53: Parents' perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by parents' income* (with Bonferroni adjustment)

Items/Composite	Parents' Income	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Parent helps with homework	$1000 or less	43	2.9	1.20		
	$4001-$5000	152	3.7	1.21		
	$1000 or less	43	2.9	1.20	F(5,881) = 5.29,	.029
	Above $5000	149	3.7	1.10	MSE = 1.64, p < .01	
	$1001-$2000	207	3.2	1.41		
	$4001-$5000	152	3.7	1.21		
	$1001-$2000	207	3.2	1.41		
	Above $5000	149	3.7	1.10		
Child tells parent secrets and feelings	$1000 or less	42	2.6	1.23	F(5,879) = 3.10, MSE = 1.46, p < .01	.017
	$3001-$4000	137	3.2	1.24		
Grandparent gets angry with child	$1001-$2000	175	1.7	.90	F(5,777) = 3.19, MSE = 1.08, p < .01	.020
	Above $5000	140	2.2	1.12		
Grandparent scolds/punishes child	$1001-$2000	175	1.7	.91	F(5,777) = 3.08, MSE = 1.12, p < .01	.019
	$2001-$3000	181	2.1	1.14		
Composite on sibling relationship	$1000 or less	36	3.4	.64		
	$1001-$2000	183	3.6	.58		
	$2001-$3000	172	3.5	.59	F(5,767) = 2.95, n.s	-
	$3001-$4000	118	3.6	.58		
	$4001-$5000	134	3.6	.51		
	Above $5000	130	3.5	.56		
Composite on friendship	$1000 or less	43	3.0	.79		
	$1001-$2000	207	3.1	.82		
	$2001-$3000	198	3.2	.73	F(5,881) = 2.26, n.s	-
	$3001-$4000	138	3.2	.77		
	$4001-$5000	152	3.3	.64		
	Above $5000	149	3.2	.64		
All items on emotional well-being	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-

* Only statistically significant results are shown for parent-child and grandparent-child relationships.

Table 54: Parents' perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by parents' employment status* (with Bonferroni adjustment)

Items/Composite	Employment Status	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Parent helps with homework	Not employed Full-time	224 604	3.7 3.4	1.28 1.26	F(2,903) = 8.27, MSE = 1.66,	.018
	Not employed Part-time	224 58	3.7 3.1	1.28 1.57	p < .01	
Child tells parent secrets and feelings	Not employed Full-time	241 604	3.3 2.9	1.20 1.21	F(2,900) = 13.40, MSE = 1.45,	.029
	Not employed Part-time	241 58	3.3 2.6	1.20 1.20	p < .01	
Child and parent argue with each other	Not employed Full-time	244 604	2.9 2.7	1.04 1.00	F(2,903) = 5.04, MSE = 1.06, p < .01	.011
Parent spends time with the child	Not employed Full-time	244 603	4.5 4.2	.64 .73	F(2,902) = 15.79, MSE = .51, p < .01	.034
	Not employed Part-time	244 58	4.5 4.2	.64 .79		
All items on grandparent-child relationship	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-
Composite on sibling relationship	Not employed Full-time Part-time	219 526 45	3.5 3.6 3.4	.58 .57 .62	F(2,787) = 2.46, n.s.	-
Composite on Friendship	Not employed Full-time Part-time	244 604 58	3.2 3.2 3.1	.75 .73 .80	F(2,903) = .92, n.s	-
All items on emotional well-being	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-

* Only statistically significant results are shown for parent-child relationship.

