

EXPLORING URBAN LIFE PECULIARITY WELL-BEING IN MALAYSIAN CITIES

KAMISAH SUPIAN^{1*}, SHARIFAH HILMI SYED ABDULLAH², NORHAILA SABL³

^{1,2,3} Faculty of Business and Accountancy, Universiti Selangor, Malaysia

*Corresponding Author: kamisah@unisel.edu.my

Abstract: Individual and societal health, flourishing, and prosperity are all linked to well-being. Well-being is more than simply the absence of disease or illness. It is a complex interplay of physical, mental, emotional, and social health factors. Happiness and life satisfaction are strongly linked to well-being. Unfortunately, well-being looks to be declining, with rising conflicts adding to the pressure on cities, as more than half of the forcibly displaced people live in cities. Urban life peculiarity well-being (LPW) is complicated and multidimensional. A diverse set of urban well-being evaluation methods has been created around the world to measure and monitor the quality of urban life while taking into account the specific characteristics of cities/regions and the demands of their populations. This study is aimed to investigate the urban LPW among tourism industry workers in Malaysia. Data were collected from 35 tourism industry workers with various backgrounds by distributing questionnaires using a convenient sampling approach. The collected data of 35 were analysed by using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) software. This finding calls for a better understanding of the urban LPW elements among the tourism industry workers in Malaysia. The study highlights the value of the created framework and comprehensive list of criteria as an organised and efficient method for developing better urban LPW assessment tools.

Keywords: Safety Management, Economic Stability, Family Well-Being, Quality of Life Tourism Industry

1. Introduction

According to The World Bank (2023), presently some 4.4 billion inhabitants (56%) of the world's population live in cities, and this trend is predicted to continue, with the urban population more than tripling by 2050, when roughly 7 out of 10 people live in cities. The COVID-19 pandemic posed a significant challenge to cities and their affluent and poor residents. Its impact and the measures used to stop the virus's spread disproportionately impacted the poor, marginalised, and vulnerable, exposing weak lines in cities' economic structures and preparedness for such a crisis, particularly the quality of their public health and service delivery systems. For sustaining and promoting human health and well-being, urbanisation brings opportunities, threats, and huge problems.

The Malaysian Well-being Index (MyWI) is one of the key social indicators used by the government to assess the level of well-being and overall quality of life in Malaysia. The measure, formerly known as the Malaysia Quality of Life Index (MQLI) was debuted in 2000. Malaysian Well-being Index comprises two sub-components of well-being: economic well-being (transport, communications, education, income and distribution, working life) and social well-being (housing, entertainment and recreation, public safety, social participation,

governance, culture, health, environment, and family). Figure 1 shows that in the sub-composite index of the economic well-being index, all five components posted positive growth in 2022 however, MyWI's three components, namely public safety, governance and social participation, all declined. COVID-19 proliferation has had an impact on the Malaysian Well-Being Index for 2020 (Berita Nasional Malaysia [Bernama], 2021). Aside from that, the Malaysian economy has been harmed by the government's implementation of the Movement Control Order (MCO) in all industries, including tourism.




Figure 1. Malaysian Well-being Index 2022 (DOSM, 2023)

The tourist industry in Malaysia is large, contributing significantly to the country's economy. Tourism contributed 15.9 per cent of GDP in 2019, totalling RM240.2 billion before the pandemic (Malaysia Investment Development Authority [MIDA], 2023). Amid the positive outlook, the Coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak has taken the world by surprise. As a result of

global economic issues, many households globally, including Malaysian households, have suffered. Malaysia's economic landscape has seen increasingly competitive business environments, challenging labour market conditions, and high living costs, all of which have influenced households and consumers. Firms in numerous industries have been obliged to downsize their workforce, and such actions have a detrimental influence on workers' well-being due to job loss and income loss (Nurul Shahnaz et al., 2020). According to Nurul Shahnaz et al. (2020), rising living costs can lead to a decrease in household purchasing power, an increase in the use of credit and debt, an unfavourable effect on financial well-being, and other socio-economic challenges such as increased unemployment, poverty, and crime.

