



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN BUSINESS & SOCIAL SCIENCES



Exploring Factor Structure of Social Well-Being on the Basis of Maqasid Syariah in Malaysia

Norizan Abdul Ghani, Muhammad Ammar Abd. Wahab, Jumadil Saputra, Wan Abd. Aziz Wan Mohd Amin, Wan Mohd Yusof Wan Chik, Fadzli Adam, Wan Nor Jazmina Wan Ariffin, Mohamad Fauzi Abdul Latib

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v12-i1/12263> DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v12-i1/12263

Received: 15 November 2021, **Revised:** 17 December 2021, **Accepted:** 01 January 2022

Published Online: 24 January 2022

In-Text Citation: (Ghani et al., 2022)

To Cite this Article: Ghani, N. A., Wahab, M. A. A., Saputra, J., Amin, W. A. A. W. M., Chik, W. M. Y. W., Adam, F., Ariffin, W. N. J. W., & Latib, M. F. A. (2022). Exploring Factor Structure of Social Well-Being on the Basis of Maqasid Syariah in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 12(1), 1956–1967.

Copyright: © 2022 The Author(s)

Published by Human Resource Management Academic Research Society (www.hrmars.com)

This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this license may be seen at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

Vol. 12, No. 1, 2022, Pg. 1956– 1967

<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/IJARBSS>

JOURNAL HOMEPAGE

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/publication-ethics>



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN BUSINESS & SOCIAL SCIENCES



www.hrmars.com

ISSN: 2222-6990

Exploring Factor Structure of Social Well-Being on the Basis of Maqasid Syariah in Malaysia

Norizan Abdul Ghani¹, Muhammad Ammar Abd. Wahab¹,
Jumadil Saputra², Wan Abd. Aziz Wan Mohd Amin¹, Wan Mohd
Yusof Wan Chik³, Fadzli Adam³, Wan Nor Jazmina Wan
Ariffin¹, Mohamad Fauzi Abdul Latib¹

¹Faculty of Applied Social Sciences, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin (UniSZA), 21300 Kuala Terengganu, Terengganu, Malaysia, ²Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Development, Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, 21030 Kuala Nerus, Terengganu, Malaysia, ³Research Institute for Islamic Products and Malay Civilization, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin (UniSZA), 21300 Kuala Terengganu, Terengganu, Malaysia

Abstract

Social well-being is an issue that is increasingly being discussed today. In Malaysia, the Economic Planning Unit (EPU) has released well-being indices under Prime Minister's Department. They were starting with the Malaysian Quality of Life Index 1999 (IKHM 1999) and finally the Malaysians Well-being Index 2018 (IKRM 2018). The index has been a measure of the well-being of the people in Malaysia until today. This study was conducted specifically to discuss social well-being in Malaysia. The construction of this social well-being questionnaire items on the basis of the five elements of *Maqasid Syariah*, namely Protection of Religion, Protection of Life, Protection of Intellect, Protection of lineage, and Protection of Wealth. The original total number of social welfare items was 113, but after factor analysis had been done, the total number of items was only 102. These items are under five main indicators, namely religious care and belief, living needs, social issues, social opportunities, and politics and stability. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and Bartlett's test of sphericity found that all factors exceeded the minimum value. Still, the factors needed to be re-arranged according to the results of the factor analysis.

Keywords: Social Well-being, Malaysian Quality of Life Index, Maqasid Syariah, Exploratory Factor Analysis.

Introduction

The issue of social well-being is not new in Malaysia. Many well-being studies are done from different perspectives. Social well-being is the goal that all individuals, families, communities, and nations want to achieve (Ibrahim et al., 2019). It is a crucial element in determining the level of development of a community or a country. The concept of social well-being explains the strategy of changing society based on approaches related to social problem management, the fulfilment of living needs, and the provision of social mobility opportunities in the community (Ibrahim et al., 2019).

Understanding these three elements of social well-being will help policymakers and program implementers launch efforts to improve the well-being of individuals, families, and communities. In addition, these three elements of social well-being will provide the community with safe environmental conditions, comprehensive satisfaction with basic needs, and maximize social mobility opportunities. Thus, community members are free to develop their potential, be actively involved in activities implemented in social, economic, and political aspects, and contribute to religion, community, race, and country. The question is, is social well-being in Malaysia at a satisfactory level?