Table 55: Parents' perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by housing types* (with Bonferroni adjustment)

Items/Composite	Housing Type	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Parent helps with homework	3-room	164	3.2	1.46	$F(5,900) =$ 4.76, MSE = 1.65, p < .01	.026
	5-room/executive	309	3.7	1.19		
	4-room	368	3.3	1.31		
	5-room/executive	309	3.7	1.19		
All items on grandparent-child relationship	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-
Composite on sibling relationship	1- or 2-room	17	3.5	.63	$F(5,784) = .75$, n.s.	-
	3-room	142	3.6	.62		
	4-room	311	3.6	.56		
	5-room/executive	281	3.5	.57		
	Condominium	15	3.4	.59		
	Landed Property	24	3.7	.57		
Composite on friendship	1- or 2-room	19	2.8	.93	$F(5,900) =$ 2.19, n.s	-
	3-room	164	3.1	.75		
	4-room	368	3.2	.78		
	5-room/executive	309	3.2	.69		
	Condominium	18	3.2	.60		
	Landed Property	28	3.3	.60		
Child wants to be alone	3-room	164	1.8	1.12	$F(5,900) =$ 3.85, MSE = 1.10, p < .01	.021
	4-room	368	2.1	1.07		

* Only statistically significant results are shown for parent-child relationship and emotional well-being.

Table 56: Parents' perspectives on parent-child, grandparent-child and sibling relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by parents' education level* (with Bonferroni adjustment)

Items/Composite	Parents' Education	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Parent helps with homework	Little/no schooling Some Secondary	25 157	2.4 3.3	1.58 1.29		
	Little/no schooling Completed N or O Levels	25 277	2.4 3.7	1.58 1.18		
	Little/no schooling Completed A Levels	25 60	2.4 3.7	1.58 1.27		
	Little/no schooling Completed Polytechnic	25 90	2.4 3.7	1.58 1.10		
	Little/no schooling Completed University	25 124	2.4 3.7	1.58 1.22	F(7,898) = 10.89, MSE = 1.56, p < .01	.078
	Completed Primary Some Secondary	124 157	2.8 3.3	1.41 1.29		
	Completed Primary Completed N or O Levels	124 277	2.8 3.7	1.41 1.18		
	Completed Primary Completed A Levels	124 60	2.8 3.7	1.41 1.27		
	Completed Primary Completed Polytechnic	124 90	2.8 3.7	1.41 1.10		
	Completed Primary Completed University	124 124	2.8 3.7	1.41 1.22		
Child tells parent secrets and feelings	Little/no schooling Completed N or O Levels	25 276	2.2 3.1	1.40 1.18		
	Little/no schooling Completed A Levels	25 60	2.2 3.5	1.40 1.17		
	Little/no schooling Completed Polytechnic	25 90	2.2 3.2	1.40 1.20	F(7,895) = 5.68. MSE = 1.44, p < .01	.043
	Little/no schooling Completed University	25 124	2.2 3.1	1.40 1.02		
	Completed Primary Completed N or O Levels	122 276	2.6 3.1	1.33 1.18		
	Completed Primary Completed A Levels	122 60	2.6 3.5	1.33 1.17		
	Some Secondary Completed A Levels	157 60	2.9 3.5	1.22 1.17		

Items/Composite	Parents' Education	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
Parent thinks he/she is right to scold/ punish child	Completed A Levels Completed Polytechnic	60 90	3.4 3.7	.99 1.04	F(7,898) = 3.01, MSE = 1.17, p < .01	.023
Parent thinks grandparent is right to scold/punish	Some Secondary Completed N or O Levels	126 250	2.4 3.0	1.63 1.62	F(7,788) = 2.94, MSE = 2.58, p < .01	.025
Composite on sibling relationship	Little/no schooling Completed Primary Some Secondary Completed N or O Levels Completed A Levels Completed Polytechnic Completed University	20 106 141 241 49 82 107	3.7 3.6 3.7 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.6	.58 .60 .61 .57 .60 .53 .51	F(7,782) = .98, n.s	-
Composite on friendship	Completed Primary Completed University	124 124	3.0 3.4	.88 .66		
	Some Secondary Completed N or O Levels	157 277	3.0 3.3	.82 .65	F(7,898) = 3.93, MSE = .54, p < .01	.030
	Some Secondary Completed University	157 124	3.0 3.4	.82 .66		
All items on emotional well-being	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-

* Only statistically significant results are shown for parent-child and grandparent-child relationships.