2. Research Problem

Malaysians are currently divided into three income groups: the bottom 40% (B40), the middle 40% (M40), and the top 20% (T20). B40 represents low-income households with a monthly income of less than RM4,850. M40 refers to middle-class households with incomes ranging from RM4,850 to RM10,959, while T20 refers to upper-income households earning more than RM10,959. The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly impacted many Malaysians' incomes in 2020, and 2021. Because of the pandemic, many Malaysians have moved into lower income brackets and have experienced a decline in their life's peculiarity well-being. According to Chief Statistician Datuk Seri Dr Mohd Uzir Mahidin, the Malaysian Well-Being Index (MyWI) for 2020 fell by 2.1 per cent to 118.3 points, compared to 120.8 points in 2019 due to the COVID-19 pandemic (Bernama, 2021).

According to the Department of Statistics Malaysia's (DOSM) Household Income and Basic Amenities Survey Report 2020, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic aftermath, 20% of M40 households have plummeted into the B40 group (Bernama, 2022). The M40 income earners, dubbed the "new poor," are said to be clinging to life by a thread, with some even falling into poverty. Middle-class salaries, the bedrock of economic growth, are now confronted with financial challenges and commitments as the cost of living rises, particularly in urban areas. In 2020, the average household monthly income was RM7,089, up from RM7,901 in 2019, while the median household monthly income was RM5,209, down from RM5,873 in 2019. Khazanah Research Institute's (KRI) State of Households 2018 disclosed that Malaysian household income has steadily increased from 1970 to 2018. Malaysia's Gini coefficient, however, fell from 0.513 to 0.399 (Teoh, 2018).

Over 60 years of five-year plans and alleged social engineering, social well-being has not been maximised. The key aspects of well-being, such as family, environment, and public safety, have decreased over time in Malaysia. According to MyWI, which measures people's well-being advancement, economic well-being has declined by 3.4% to 126.2 points, while social well-being has decreased by 12.1% to 114.0 points (Bernama, 2021). The living wage, on the other hand, allows for a higher standard of living by covering necessities, emergency savings, and future investments. Considering the concerns surrounding B40 and M40 life peculiarity well-being (i.e., quality of life well-being) in Malaysia, this study aims to explore the life peculiarity well-being among the B40 and M40 urbanite groups.

3. Literature Review

The concept of well-being is complicated and multifaceted. Human well-being is about how well the needs of people in a society are met across various domains - the physical, economic, social, environmental, emotional, and spiritual as well as individuals' evaluations of their own lives and the way that their society operates. In the modern metropolis, the concept of well-being relates to people's ability to live healthy, creative, and satisfying lives. While the phrase "well-being" is commonly used in academic, public, and commercial settings, it can be defined and quantified in a variety of ways (Biloria et al., 2020). The multiplicity of approaches to the study of well-being has resulted in somewhat broad definitions of well-being, with researchers using the construct of 'well-being' synonymously with 'satisfaction', 'happiness', or 'quality of life' (Mansfield et al., 2020; Ruggeri et al., 2020). According to Biloria et al. (2020), well-being refers to people's ability to live healthy, creative, and fulfilling lives. In the late 1990s, Kahneman et al. (1999) suggested a new science of well-being centred on explaining positive states of mind and subjective appraisals of emotions and quality of life.

There are two types of well-being indicators, which include objective measures of well-being, and subjective measures of well-being (Gilbert et al. 2016). Objective measures of well-being refer to the resources and opportunities that people have access to, and subjective measures of well-being apply to an individual's evaluation of his life circumstances (Cummins, 2019; Gilbert et al., 2016). Subsequently, objective measures of well-being indicators include social, economic, physical, and other easily quantifiable domains that can be used to gauge the resources and opportunities people have access to. This measure is the prevailing method of comparing human well-being across populations. An additional challenge to the traditional objective measures of life quality is that, of the two dimensions, the subjective is by far the most important (Cummins, 2019). Quality of life and well-being are used interchangeably and inconsistently within studies (Aisyah et al., 2016). Some have argued that higher levels of subjective well-being are linked to positive societal outcomes and should thus be a policy focus (Gilbert et al., 2016).