Many well-being issues are happening nowadays. For example, according to Cheah, Azahadi, Phang & Abd Manaf (2020), four out of ten Malaysians are estimated to have mental health problems. Meanwhile, the National Health and Morbidity survey in 2019, of 2.3%, which is about half a million people face depression in Malaysia. In addition, it was found that 424,000 children were identified as having mental health problems in Malaysia.

From a social point of view, Malaysia has not yet reached the level of unity for a country (Zakaria & Daud, 2018). The relationship between the multi-racial communities in this country is only at the level of integration. Political turmoil and manpower unpreparedness are adapted to the robotics and automation boom, society's unpreparedness to face the phenomenon of rising incomes among highly skilled people that widen the economic gap, the rising cost of living, the confusion of the education system, the polarization or fragmentation of races and ethnicities, the polarization between religions, and even the conflict between ideologies in Islam itself that lead to the existence of liberals, conservatives, and radicals or fundamentals (McCoy et al., 2018).

Literature Review

Many studies have been conducted to discuss well-being, both in Malaysia and abroad. According to Javadi-Pashaki & Darvishpour (2015), lower levels of social well-being are observed to be the most grounded indicators of negative psychological health. Criminal victimization is connected to a lower level of subjective well-being, which defines how important it is to reduce criminal activities (Sticklely et al., 2018). Rodríguez-Pose & Tselios (2019) stated there is a relationship between good governance and well-being. Minkin & Reyes-García (2017) express the correlation between income, wealth, and subjective well-being, where happiness, anger, fear, and sadness have been included for subjective well-being. Furthermore, a study showed that having a greater sense of religious identity may increase the well-being and racial identity that a person perceives for higher public regard (Ibrahim, 2016). Health literacy mediates the association between social involvement and well-being and health status (Amoah, 2018).

A study on the social participation and subjective social well-being index of poor children in Malaysia shows that the subjective social well-being index is at a moderate level (Ali, Omar, Azman, 2017). However, the level of well-being of poor children in terms of social participation is at a satisfactory level, which is 64.6 percent.

Furthermore, further studies confirm a weak positive linear relationship between the relationships of students' leisure activities with the social well-being of individuals (Shokhailya & Ahmada, 2017). Besides, it is found that the management of social problems is one of the important indicators in ensuring the social well-being of the coastal community is in good condition (Musa et al., 2019).

In social studies, the well-being of older people reports that the welfare of the elderly is similar to the quality of life and is related mainly to their social well-being (Ivankina & Ivanova,

2016). Besides, social well-being can be formed through the prism of social challenges (i.e. adaptation, participation, integrity, etc.) that must be overcome by older adults when moving to a new level (old age) (Beskrovnaya, Kovalenko & Chalov, 2017). Previous studies have also been conducted to identify well-being according to the principles of *Maqasid Syariah* (Rasool et al., 2020; Oladapo, Rahman, 2017).

Methodology

The current study is designed using a quantitative approach through cross-sectional data. The data were collected by distributing the questionnaires. For data analysis, factor analysis methods are used in this study. Factor analysis is an advanced method used to determine whether the item being analyzed leads to a similar constructor (Gaskin & Happell, 2014) that forms a new factor, and it is a multivariate technique emphasizing data that are closely related to a group of independent variables (Hair et al., 2006; Nawang et al., 2015).

Results and Findings

To ensure that the samples are sufficient in running factor analysis, the KMO value must be greater than 0.5 (Piaw, 2012). To determine whether factor analysis was appropriate, the KMO and Bartlett tests were performed early. The results of the KMO and Bartlett test study, as well as factor analysis for the determining factors of social well-being indicators, are as shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1: KMO and Bartlett Test Results

Indicator	KMO	Approx Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Religious Care and Belief	0.843	2146.540	36	0.000
Living Needs	0.942	14211.879	1176	0.000
Social Issues	0.871	7417.219	325	0.000
Social Opportunity	0.865	3258.134	91	0.000
Politics and Stability	0.820	3327.76	105	0.000

Table 1 shows the results of Bartlett's test of sphericity found that the test results were significant, i.e. at a value of $p < 0.05$, indicating that the correlation between the items was sufficient to conduct factor analysis. Through the KMO test, the values obtained were 0.843 (religious care and belief), 0.942 (living needs), 0.871 (social issues), 0.865 (social opportunities / social mobility), and 0.820 (politics and stability). The KMO value was found to be quite high and exceeded the minimum level, which is 0.50. It indicates that KMO values do not have any problems, and appropriate factor analysis is conducted on social welfare indicator data.