Table 57: Parents' perspectives on parent-child and grandparent-child relationships, friendship and emotional well-being, differentiated by whether children have siblings

Items/Composite	Siblings	N	Av Freq	S.D	F Statistics	Partial eta squared
All items on parent-child relationship	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-
All items on grandparent-child relationship	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-
Composite on friendship	Yes No	790 116	3.2 3.2	.74 .76	F(1,904) = .02, n.s	-
All items on emotional well-being	-	-	-	-	All n.s	-

Table 58: Parents' perspectives on the difference between the quality of sibling relationship and friendship of children

Composite	N	Av Freq	S.D	t Statistics	Cohen's d
Composite on sibling relationship	790	3.6	.58	t(789) = 13.38,	.95
Composite on friendship	790	3.2	.74	p < .01	

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>**Participant Number:**</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Singapore Children's Society
PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE
Survey on Children's Social & Emotional Well-being

Children's
S O C I E T Y
Caring for the Future

POST-FIELDWORK ADMINISTRATION				
Submit:	Edit:	Validate:	Code:	DP:

Hello, my name is _____. I am an interviewer from the Singapore Children's Society [SHOW ID]. We are conducting a survey to find out more about the social and emotional well-being of children in Singapore, and would like to get your opinions. I would appreciate your help. Whatever you tell me will be kept strictly confidential.

1. **Are you Singaporean, a Permanent Resident or a foreigner? (circle one)**
    1. Singaporean
    2. Permanent Resident
    3. Foreigner
    4. Other specify : _____

Terminate if parent being interviewed is a Non-Singaporean / PR.

2. **Are there any children between Primary 1 and 6 living in your household?**
    1. Yes (go to Q2)
    2. No [thank the respondent and end the interview].

3. **Could I please speak with a parent or guardian of the children? [Reintroduce if necessary]**
    1. Yes (continue)
    2. Parent not available [thank the respondent and end the interview].

Person interviewed (circle one)
    1. Father
    2. Mother
    3. Male guardian
    4. Female guardian

We are interested in what both parents and their children have to say. Could I interview you first and then speak to one of your children currently studying in Primary 1 to 6 please?

1. If yes, what is the name and age of the child I can interview after you?
Name _____   Age _____
2. If no, thank the respondent and end the interview.

Take note of the CHILD'S NAME as it will be used very often later.

Section A: Demographics

I would like to ask you some questions about yourself.

1. **How many children do you have?** _____ **(write number)**

2. **How old are you?** _____ **years old (write actual age, no range allowed)**

3. **What is your race?**
    1. Chinese
    2. Malay
    3. Indian
    4. Eurasian
    Other, specify : _____

4. **What is your religion?**
    1. Christianity
    2. Buddhism
    3. Islam
    4. Hinduism
    5. Roman Catholic
    6. Taoism
    7. Nil
    Other, please specify : _____

5. **What is your educational level?**
    1. Little or no schooling (e.g., some Primary education)
    2. Completed Primary School
    3. Some Secondary School
    4. Completed "N" or "O" levels
    5. Completed "A" levels
    6. Completed tertiary education (Polytechnic)
    7. Completed tertiary education (University)
    Other, please specify : _____

6. **What type of housing are you currently living in?**
    1. 1- or 2-Room Flat
    2. 3-Room Flat
    3. 4-Room Flat
    4. 5-Room or Executive Flat
    5. Condominium or Private Flat
    6. Landed Property
    Other, please specify: _____

7. **What language do you use most often with (child's name)? (circle one)**
    1. English
    2. Mandarin
    3. Chinese Dialect
    4. Malay
    5. Tamil
    Other, please specify : _____

8. **Are you working full time, part time or not working? (circle one)**
    1. Full-time
    2. Part-time
    3. Not working

9. **What type of job are you currently in? (circle one)**
    1. Own business
    2. Clerical
    3. Technical
    4. Managerial/Professional
    5. Househusband/Housewife

10. **What is your monthly income?**
    1. $1000 or less
    2. $1001 - $2000
    3. $2001 - $3000
    4. $3001 - $4000
    5. $4001 - $5000
    6. Above $5000

I would like to ask you some questions about the child's other parent (or guardian).