3.1 *Life Peculiarity Well-being*

Life peculiarity well-being (i.e., quality of life) is a notion everyone appears to grasp but cannot describe accurately. This conflict is embedded in many elements of people's lives, including health, personal safety, leisure, and other health-related variables. The World Health Organisation (WHO) defines quality of life as an individual's view of their place in life about their goals, aspirations, standards, and concerns in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live. Determining and evaluating the life peculiarity well-being (LPW) is a difficulty that remains open to interpretation since it covers a broad concept encompassing many life areas and personal ideas (Agus, 2017). There are numerous factors of life peculiarity well-being, and each component is picked for a reasonable reason (Nur Farhanah et al., 2018). According to Tvaronavičienė et al. (2022), one of the purposes of the welfare state is to improve the perception of other democratic ideals in the country as well as the reasons for economic development and participation. The key sustainable development goals of the United Nations Development Programme take LPW into account in a variety of ways

(Michalos, 2017). Due to the variety of available measures, comparing LPW across various socio-economic levels in each state of Malaysia might be difficult. This study assesses fresh evidence by exploring the LPW dimensions (i.e., safety, economic stability, and family) among city-dwelling tourism personnel.

3.2 Safety

Safety is synonymous with well-being, and it refers to a broad notion whose meaning varies depending on the sector or scientific subject concerned, such as public health, sociology, geography, criminology, architecture, environmental psychology, political science, or urban planning (Whitzman, 2008). Safety is utilised in the scientific literature as an individual condition, a necessary quality in society, and an outcome (Kullberg, 2010). The strongest communities are also the safest, while when a community is healthy, it can be a potent and resilient deterrent against crime. In general, happy people live in environments that foster mental and physical health, connectivity, and resilience. According to Chief Statistician Datuk Seri Dr. Mohd Uzir Mahidin, the three most important factors that contribute to an increase in MyWI are entertainment and recreation (20.8%), transportation (8.0%), and culture (6.5%), while the three factors that contribute to a decrease in MyWI are public safety, governance, and social participation (Bernama, 2023). Although research from the perspective of residents is scarce in the literature, safety in the housing environment is a basic human need and a prerequisite for health. Maslow's hierarchy of human needs considers safety needs to be the most essential after basic physiological needs (hunger and thirst) (Maslow, 1999).

Maslow's hierarchy of needs is a psychological motivational theory consisting of a five-tier model of human needs, commonly shown as hierarchical tiers within a pyramid. The hierarchy has five levels: physiological, safety, love/belonging, esteem, and self-actualisation. Maslow (1943) proposed a hierarchy of human needs, with physiological (survival) needs at the bottom and more creative and intellectually oriented 'self-actualisation' demands at the top. According to Mcleod (2023), safety needs can be fulfilled by the family and society (e.g., police, schools, businesses, and medical care). Besides that, emotional security, financial security (e.g., job, social welfare), law and order, fearlessness, social stability, property, health, and well-being (e.g., safety from accidents and injury) are examples of safety needs. Beyond individuals' fulfilment of their own needs, societal need fulfilment predicted subjective well-being, showing the desirability of living in a flourishing society (Tay & Diener, 2011). Hale et al. (2018), as shown in Figure 2 extend the initial basic human need for physical safety to encompass contemporary challenges of personal and financial security.

Archbold et al. (2018) emphasised that residents' sentiments of protection from crime and violence in their neighbourhood declined as their years of residency grew. Compared to new residents, residents with greater longevity felt less safe from crime and violence in their neighbourhood. Veenhoven and Ehrhardt (1995) advocated for the "livability theory," which holds that some societies have a greater quality of life because they possess universally desirable features for people. As safety is a fundamental human need, safety is a prerequisite to maintaining and improving the population's well-being and health (Kullberg, 2010).



Figure 2. A Modern Revision of Maslow's Original Work (Hale et al., 2018)

3.3 Economic Stability

Economic stability implies that individuals have the resources to live a healthy life. The affordability of housing, employment that pays a decent salary, and employment supports such as worker protections, paid sick leave, child care, and access to reliable transportation all influence economic stability. Poverty, employment, food security, and housing stability are all important aspects of economic stability. Ultimately, these economic issues imply that there may be a negative impact on urban well-being, perhaps leading to other socio-economic adversities such as higher unemployment, poverty, and crime (Biloria et al., 2020; Nurul Shahnaz et al., 2020). These concerns can have an impact on how people prepare for and respond to an emergency.

Since the last decade and in recent years, global economic concerns have negatively impacted many households worldwide, including Malaysian households. Malaysia's economic landscape has seen increasingly competitive corporate environments, difficult labour market conditions, and high living costs, which have impacted households and consumers in general (Nurul Shahnaz et al., 2020). When the COVID-19 pandemic devastated the world economy, many family members lost employment or earned lower wages. With or without job loss, many families earned less during COVID-19. Nonetheless, the epidemic has posed a major threat to the economic well-being of many families with less stable employment and those working in small companies, retail, and service sectors due to a sharp drop in consumers and foreign tourists (Lee et al., 2020).