Eigenvalue indicates that the items of the questionnaire contained more than one factor. Based on the results, the questionnaire items are multi-dimensional, which contains more than one constructor component. The researcher has set the value of the coefficient accepted for this study is 0.5. This value is chosen as the minimum condition because the square of the value represents the total variance change of 20 percent to that factor.

Table 2: Analysis of Religious and Belief Care Factors

Item	Loadings Value	
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Religion 5	0.873	
Religion 6	0.805	
Religion 7	0.798	
Religion 8	0.778	
Religion 4	0.540	
Religion 2		0.907
Religion 1		0.877
Religion 3		0.726
Religion 9		0.656
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.843
Approx. Chi-Square		2146.540
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	df	36
	Sig.	0.000

Table 2 displays the validation factor analysis is done to confirm the validity of those factors. All nine items were tested to determine the Bartlett Test of Sphericity value and KMO value. Based on the test results, the KMO value obtained is 0.843, where this value is high and has no multicollinearity problem because it exceeds the minimum level of 0.50. The study results also found that no component was removed, but indicators of religious care and belief were broken down into two factors. The first factor (Factor 1) items can be classified under the religious care construct, while the items in the second factor (Factor 2) are categorized under the religious belief construct.

Table 3: Analysis of Living Needs Factors

Item	Factor Value
FACTOR 1	
Health & Community Services 3	
Health & Community Services 2	0.825
Health & Community Services 4	0.806
Health & Community Services 5	0.734
Health & Community Services 1	0.699
Health & Community Services 6	0.691
Health & Community Services 8	0.689
Healthy Eating & Lifestyle 2	0.664
Health & Community Services 7	0.591
Housing & Neighborhoods 1	
FACTOR 2	
Work environment 1	0.831
Work environment 4	0.779
Work environment 5	0.777
Work environment 2	0.770
Work environment 6	0.705
Work environment 7	0.697
Work environment 3	0.643

Work environment 8	0.559	
FACTOR 3		
Household 5	0.827	
Household 4	0.811	
Household 3	0.795	
Household 6	0.748	
Household 2	0.728	
Household 1	0.650	
Income Guarantee 1	0.556	
Household 7	0.521	
FACTOR 4		
Housing & Neighborhoods 6	0.811	
Housing & Neighborhoods 7	0.790	
Housing & Neighborhoods 2	0.701	
Housing & Neighborhoods 5	0.614	
Healthy Eating & Lifestyle 5	0.579	
Housing & Neighborhoods 4	0.577	
Housing & Neighborhoods 3		
FACTOR 5		
Income Guarantee 2		
Income Guarantee 4	0.668	
Income Guarantee 3	0.652	
Income Guarantee 6	0.643	
Income Guarantee 7	0.575	
Income Guarantee 5		
Personal 2		
FACTOR 6		
Personal 3		
Personal 4	0.638	
Healthy Eating & Lifestyle 1	0.559	
Personal 1	0.530	
Personal 5		
FACTOR 7		
Healthy Eating & Lifestyle 3		0.660
Healthy Eating & Lifestyle 4		0.626
Healthy Eating & Lifestyle 6		0.549
Healthy Eating & Lifestyle 7		
<hr/>		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	0.942	
	Approx. Chi-Square	14211.879
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity :	df	1176
	Sig.	0.000
<hr/>		

Table 3 shows the validation factor analysis is done to confirm the validity of the factors for living needs indicators. All 49 items were tested to determine the Bartlett Test of Sphericity value and KMO value. Based on the test results, the KMO value obtained is 0.942. This KMO value is high and exceeds the minimum level of 0.50., so it has no *multicollinearity* problem. The results of the study also found that there were nine items removed. The items are factor

1 (Health & Community Services 7 and Housing & Neighborhood 1), items on factor 4 (Housing & Neighborhood 3), items on factor 5 (Income Guarantee 7, Income Guarantee 5, and Personal 2), items on factor 6 (Personal 1 and Personal 5) and items on factor 7 (Nutrition & Healthy Lifestyle 7).