11. **How old is the mother/father of the child? _____years old (write number)**

12. **What is the race of the mother/father of the child?**
    1. Chinese
    2. Malay
    3. Indian
    4. Eurasian
    Other, specify : _____

13. What is the religion of the mother/father of the child?
   1. Christianity
   2. Buddhism
   3. Islam
   4. Hinduism
   5. Roman Catholic
   6. Taoism
   7. Nil
   Other, please specify : _____

14. What is the educational level of the mother/father of the child?
   1. Little or no schooling (e.g. some Primary education)
   2. Completed Primary School
   3. Some Secondary School
   4. Completed "N" or "O" levels
   5. Completed "A" levels
   6. Completed tertiary education (Polytechnic)
   7. Completed tertiary education (University)
   Other, please specify : _____

15. Is the mother/father of the child a Singaporean, a Permanent Resident or a foreigner?
   1. Singaporean
   2. Permanent Resident
   3. Foreigner
   Other, please specify : _____

16. What language does the mother/father of the child use most often with him/her?
   1. English
   2. Mandarin
   3. Chinese Dialect
   4. Malay
   5. Tamil
   Other, please specify : _____

17. Is the mother/father of the child currently working?
   1. Full-time
   2. Part-time
   3. Not working

18. What type of job is the mother/father of the child currently in?
   1. Own business
   2. Clerical
   3. Technical
   4. Managerial/Professional
   5. Househusband/Housewife

19. What is the monthly income of the mother/father of the child?
   1. $1000 or less
   2. $1001 - $2000
   3. $2001 - $3000
   4. $3001 - $4000
   5. $4001 - $5000
   6. Above $5000

Section B: Friendship

Next I would like to ask you about (child's name) whom I will interview later. This section is about (child's name) and his/her friends. Thinking about all of (child's name)'s friends, please answer the following questions using the scale [Show and explain Scale A].

Note: (1) Remind respondents to rate with respect to all of their child's friends in general.
(2) Mark if respondent does not know.

	Never		Sometimes		Many times	Do not know
1. How often are (child's name)'s friends nice to him/her?	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. How often do (child's name)'s friends care about his/her feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. How often does (child's name) have fun with his/her friends?	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. How often do (child's name) and his/her friends argue/quarrel with one another?	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. How often do (child's name)'s friends help him/her?	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. How often do (child's name) and his/her friends tell one another about problems?	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. How often do (child's name) and his/her friends help one another with schoolwork?	1	2	3	4	5	0
8. How often does (child's name) share things with his/her friends?	1	2	3	4	5	0
9. How often do (child's name)'s friends pay attention to what he/she says	1	2	3	4	5	0
10. How often does (child's name) spend his/her time with his/her friends outside school?	1	2	3	4	5	0

For the following questions, please answer "YES", "NO", or "Do not know". (circle one)

	Yes	No	Do not know
11. Does (child's name) have enough friends? If not, why? _____	1	2	99
12. Is it easy for (child's name) to make new friends at school? If not, why? _____	1	2	99
13. Does (child's name) like his/her friends? If not, why? _____	1	2	99
14. Does (child's name) like his/her school? If not, why? _____	1	2	99
15. Is (child's name)'s relationship with his/her friends good? If not, why? _____	1	2	99

Section C: Brother(s) / Sister(s)

Note to interviewer: Skip this section if respondent has only 1 child.

The following section is about (child's name) and his/her brother(s) / sister(s). Thinking about all of (child's name)'s brother(s)/sister(s), please answer the following questions using the scale [Show Scale A].

Note: (1) Remind respondents to rate with respect to all of their child's brother(s)/ sister(s) in general.
(2) Mark if respondent does not know.

