

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

NORIZAN ABDUL GHANI^{1,*}, JUMADIL SAPUTRA^{2,*}, MUHAMMAD AMMAR ABD. WAHAB¹, 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
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
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.

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

1 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 [1]. 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 [2].

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 [3], 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 [4], [5]. 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 [6].

2 Literature Review

Many studies have been conducted to discuss well-being, both in Malaysia and abroad. According to Javadi-Pashaki & Darvishpour [7], 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 [8]. Rodríguez-Pose & Tselios [9] stated there is a relationship between good governance and well-being. Minkin & Reyes-García [10] 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 [11]. Health literacy mediates the association between social involvement and well-being and health status [12].

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 [13]. 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 [14]. 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 [15].

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 [16]. 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) [17]. Previous studies have also been conducted to identify well-being according to the principles of *Maqasid Syariah* [18], [19].

3 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 [20] that forms a new factor, and it is a multivariate technique emphasizing data that are closely related to a group of independent variables [21], [22].

4 Results and Findings

To ensure that the samples are sufficient in running factor analysis, the KMO value must be greater than 0.50 [23]. 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 | 0.865 | 3258.134 | 91 | 0.000 |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|-----|-------|
| Opportunity 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 |

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 |

| | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| 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 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity : | Approx. Chi-Square | 2146.540 |
| | 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.

| | | |
|--|-------|-----------|
| 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 | | |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | 0.942 |
| Approx. Chi-Square | | 14211.879 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity : | | |
| df | | 1176 |
| Sig. | | 0.000 |

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 |
| | df |
| | Sig. |
| | 7417.219 |
| | 325 |
| | 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 |
| | df |
| | Sig. |
| | 3258.134 |
| | 91 |
| | 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 |

4 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.

References

- [1] Ibrahim, R. Z. A. R., Saputra, J., Ali, S. N. M., Dagang, M. M., & Bakar, A. A.,

- “Organizational justice and job satisfaction among Malaysian workers,” *Opcion*, vol. 35, no. 89, pp. 494–513, 2019.
- [2] Ibrahim, R. Z. A. R., Saputra, J., & Akmal, N. A., “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, 2020.
- [3] Cheah, Y. K., Azahadi, M., Phang, S. N., & Abd Manaf, N. H., “Sociodemographic, lifestyle, and health factors associated with depression and generalized anxiety disorder among Malaysian adults,” *J. Prim. Care Community Health*, vol. 11, p. 2150132720921738, 2020.
- [4] Malakolunthu, S., & Rengasamy, N. C., “Education policies and practices to address cultural diversity in Malaysia: Issues and challenges,” *Prospects*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 147–159, 2012.
- [5] Zakaria, J., & Daud, S., “Menelusuri Pendemokrasian di Malaysia: Impak terhadap Pencapaian Integrasi Nasional,” *e-Academia J.*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2018.
- [6] McCoy, J., Rahman, T., & Somer, M., “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, 2018.
- [7] Javadi-Pashaki, N., & Darvishpour, A., “What are the predictor variables of social well-being among the medical science students?,” *J. Educ. Health Promot.*, vol. 7, 2018.
- [8] Stickley, A., Koyanagi, A., Roberts, B., Goryakin, Y., & McKee, M., “Crime and subjective well-being in the countries of the former Soviet Union,” *BMC Public Health*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2015.
- [9] Rodriguez-Pose, A., & Tselios, V., “Well-being, political decentralisation and governance quality in Europe,” *J. Hum. Dev. Capab.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 69–93, 2019.
- [10] Minkin, D., & Reyes-García, V., “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, 2017.
- [11] Ibrahim, M. H., *Religion and Well-being: Differences by Identity and Practice*. Macalester College, 2016.
- [12] Amoah, P. A., “Social participation, health literacy, and health and well-being: A cross-sectional study in Ghana,” *SSM-population Heal.*, vol. 4, pp. 263–270, 2018.
- [13] Ah, S. H. A. B., Omar, N., & Azman, Z., “Penyertaan sosial dan indeks kesejahteraan sosial subjektif kanak-kanak miskin di Malaysia,” *Akademika*, vol. 87, no. 2, pp. 105–118, 2017.
- [14] Shokhailya, M. N. Z. A., & Ahmada, A., “Student Participation In The Leisure Activities And The Relationship Between Individuals Social Wellbeing,” 2016.
- [15] Musa, H. D., Yacob, M. R., & Abdullah, A. M., “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, 2019.
- [16] Ivankina, L., & Ivanova, V., “Social well-being of elderly people (based on the survey results),” in *SHS Web of Conferences*, 2016, vol. 28, p. 1046.
- [17] Beskrovnaya, L. V., Kovalenko, N. A., & Chalov, D., “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, 2017.
- [18] S. M. Rasool, M. S. A., Yusof, M. A. M., & Ali, “Wellbeing of the Society: A Maqasid al-Shari’ah Approach,” *Afkar-Jurnal Akidah Pemikir. Islam*, pp. 25–46, 2020.
- [19] Oladapo, I. A., & Ab Rahman, A., “Maqasid Sharī ‘Ah: the drive for an inclusive human development policy,” *J. Syariah*, vol. 24, no. 2, 2017.
- [20] Gaskin, C. J., & Happell, B., “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, 2014.
- [21] Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R., “Multivariate data analysis . Uppersaddle River.” NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2006.
- [22] Wan Nawang, W. M. Z., Sa’at, N. H., Ahmad, S., & Mamat, I., “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, 2015.
- [23] Piaw, C. Y., *Statistik Penyelidikan Lanjutan Ujian Regresi*, vol. 5. Malaysia: McGraw-Hill, 2012.

Contribution of individual authors to the creation of a scientific article (ghostwriting policy)

Norizan Abdul Ghani writing – original draft, investigation, editing and supervision.

Muhammad Ammar Abd. Wahab writing – original draft, investigation and editing.

Jumadil Saputra writing – methodology, review, editing, investigation, and data analysis

Wan Abd. Aziz Wan Mohd Amin writing – methodology, review, editing, investigation, and data analysis.

Wan Mohd Yusof Wan Chik writing – methodology, review, editing, investigation, and data analysis.

Fadzli Adam writing – methodology, review, editing, investigation, and data analysis.

Wan Nor Jazmina Wan Ariffin writing – methodology, review, and editing.

Mohamad Fauzi Abdul Latib writing – methodology, review, and editing.

Sources of funding for research presented in a scientific article or scientific article itself

Report potential sources of funding if there is any