Therefore, it is found that the components for life need indicators need to be renamed because they have changed after factor analysis is done. Items in the first factor can be classified under the constructs of care and health services, the second factor under the construction work environment, the third factor under the construction of the *sakinah* family, the fourth factor is the neighborhood and environmental constructs, the fifth factor is under the financial and savings management constructs, the sixth factor is under the personal needs constructs and the last is the seventh factor - is under the family relationship constructs.

Table 4: Social Issue Factor Analysis

Item	Factor Value
FACTOR 1	
Community (KP / KA) 5	0.869
Community (KP / KA) 6	0.853
Community (KP / KA) 4	0.802
Community (KP / KA) 3	0.786
Community (KP / KA) 7	0.768
Community (KP / KA) 2	0.710
Community (KP / KA) 1	0.693
FACTOR 2	
Intellectual 3	0.824
Intellectual 4	0.801
Intellectual 6	0.792
Intellectual 2	0.788
Intellectual 1	0.714
Intellectual 5	0.684
FACTOR 3	
Crime 3	0.871
Crime 2	0.859
Crime 6	0.678
Public Safety 3	0.553
Crime 1	
FACTOR 4	
Public Safety 2	0.797
Public Safety 6	0.671
Public Safety 1	0.585
Public Safety 7	0.576
FACTOR 5	
Public Safety 4	0.854
Public Safety 5	0.847
FACTOR 6	
Crime 4	0.890
Crime 5	0.885
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	0.871

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity :	Approx. Chi-Square	7417.219
	df	325
	Sig.	0.000

Table 4 above is an analysis of validation factors performed to verify the validity of the factors for social issue indicators. All 26 items were tested to determine the Bartlett Test of Sphericity and the KMO value. Based on the test results, the KMO value obtained is 0.871. Since this KMO value is high and exceeds the minimum level of 0.50, so it has no multicollinearity problem. The results of the study also found that there was only one item removed. The item is on factor 3 (Crime 1). The components for social issue indicators need to be renamed as there are changes after factor analysis is done. Items in the first factor can be classified under the construct of community management effectiveness & member involvement. The second factor is under the intellectual construct, the third factor under the legal system construct, the fourth factor is the construct of freedom and security, the fifth factor is under the construct of racial tolerance management, and the sixth factor is under the construct of poverty and unemployment.

Table 5: Analysis of Social Opportunity Factors / Social Mobility

Item	Factor Value	
FACTOR 1		
Unity & Harmony of the Nation 6	0.819	
Unity & Harmony of the Nation 5	0.797	
Unity & Harmony of the Nation 4	0.770	
Unity & Harmony of the Nation 3	0.739	
Unity & Harmony of the Nation 7	0.719	
Unity & Harmony of the Nation 1	0.700	
FACTOR 2		
Education 2	0.814	
Education 1	0.786	
Education 4	0.683	
Education 7	0.614	
FACTOR 3		
Education 6	0.825	
Education 3	0.818	
Education 5	0.694	
Unity & Harmony of the Nation 2		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	0.865	
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity :	Approx. Chi-Square	3258.134
	df	91
	Sig.	0.000

Verification factor analysis was performed to confirm the validity of the factors for the social opportunity / social mobility indicators as in table 5 above. All 14 items were tested to determine the value of the Bartlett Test of Sphericity and the KMO value. Based on the test results, the KMO value obtained is 0.865. Therefore, there is no issue with multicollinearity because this KMO value is high and exceeds the minimum level of 0.50. The results of the study also found that there was one item that was removed. The item is on factor 3 (Unity

and Harmony of Nation 2), the components of the social opportunity / social mobility indicator are renamed because there is a change after factor analysis is done, i.e. there is an addition of the component from the original. The items in the first factor can be classified under the construct of patriotism and identity, the second factor under the construct of educational democracy and moral formation, and lastly the third factor under the construct of an effective and relevant education system.