	Never		Sometimes		Many times	Do not know
1. How often are (child's name)'s brother(s)/sister(s) nice to him/her?	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. How often do (child's name)'s brother(s)/sister(s) care about his/her feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. How often does (child's name) have fun with his/her brother(s)/sister(s)?	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. How often does (child's name) argue/ quarrel with his/her brother(s)/sister(s)?	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. How often do (child's name)'s brother(s)/sister(s) help him/her?	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. How often do (child's name) and his/her brother(s)/sister(s) tell one another about problems?	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. How often do (child's name) and his/ her brother(s)/sister(s) help one another with schoolwork?	1	2	3	4	5	0
8. How often does (child's name) share things with his/her brother(s)/sister(s)?	1	2	3	4	5	0
9. How often do (child's name)'s brother(s)/sister(s) pay attention to what he/she says?	1	2	3	4	5	0
10. How often does (child's name) spend his/her time with his/her brother(s)/ sister(s)?	1	2	3	4	5	0

For the following questions, please answer "YES", "NO", or "Do not know". (circle one)

	Yes	No	Do not know
11. Does (child's name) like his/her brother(s)/sister(s)? If not, why?	1	2	99
12. Is (child's name)'s relationship with his/her brother(s)/ sister(s) good? If not, why?	1	2	99

The following section is about (child's name) and you. Please answer the following questions using the scale [Show Scale A]

	Never		Sometimes		Many times	Do not know
1. How often do you help with (child'sname)'s homework?	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. How often do you show that you like or love (child's name)?	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. How often do you get angry with (child's name)?	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. How often does (child's name) tell you his/her secrets and feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. How often do you play and have fun with (child's name)?	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. How often do you and (child's name) argue with each other?	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. How often do you pay attention to what (child's name) says?	1	2	3	4	5	0
8. How often do you scold or punish (child's name)?	1	2	3	4	5	0
9. How often do you think that you are right to scold or punish (child's name)?	1	2	3	4	5	0
10. How often do you teach (child's name) about good manners and politeness?	1	2	3	4	5	0
11. How often does (child's name) spend his/her time with you?	1	2	3	4	5	0

For the following questions, please answer "YES", "NO", or "Do not know".
(circle one)

	Yes	No	Do not know
12. Does (child's name) think you give more love and care to the other child(ren) than to (child's name)?	1	2	99
13. Does (child's name) like you? If not, why?	1	2	99
14. Is your relationship with (child's name) good? If not, why?	1	2	99

Section E: Grandparent

The following section is about (child's name) and his/her grandparents. Skip this section if child does not have grandparents.

Thinking about the grandparent that (child's name) spends the most time with, please answer the following questions using the scale [Show scale A].

Note to interviewer: (1) Remind respondents to rate with respect to the grandparent mentioned above.
(2) Mark if respondent does not know.

	Never		Sometimes		Many times	Do not know
1. How often does (child's name)'s grandparent help with his/her homework?	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. How often does (child's name)'s grandparent show that he/she likes or loves him/her?	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. How often does (child's name)'s grandparent get angry with him/her?	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. How often does (child's name) tell his/her secrets and feelings with his/her grandparent?	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. How often does (child's name) play and have fun with his/her grandparent?	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. How often do (child's name) and his/her grandparent argue with each other?	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. How often does (child's name)'s grandparent pay attention to what he/she says?	1	2	3	4	5	0
8. How often does (child's name)'s grandparent scold or punish him/her?	1	2	3	4	5	0
9. How often does (child's name) think that his/her grandparent is right to scold or punish him/her?	1	2	3	4	5	0
10. How often does (child's name)'s grandparent teach him/her about good manners and politeness?	1	2	3	4	5	0
11. How often does (child's name) spend his/her time with his/her grandparent?	1	2	3	4	5	0

For the following questions, please answer "YES", "NO", or "Do not know". (circle one)

	Yes	No	Do not know
12. Does (child's name) like his/her grandparent? If not, why? _____	1	2	99
13. Is (child's name)'s relationship with his/her grandparent good. If not, why? _____	1	2	99

Section F: Emotional Well-Being

The following section is about (child's name) feelings and thoughts.