Economic well-being refers to an economy's overall level of living and quality of life for individuals and households. It includes a variety of variables such as income, wealth, work possibilities, access to essential goods and services, social support, and general life pleasure (Biloria et al., 2020; Nurul Shahnaz et al., 2020; Sano et al., 2021; White et al., 2023). Economic well-being is measured using a combination of objective and subjective indicators. Subjective well-being has piqued researchers' interest in various fields, including psychology, economics, geography, and sociology (Schwanen & Atkinson, 2015; Biloria et al., 2020). According to White et al. (2023), economic stability is a well-established social determinant of health (SDOH), and financial pressure is a major contributor to the health disparities reported in low-

income people. Hence, no single indicator can adequately convey the complexities and multidimensionality of people's economic well-being.

3.4 Family

Family well-being is identical to family happiness, and it covers both physical and psychological well-being, the quality of the parent-child connection, and the quality of interactions between parents and children. According to the National Population and Family Development Board Malaysia [NPFDB] (2011), family well-being is defined as a safe, healthy, pleasant, harmonious, and satisfying family situation. This definition includes spiritual fulfilment and comfort regarding their economy and finances, as well as mental, psychosocial, health, political, and environmental sustainability. In Figure 3, Krys et al. (2021) developed the valuation and levels of four different types of well-being, ranging from a more traditional individualism-themed conceptualisation of well-being (i.e., the life satisfaction of an individual) to a more collectivism-themed one (i.e., interdependent happiness of a family). They found that well-being is an important factor in understanding well-being valuation in which family well-being is valued more than personal well-being.




Figure 3. Four Kinds of Well-being and Their Measures (Krys et al., 2021)

According to Armstrong et al. (2005), the family well-being domain contains dimensions of family organisational structure, interpersonal relationships, psychological state, and self-efficacy. Family organisational structure relates to closeness agreement in terms of care, expression of sentiments, and disputes, whereas interpersonal relationships encompass family relationships with family members and friends. On the other hand, parental self-efficacy relates to parental competence in dealing with their children's challenges. Parents' physical health, mental health, self-ability, and family resilience are essential factors in measuring family well-being (Newland, 2015). Hence, family well-being is a crucial dimension in LPW that needs to be focused on.

4. Methodology

The current pilot study on LPW during the COVID-19 pandemic was conducted in the tourism business. During July and August 2022, a cross-sectional design was employed to collect data via a self-administered questionnaire. The respondents, being workers in the tourism industry in Malaysia, were approached through the Google Forms platform and asked

to fill out the questionnaire in the survey link. At the time of data collection, all participants were full-time, in-person employees; and no work-from-home employees were included in the study.

The primary data were gathered through a self-administered questionnaire. A structured questionnaire was developed to collect data, including fourteen demographic variables and three dimensions of LPW among tourism industry workers. The questionnaires were distributed to various locations throughout Malaysia's cities in the tourism industry. As a component of non-probability sampling techniques, "convenience sampling" was adopted in this study. According to Malhotra (2008), respondents are selected for convenience sampling because "they happen to be in the right place at the right time". The questionnaire was filled out by the tourism industry workers, with 50 dispersed and 35 returned and useable, with a response rate of 70%.

The items measured by the LPW used in the pilot study were mainly derived from those posited by Smrke et al. (2018), Tammaru et al. (2020), Drews and van den Bergh (2016), Swamy (2014), Nuri et al. (2020) and Thomas et al. (2017). All items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale; a non-comparative scaling technique was adopted for this study. This study's respondents were asked to rate their thoughts on a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The 5-point Likert Scale has been used in previous research to assess well-being (Durkin et al., 2016; Xiaogang & Jun, 2017; Guidetti et al., 2022). Bouranta et al. (2009) argued that the 5-point Likert Scale is less confusing and enhances response rate. Furthermore, developing a Likert scale is straightforward and is likely to provide a highly reliable scale; it is also simple to read and complete from the participants' perspective (Taherdoost, 2019). Hence, it is considered a valid and reliable measurement.