Table 6: Analysis of Political Factors and Stability

Item	Value of Loadings Factor	
FACTOR 1		
Politics & National Stability 7	0.799	
Politics & National Stability 8	0.721	
Politics & National Stability 5	0.700	
Politics & National Stability 6	0.673	
Politics & National Stability 4	0.632	
FACTOR 2		
Governance 2	0.923	
Governance 3	0.922	
Governance 1	0.678	
Politics & National Stability 9	0.565	
FACTOR 3		
Governance 6		0.896
Governance 5		0.876
Governance 4		0.763
FACTOR 4		
Politics & National Stability 3		0.830
Politics & National Stability 1		0.778
Politics & National Stability 2		0.710
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	0.820	
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity :	Approx. Chi-Square	3327.176
	df	105
	Sig.	0.000

Based on table 6 above, validation factor analysis is done to confirm the validity of the factors for political indicators and stability. All 15 items were tested to determine the value of the Bartlett Test of Sphericity and the KMO value. Based on the test results, the KMO value obtained is 0.820, where this value is high and has no multicollinearity problem because it exceeds the minimum level of 0.50. The results of the study also found that no component was removed, but the indicators of political care and stability have become four factors. Items in the first factor can be classified under the constitutional empowerment construct of the country, the second factor under the construction of the national governance delivery system, the third factor under the construct of an efficient and effective governance system, and lastly the fourth factor under the construct of freedom in politics. On the basis of results factor analysis, all items in the original questionnaire containing a total of 113 items were re-arranged according to the new construct which now has 102 items only (Table 7). The following are the factors for indicators of social well-being before and after factor analysis.

Table 7: Factors of Social Welfare Indicators Before & After Factor Analysis

Indicator	Factor	
	Before Factor Analysis	After Factor Analysis
Religious Care	1. Religious Care	1. Religious Care 2. Religious Beliefs
Living needs	1. Health and Community Services 2. Income Guarantee 3. Work environment 4. Household 5. Neighborhood and Environment 6. Personal 7. Healthy Eating and Lifestyle	1. Health and Community Services 2. Work environment 3. Formation of <i>Sakinah</i> Family 4. Neighborhood and Environment 5. Financial Management and Savings 6. Personal needs 7. Family Bonding
Social Issues	1. Crime 2. Intellectualism 3. Public Safety 4. Community (Management Effectiveness / Member Involvement)	1. Effectiveness of Community Management and Member Involvement 2. Intellectualism 3. The legal system 4. Freedom and Security 5. Racial Tolerance 6. Poverty and Unemployment
Social Opportunity / Social Mobility	1. Education 2. Unity and Harmony of the Nation	1. Patriotism and Identity 2. Education Democracy and Moral Formation 3. Effective and Relevant Education System
Politics and Stability	1. Politics and National Stability 2. Governance	1. Empowerment of the National Constitution 2. National Governance Delivery System 3. Efficient and Effective Governance System 4. Freedom in Politics

Conclusions

In conclusion, this study indicated different factors before and after conducting the exploratory factor analysis. This study found religiosity factors consist of two, namely Religious Care and Religious Beliefs. Living needs are Health and Community Services, Work environment, Formation of *Sakinah* Family, Neighborhood and Environment, Financial Management and Savings, Personal needs and Family Bonding. For Social Issues, this study obtained six factors: Effectiveness of Community, Management and Member, Involvement,

Intellectualism, the legal system, Freedom and Security, Racial Tolerance and Poverty, and Unemployment. Social Opportunity/Social Mobility are Patriotism and Identity, Education Democracy and Moral Formation and Effective and Relevant Education System. Lastly, Politics and Stability consist of Empowerment of the National Constitution, National Governance Delivery, System, Efficient and Effective Governance System and Freedom in Politics.

Acknowledgment

This paper is a research outcome from the “Pembentukan Model Kesejahteraan Sosial di Malaysia berasaskan Maqasid Syariah” project funded by the Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia under the Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (FRGS) 2019.