	Never		Sometimes		Many times	Do not know
1. How often does (child's name) worry about things?	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. How often does (child's name) feel very sad?	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. How often does (child's name) have fun?	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. How often does (child's name) cry when doing things?	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. How often is (child's name) sick?	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. How often does (child's name) quarrel with others?	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. How often does (child's name) want to be alone?	1	2	3	4	5	0
8. How often does (child's name) forget things?	1	2	3	4	5	0
9. How often is (child's name) happy?	1	2	3	4	5	0
10. How often does (child's name) think he/she is a good person?	1	2	3	4	5	0

Section G: School Bullying

The following section is about school bullying. Please indicate if your child has had experienced any of the following by his/her schoolmates* using the scale [Show Scale A].

Note: Can happen in or outside the school compound. If respondent asked about the acts they consider as "play play", explain that they should only rate the items below if they consider the act as bullying.

	Never		Sometimes		Many times	Do not know
1. Pulls (child's name) hair, hits (child's name), pinches (child's name), bites (child's name) or pushes (child's name).	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. Takes (child's name) money or things and refuses to return them	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. Makes (child's name) scared or fearful of him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. Calls (child's name) bad names	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. Does not let others be (child's name) friend.	1	2	3	4	5	0

If respondent's child had never experience any of the above or respondent do not know for all the items above, please end the interview and start on the Child interview.

	Yes	No	Do not know
6. Has (child's name) told anybody about this bullying? If not, why?_____ [End questionnaire after this if respondent answers "No"]	1	2	99
7. Who did (child's name) tell? _____	1	2	99
8. Did the person (child's name) told help him/her?	1	2	99

Thank you. May I now interview the child we have been talking about?

Scale A

Never		Sometimes		Many times
1	2	3	4	5

1 is Never   3 is Sometimes   5 is Many times

2 is between 1 & 3.
For example if you are tired less than "Sometimes" but more than "Never", you would circle 2.

4 is between 3 & 5.
For example if you are tired less than "Many times" but more than "Sometimes", you would circle 4.

Respondent ID:

**Singapore Children's Society
CHILD QUESTIONNAIRE
Survey on Children's Social & Emotional Well-being**

Children's
S O C I E T Y

Caring for the Future

POST-FIELDWORK ADMINISTRATION				
Submit:	Edit:	Validate:	Code:	DP:

Hello, my name is _____. I am from the Singapore Children's Society [SHOW ID]. We want to learn more about children and their friends, brothers and sisters, parents and grandparents. We would like to ask you some questions about this.

This is not a test. Please just tell me what you think about each question.

Section A: Demographics

1. Record Gender [BY OBSERVATION]
   1. Male
   2. Female

2. What is your school level?
   Primary   **1** ⌐   **2** ⌐   **3** ⌐   **4** ⌐   **5** ⌐   **6** ⌐
   Other (specify): _____

3. What is your race?
   1. Chinese
   2. Malay
   3. Indian
   4. Eurasian
   Other (specify): _____

4. How old are you?
   6 ⌐   **7** ⌐   **8** ⌐   **9** ⌐   **10** ⌐   **11** ⌐   **12** ⌐

Section B: Friends

I want to ask you some questions about your friends. Thinking about all of your friends, please answer the questions using the scale [Show and explain Scale A]

Note: Remind respondents to rate with respect to all of his/her friends in general.