5. Findings

IBM SPSS, Version 26, was used to analyse the data. The descriptive analyses were performed to examine the demographics and elements of each dimension. The following are the results:

5.1 Sociodemographic

As shown in Table 1, A total of 35 workers from the tourism industry responded to the questionnaire. The highest number of participants came from Shah Alam (22.9%), followed by Putrajaya (17.1%), Seremban (14.3%, Alor Setar (11.4%), 8.6% participants from Kangar and Kuala Lumpur, 5.7% from Ipoh and 2.9% from Bandaraya Melaka, Kuantan, Kota Kinabalu and Kuching. 57.1% were male and 42.9% were female. Most of the participants fell in the age of 35–39 years (28.6%), followed by 25–29 years (25.7%), 30–34 years (22.9%), 40–44 years (14.3%), 45–49 years (5.7%), and finally 50–55 years (2.9%). The primary ethnic composition of the sample included Malay (77.1%), Chinese (11.4%), Others (8.6%) and Indian (2.9%).

Table 1. Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants

Participants	Characteristics	N (35)	%
Area of Living	Alor Setar	4	11.4
	Bandaraya Melaka	1	2.9
	Seremban	5	14.3
	Kuantan	1	2.9
	Ipoh	2	5.7
	Kangar	3	8.6
	Kota Kinabalu	1	2.9
	Kuching	1	2.9
	Shah Alam	8	22.9
	Kuala Lumpur	3	8.6
	Putrajaya	6	17.1
Gender	Male	20	57.1
	Female	15	42.9
Age	25 – 29 years old	9	25.7
	30 – 34 years old	8	22.9
	35 – 39 years old	10	28.6
	40 – 44 years old	5	14.3
	45 – 49 years old	2	5.7
	50 – 55 years old	1	2.9
Race	Malay	27	77.1
	Indian	1	2.9
	Chinese	4	11.4
	Others	3	8.6
Education Level	Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia (SPM)	2	5.7
	Diploma	15	42.9
	Bachelor Degree	15	42.9
	Master Degree	2	5.7
	Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)	1	2.9
Household Income Classification	B40 Group (<RM4850)	22	62.9
	M40 Group (RM4850-RM10970)	13	37.1
Monthly Household Income	Less than RM2500	9	25.7
	RM2501-RM3169	7	20.0
	RM3170-RM3969	2	5.7
	RM3970-RM4849	4	11.4
	RM4850-RM5879	3	8.6
	RM5880-RM7099	1	2.9
	RM7100-RM8699	4	11.4
	RM8700- RM10959	5	14.3
Marital Status	Single	15	42.9
	Married	20	57.1
Spouse Employment	Employed	14	40.0
	Unemployed	6	17.1
	N/A	15	42.9
Number of Children	No children	19	54.3
	1 child	4	11.4
	2 children	3	8.6
	3 children	7	20.0
	4 children	1	2.9
	More than 4 children	1	2.9

Tourism Industry	Heritage, Arts and Culture	2	5.7
	Agritourism	3	8.6
	Accommodation	6	17.1
	Entertainment and Recreation	2	5.7
	Travel and Tourism	15	42.9
	Medical and Wellness	7	20.0
Year of Service	Less than 2 years	7	20.0
	2 – 5 years	7	20.0
	6 - 8 years	6	17.1
	9 - 10 years	3	8.6
	11 – 13 years	4	11.4
	14 – 15 years	4	11.4
House Ownership	More than 15 years	4	11.4
	Rent	9	25.7
Yearly Budget for Family Vacation	Own	26	74.3
	Yes	14	40.0
	No	21	60.0

Most participants had a Diploma and Bachelor's Degree (44.9%), SPM and Master's Degree (5.7%) and PhD only 2.9%. In terms of income group, 62.9% were under B40, and 37.1% were under M40 income group category. Most of the B40 participants earned less than RM2500 (25.7%) monthly income; the highest monthly income earned by M40 participants was RM8700 - RM10959. Most participants were married (57.1%) and single (42.9%). Of 20 married participants, 40% of their spouses were employed, and 17.1% were unemployed. Most participants did not have any children (54.3%), followed by having three children (20%), one child (11.4%), two children (8.6%) and four and more children (2.9%), respectively.