References

- Ibrahim, R. Z. A. R., Saputra, J., Ali, S. N. M., Dagang, M. M., & Bakar, A. A. (2019). “Organizational justice and job satisfaction among Malaysian workers,” *Opcion*, vol. 35, no. 89, pp. 494–513.
- Ibrahim, R. Z. A. R., Saputra, J., & Akmal, N. A. (2020) “The Effects of Work-Family Conflict on Teachers’ Job Satisfaction: A Study in the East Coast of Malaysia,” *Int. J. Innov. Creat. Chang.*, vol. 13, no. 3..
- Cheah, Y. K., Azahadi, M., Phang, S. N., & Abd Manaf, N. H. (2020). “Sociodemographic, lifestyle, and health factors associated with depression and generalized anxiety disorder among Malaysian adults,” *J. Prim. Care Community Health*, vol. 11, p. 2150132720921738.
- Malakolunthu, S., & Rengasamy, N. C. (2012). “Education policies and practices to address cultural diversity in Malaysia: Issues and challenges,” *Prospects*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 147–159.
- Zakaria, J., & Daud, S. (2018). “Menelusuri Pendemokrasian di Malaysia: Impak terhadap Pencapaian Integrasi Nasional,” *e-Academia J.*, vol. 7, no. 1..
- McCoy, J., Rahman, T., & Somer, M. (2018). “Polarization and the global crisis of democracy: Common patterns, dynamics, and pernicious consequences for democratic polities,” *Am. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 16–42.
- Javadi-Pashaki, N., & Darvishpour, A. (2018). “What are the predictor variables of social well-being among the medical science students?,” *J. Educ. Health Promot.*, vol. 7.
- Stickley, A., Koyanagi, A., Roberts, B., Goryakin, Y., & McKee, M. (2015). “Crime and subjective well-being in the countries of the former Soviet Union,” *BMC Public Health*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–9.
- Rodríguez-Pose, A., & Tselios, V. (2019). “Well-being, political decentralisation and governance quality in Europe,” *J. Hum. Dev. Capab.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 69–93.
- Minkin, D., & Reyes-García, V. (2017). “Income and wellbeing in a society on the verge to market integration: the case of the Tsimane’ in the Bolivian Amazon,” *J. Happiness Stud.*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 993–1011.
- Ibrahim, M. H. (2016). *Religion and Well-being: Differences by Identity and Practice*. Macalester College.
- Amoah, P. A. (2018). “Social participation, health literacy, and health and well-being: A cross-sectional study in Ghana,” *SSM-population Heal.*, vol. 4, pp. 263–270.
- Ah, S. H. A. B., Omar, N., & Azman, Z. (2017). “Penyertaan sosial dan indeks kesejahteraan sosial subjektif kanak-kanak miskin di Malaysia,” *Akademika*, vol. 87, no. 2, pp. 105–118.

- [Shokhailya, M. N. Z. A., & Ahmada, A. (2016). "Student Participation In The Leisure Activities And The Relationship Between Individuals Social Wellbeing," 2016.
- Musa, H. D., Yacob, M. R., & Abdullah, A. M., (2019). "Delphi exploration of subjective well-being indicators for strategic urban planning towards sustainable development in Malaysia," *J. urban Manag.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 28–41..
- Ivankina, L., & Ivanova, V. (2016) "Social well-being of elderly people (based on the survey results)," in *SHS Web of Conferences*, 2016, vol. 28, p. 1046.
- Beskrovnaya, L. V., Kovalenko, N. A., & Chalov, D. (2017). "Social Wellbeing of Older Adults in Britain and Russia through the Prism of Social Challenges," *Eur. Proc. Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 192016, pp. 83–89.
- Oladapo, I. A., & Ab Rahman, A. (2017). "Maqasid Shari'Ah: the drive for an inclusive human development policy," *J. Syariah*, vol. 24, no. 2.
- Gaskin, C. J., & Happell, B. (2014). "On exploratory factor analysis: A review of recent evidence, an assessment of current practice, and recommendations for future use," *Int. J. Nurs. Stud.*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 511–521.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. (2016). "Multivariate data analysis . Uppersaddle River." NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Nawang, W. M. Z., Sa'at, N. H., Ahmad, S., & Mamat, I. (2015). "Penggunaan analisis faktor bagi kajian hubungan antara faktor-faktor peramal dengan kecenderungan pelajar menceburi kerjaya keusahawanan," *Int. J. Bus. Technopreneursh.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 293–306.
- Piaw, C. Y. (2012). *Statistik Penyelidikan Lanjutan Ujian Regresi*, vol. 5. Malaysia: McGraw-Hill.