	Never		Sometimes		Many times
1. How often are your friends nice to you?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How often do your friends care about your feelings?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How often do you have fun with your friends?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How often do you and your friends argue/ quarrel with one another?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How often do your friends help you?	1	2	3	4	5
6. How often do you and your friends tell one another about problems?	1	2	3	4	5
7. How often do you and your friends help one another with schoolwork?	1	2	3	4	5
8. How often do you share things with your friends?	1	2	3	4	5
9. How often do your friends pay attention to what you say?	1	2	3	4	5
10. How often do you spend your time with your friends outside school?	1	2	3	4	5

For the next questions, please answer "YES" or "NO" (circle one).

	Yes	No	NA
11. Do you have enough friends? If not, why? _____	1	2	
12. Is it easy for you to make new friends at school? If not, why? _____	1	2	
13. Do you like your friends? If not, why? _____	1	2	
14. Do you like your school? If not, why? _____	1	2	
15. Is your relationship with your friends good? [**If younger respondents do not understand, mark as NA for this item.**] If not, why? _____	1	2	9

Section C: Brothers and Sisters

	Yes	No
1. Do you have any brothers or sisters?	1	2

[If No go to next page]

[If Yes] Now I would like to ask you some questions about your brothers and sisters. Thinking about all of your brother(s)/sister(s), please answer the questions using the scale **[Show Scale A]**

Note: Remind respondents to rate with respect to all of his/her brother(s)/sister(s) in general.

	Never		Sometimes		Many times
2. How often are your brother(s)/sister(s) nice to you?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How often do your brother(s)/sister(s) care about your feelings?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How often do you have fun with your brother(s)/sister(s)?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How often do you argue/quarrel with your brother(s)/sister(s)?	1	2	3	4	5
6. How often do your brother(s)/sister(s) help you?	1	2	3	4	5
7. How often do you and your brother(s)/sister(s) tell one another about problems?	1	2	3	4	5
8. How often do you and your brother(s)/sister(s) help one another with schoolwork?	1	2	3	4	5
9. How often do you share things with your brother(s)/sister(s)?	1	2	3	4	5
10. How often do your brother(s)/sister(s) pay attention to what you say?	1	2	3	4	5
11. How often do you spend your time with your brother(s)/sister(s)?	1	2	3	4	5

For the next questions, please answer "YES" or "NO" (circle one).

	Yes	No	NA
12. Do you like your brother(s)/sister(s)? If not, why? _____	1	2	
13. Is your relationship with your brother(s)/sister(s) good? [If younger respondents do not understand, mark as NA for this item.] If not, why? _____	1	2	9

Section D: Father

Now I would like to ask you some questions about your father.

	Yes	No
1. Do you live with your father?	1	2

Thinking about your father, please answer the questions using the scale [Show Scale A]

	Never		Sometimes		Many times
2. How often does your father help with your homework?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How often does your father show that he likes or loves you?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How often does your father get angry with you?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How often do you tell your father your secrets and feelings?	1	2	3	4	5
6. How often do you play and have fun with your father?	1	2	3	4	5
7. How often do you and your father argue with each other?	1	2	3	4	5
8. How often does your father pay attention to what you say?	1	2	3	4	5
9. How often does your father scold or punish you?	1	2	3	4	5
10. How often do you think that your father is right to scold or punish you?	1	2	3	4	5
11. How often does your father teach you about good manners and politeness?	1	2	3	4	5
12. How often do you spend your time with your father?	1	2	3	4	5

For the next questions, please answer "YES" or "NO" (circle one).

	Yes	No	NA
13. Do you like your father? If not, why? _____	1	2	
14. Is your relationship with your father good? **[If younger respondents do not understand, mark as NA for this item.]** If not, why? _____	1	2	9
15. Do you think your father gives more love and care to your brother(s)/sister(s) than to you?	1	2	

Section E: Mother

Now I would like to ask you some questions about your mother.