The participants came from various types of the tourism industry, with most participants from Travel and Tourism (42.9%), Medical and Wellness (20%), Accommodation (17.1%), Agritourism (8.6%) and 5.7% from Heritage, Arts and Culture, as well as Entertainment and Recreation. In terms of year of service, the majority fell into the range of less than 2 years (20%) and 2 – 5 years (20%), followed by 6 - 8 years (17.1%), 11 – 13 years (11.4%), 14 – 15 years (11.4%), More than 15 years (11.4%), and lastly 9 - 10 years (8.6%). Regarding house ownership, it was found that the majority (74.3%) own their house, and very few (25.7%) rent the house. It was found that most participants did not have a yearly budget for a family vacation (60%) and 40% did have a yearly budget for a family vacation.

5.2 Reliability Test

The reliability and validity testing were performed on the developed measurement model. According to the results, the reliability and validity of the questionnaire were assured through a reliability test (Cronbach Alpha) in SPSS. Hair et al. (2017) defined consistency as the degree to which two measurements correlate well with one another. Table 2 shows that Cronbach's Alpha (CA) for all constructs was above 0.7, ranging from 0.726 to 0.891. Thus, the pilot supported initial reliability, as well as an expert jury (focus group) and concurrent validity (correlation with the global items).

Table 2. Results of the Reliability Test

Model Constructs	N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha (CA)
Safety	7	0.855
Economic Stability	7	0.726
Family	7	0.891

5.3 Safety Items

Table 3 shows the safety items, and the respondents were asked on a 5-point Likert scale of seven questions. The overall items indicate safety in the average range of 2.40 to 4.57. The respondents agreed that safety is the dimension of LPW. Safe home environment, low rate of crime, low rate of road accidents, raise children in a secure environment, safe residential area playground and safe walking alone in the residential area were the elements needed by the respondents (M – 4.31, SD – 0.932; M – 4.06, SD – 0.998; M – 3.91, SD – 1.147; M – 4.57, SD – 0.884; M – 3.46, SD – 1.245; M – 3.86, SD – 1.167) respectively. However, some of their residential areas did not have a security guard (M – 2.40, SD – 1.612). From the analysis, safety is a crucial element to enhance the LPW of the participants.

Table 3. Safety Items

No	Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.	I have a safe home environment.	35	4.31	0.932
2.	My neighbourhood area has a low rate of crime.	35	4.06	0.998
3.	My neighbourhood area has a low rate of road accidents.	35	3.91	1.147
4.	I prefer to raise my children in a secure environment.	35	4.57	0.884
5.	My residential area has a security guard.	35	2.40	1.612
6.	I feel safe letting my kids play in my residential area playground.	35	3.46	1.245
7.	I feel safe walking alone in my residential area.	35	3.86	1.167

5.4 Economic Stability Items

The findings in Table 4 show the items of economic stability. Seven questions about economic stability were asked on a 5-point Likert scale. The overall items denote economic stability in the average range of 2.77 to 4.31. The respondents were prone to having enough money to meet their needs (M – 3.23, SD – 1.063) and satisfied with their current job (M – 3.60, SD – 1.063). The respondents also emphasised that economic stability is necessary to create jobs (M - 4.03, SD – 1.071), and continued economic growth is essential for improving people's life satisfaction (M - 4.23, SD – 0.877). In addition, the respondents believed that a higher minimum wage is essential for improving people's life satisfaction (M - 4.31, SD – 0.900) and they can enjoy life due to the current economic situation (M - 3.17, SD – 1.098) for their life peculiarity well-being. However, the respondents highlight that this country's economic system does not have fair favours to everyone (M – 2.77, SD – 1.031), which is also crucial in their life's peculiarity well-being. Thus, economic stability items are essential in developing the B40 and M40 tourism workers' life peculiarity of well-being.

Table 4. Economic Stability Items

No	Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.	I have enough money to meet my needs.	35	3.23	1.087
2.	I am satisfied with my current job.	35	3.60	1.063
3.	Economic stability is necessary to create jobs.	35	4.03	1.071
4.	The economic system in this country fairly favours everyone in the country.	35	2.77	1.031
5.	Continued economic growth is essential for improving people's life satisfaction.	35	4.23	0.877
6.	A higher minimum wage is essential for improving people's life satisfaction.	35	4.31	0.900
7.	I can enjoy life due to the current economic situation.	35	3.17	1.098

5.3 Family Items

Seven questions of the family items were asked on the 5-point Likert scale. The findings in Table 5 exhibit the items of family that enhance the respondents' life peculiarity well-being. The overall items show the family items in the average range of 3.74 to 4.46. Family was the most concerned dimension of life peculiarity well-being among the participants. They always share their problem with the family (M – 4.00, SD – 1.057). The participants emphasised that they were satisfied with the help received from their family (M – 4.31, SD – 0.796).