	Yes	No
1. Do you live with your mother?	1	2

Thinking about your mother, please answer the questions using the scale [Show Scale A]

	Never		Sometimes		Many times
2. How often does your mother help with your homework?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How often does your mother show that she likes or loves you?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How often does your mother get angry with you?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How often do you tell your mother your secrets and feelings?	1	2	3	4	5
6. How often do you play and have fun with your mother?	1	2	3	4	5
7. How often do you and your mother argue with each other?	1	2	3	4	5
8. How often does your mother pay attention to what you say?	1	2	3	4	5
9. How often does your mother scold or punish you?	1	2	3	4	5
10. How often do you think that your mother is right to scold or punish you?	1	2	3	4	5
11. How often does your mother teach you about good manners and politeness?	1	2	3	4	5
12. How often do you spend your time with your mother?	1	2	3	4	5

For the next questions, please answer "YES" or "NO" (circle one).

	Yes	No	NA
13. Do you like your mother? If not, why? _____	1	2	
14. Is your relationship with your mother good? **[If younger respondents do not understand, mark as NA for this item.]** If not, why? _____	1	2	9
15. Do you think your mother gives more love and care to your brother(s)/sister(s) than to you?	1	2	

Section F: Grandparents

Now I would like to ask you some questions about your grandparents. Skip this section if child does not have grandparents.

Thinking about the grandparent that you spend the most time with, please answer the questions using the scale [Show scale A]

Note to interviewer: Remind respondents to rate with respect to the grandparent that respondent spent the most time with.

	Never		Sometimes		Many times
1. How often does your grandparent help with your homework?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How often does your grandparent show that he/she likes or loves you?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How often does your grandparent get angry with you?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How often do you tell your grandparent your secrets and feelings?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How often do you play and have fun with your grandparent?	1	2	3	4	5
6. How often do you and your grandparent argue with each other?	1	2	3	4	5
7. How often does your grandparent pay attention to what you say?	1	2	3	4	5
8. How often does your grandparent scold or punish you?	1	2	3	4	5
9. How often do you think that your grandparent is right to scold or punish you?	1	2	3	4	5
10. How often does your grandparent teach you about good manners and politeness?	1	2	3	4	5
11. How often do you spend your time with your grandparent?	1	2	3	4	5

For the next questions, please answer "YES" or "NO" (circle one).

	Yes	No	NA
12. Do you like your grandparent? If not, why? _____	1	2	
13. Is your relationship with your grandparent good? [If younger respondents do not understand, mark as NA for this item.] If not, why? _____	1	2	9

Section G: Emotional Well-Being

Now I want to ask some questions about your feelings and thoughts.

	Never		Sometimes		Many times
1. How often do you worry about things?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How often do you feel very sad?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How often do you have fun?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How often do you cry when doing things?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How often are you sick?	1	2	3	4	5
6. How often do you quarrel with others?	1	2	3	4	5
7. How often do you want to be alone?	1	2	3	4	5
8. How often do you forget things?	1	2	3	4	5
9. How often are you happy?	1	2	3	4	5
10. How often do you think you are a good person?	1	2	3	4	5

Section H: School Bullying

Now I want to ask you about bullying at school.

Notes to interviewer: Can happen in or outside the school compound. If respondent asked about the acts they consider as "play play", explain that they should only rate the items below if they consider the act as bullying.

How often have your schoolmates...	Never		Sometimes		Many times
1. Pulled your hair, hit you, pinched you, bit you or pushed you	1	2	3	4	5
2. Took your money or things and refused to return them	1	2	3	4	5
3. Made you scared of him/her	1	2	3	4	5
4. Called you bad names	1	2	3	4	5
5. Not let others be your friend	1	2	3	4	5

If respondent had never experience any of the above, please end the interview.

	Yes	No
6. Did you tell anybody about this bullying? If not, why? _____	1	2
7. Who did you tell? _____		
8. Did the person you told help you?	1	2

Thank you so much for your time.

Scale A

Never		Sometimes		Many times
1	2	3	4	5

1 is Never   3 is Sometimes   5 is Many times

2 is between 1 & 3.
For example if you are tired less than "Sometimes" but more than "Never", you would circle 2.

4 is between 3 & 5.
For example if you are tired less than "Many times" but more than "Sometimes", you would circle 4.