Besides that, they feel that their family loves them (M – 4.46, SD – 0.817). Furthermore, they were satisfied with the time shared with their family (M – 3.86, SD – 1.089). The participants agreed that they have an annual family event (M – 3.74, SD – 1.245). They will discuss important decisions that may affect their family members (M – 4.06, SD – 0.938). Finally, they will participate in raising funds for their family member when they are in need (M – 4.03, SD – 1.124). It indicates that the stated family items are the tools used in obtaining a good life peculiarity well-being, especially among the urbanite B40 and M40 groups of tourism workers.

Table 5. Family Items

No	Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.	I always share my problems with my family.	35	4.00	1.057
2.	I am satisfied with the help that I received from my family.	35	4.31	0.796
3.	I feel that my family loves me.	35	4.46	0.817
4.	I am satisfied with the time that I and my family shared.	35	3.86	1.089
5.	My family have an annual family event.	35	3.74	1.245
6.	I discuss important decisions that may affect members of my family.	35	4.06	0.938
7.	I participate in raising funds for my family members when they are in need.	35	4.03	1.124

6. Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that safety, economic stability, and family are crucial dimensions of LPW among tourism workers in the cities of Malaysia. The findings indicate that the respondents knew about the essentiality of their LPW. According to the validity and reliability test results, safety, economic stability, and family were found to be significant dimensions of LPW. This test is illustrated by the results at CA of 0.855, 0,726 and 0.891 for safety, economic stability and family, respectively. Therefore, the research accepted the validity and reliability of this dimension as good measures. These research findings are consistent with the study conducted by White et al. (2023).

This study also found that safety and well-being are crucial in the LPW of tourism workers, and it is supported by Hale et al. (2018) and Archbold et al. (2018). Lindgren and Nilsen (2012) confirmed that safety is related to the presence of the 'right' or 'wrong' type of person. At the same time, the respondents agreed that a safe home environment, low crime rate and low road accidents would enhance their life peculiarity well-being. The findings of this study indicate that raising children in a secure environment, a safe residential area playground, and safe walking alone in the residential area were important for their LPW and supported by Kullberg (2010) and Lindgren and Nilsen (2012). Lastly, some of the respondents' residential areas did not have a security guard as an element of safety and well-being. The desire to live in a safe neighbourhood, such as in gated and guarded area residences with security guards patrolling the area at all times, might be one of the respondents' concerns (Nurshuhada et al., 2017). Respondents were concerned about their safety due to an increase in crime in Malaysia, such as snatching, stealing, and burglary within the home neighbourhood.

Based on the descriptive analysis, this study found that economic stability was one of the respondents' attentions in their LPW. The respondents agreed to have enough money to meet their needs. There is emerging evidence that (at least after fundamental financial necessities are addressed) a strong desire for material gain may be detrimental to happiness (Otis, 2017). The findings indicated that economic stability is necessary to create jobs and satisfied with their current job. Economic stability is required for job generation and job possibilities. When the economy is stable, firms can confidently plan and invest, resulting in job growth and lower unemployment rates. It also shows that continued economic growth is crucial for improving people's happiness. In addition, the respondents stated that a greater minimum wage is necessary for enhancing people's life satisfaction and that they can enjoy life because of the existing economic circumstances for their unique well-being. However, respondents emphasised that the economic system in Malaysia does not truly support everyone, which is also critical in their LPW. The "missing middle" – those who are neither "rich" nor "poor" – is frequently overlooked (The Malaysian Insight, 2023). The missing middle issue manifests itself in the majority of plans across the life cycle groups of children, working age, and old age—a phenomenon that has not been addressed by the existing method.

Family well-being was essential to the tourism workers' LPW. Among the participants, the family was the most concerned dimension of LPW, since in general they always discuss their issues with their relatives. The participants underlined their satisfaction with the

assistance they received from their families, and aside from that, they believe their family adores them. They were very pleased with the time they spent with their family. According to Lee et al. (2020), many families struggle to spend intimate family time together because they have not yet learned how to share gendered family tasks or how to support other families that are struggling due to low resources, inequities, or prejudice. Having an annual family event is part of the family's quality of life. With so much going on in peoples' everyday lives, gathering with loved ones provides a sense of belonging. It provides confidence that there are others people can lean on when things become tough, and enjoy their victories and happy moments. Furthermore, good outcomes such as family quality of life, psychological functioning, and health-related behaviours are associated with family special events (Hosokawa et al., 2022). Malaysians' perception of family well-being is based on their perceptions of peace and contentment, a stable economy, close family ties, love, and a comfortable home. Family well-being is critical to a country's social and economic success. Without a good measuring method, efforts to achieve family well-being cannot be performed successfully and efficiently (Suzana, 2022).

To cater to the LPW issues, Malaysia needs to create a broader foundation for national development because policy has been concerned with Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth and social well-being. Those hard economic facts and the creativity and innovation required to achieve growth will be accompanied by societal well-being. Trust in government is critical for economic growth because it allows it to make difficult decisions that may cause short-term pain but are important for the nation's long-term prosperity. For Malaysia to progress, broad indicators such as GDP and the Consumer Price Index (CPI) are useful, but policymakers must implement steps to improve the "real well-being" of the citizens.

7. Conclusion

There is a significant dimension of LPW, including safety, economic stability and family among tourism workers. This study suggests that an LPW will bring about workers with a good experience of health, happiness, and prosperity. The research emphasises that safety, economic stability, and family well-being should be put in place and must be objective as much as possible to achieve people's satisfaction and happiness. For ages, governments and experts have attempted to assess population well-being. This population's well-being has frequently been examined in economic or political research using a single item on life satisfaction or happiness or a limited group of measures about quality of life. However, because well-being is a complex concept, it cannot be fully examined in this manner. Higher well-being has been associated with improved physical health and longevity and improved individual performance at work, and higher life satisfaction has been linked to improved national economic performance. Hence, for future research, empirical findings from a broader population will enhance the implication of this study.

This study is not without its limitations. Because adequate populations could not be reached, convenient sampling was adopted. As a result, the study's findings cannot be extrapolated to a larger population. As a result, other researchers should do additional research to produce more credible conclusions using a larger sample size and random sampling techniques. Future researchers should stratify organisations based on size and

industry before selecting a sample to obtain more accurate results. Safety, economic stability, and family well-being are critical initiatives for enhancing urban LPW, especially in the B40 and M40 groups. The findings of this study supplement other well-being indices used by policymakers and may be beneficial input for the government and policymakers in developing appropriate policies to promote higher LPW of Malaysian households based on their sociodemographic features.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank the Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) for funding this research through the Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (FRGS No. FRGS/1/2020/SS03/UNISEL/03/1) and Universiti Selangor (UNISEL) for their assistance with this project.

References

- Agus, A. (2017). Quality of Life (QoL) of employees in Klang Valley, Malaysia: What makes you happy? *Journal of Business and Policy Research*, 12(2), 42-57.
- Aisyah Abu Bakar, Mariana Mohamed Osman, Syahriah Bachok & Mansor Ibrahim. (2016). Investigating rationales of Malaysia quality of life and wellbeing components and indicators. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 222(June), 132-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.202>
- Archbold, C. A., Mrozla, T., Huynh, C., Dahle, T. O., Robinson, C., & Marcel, A. (2018). Resident interaction and social well-being in an oil boomtown in western North Dakota. *Social Science Journal*, 55(4), 463-472. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2018.03.003>
- Armstrong, M. I., Birnie-Lefcovitch, S., & Ungar, M. T. (2005). Pathways between social support, family well-being, quality of parenting, and child resilience: What we know. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 14(2), 269-281. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-005-5054-4>
- Berita Nasional Malaysia (2021, December 1). *Malaysian well-being index down by 2.1 pct in 2020 - Chief Statistician*. Astro Awani. <https://www.astroawani.com/berita-malaysia/malaysian-wellbeing-index-down-21-pct-2020-chief-statistician-333956>
- Berita Nasional Malaysia. (2023, December 1). Malaysian wellbeing index up 2.5% in 2022. The Malaysian Insight. <https://www.themalaysianinsight.com/index.php/s/474512>
- Berita Nasional Malaysia (2022, December 15). *Malaysia's 'new poor' in dilemma*. New Straits Times. <https://www.nst.com.my/news/nation/2022/12/860974/malaysias-new-poor-dilemma>
- Biloria, N., Reddy, P., Fatimah, Y. A., & Mehta, D. (2020). Urban wellbeing in the contemporary city. In Nimish Biloria (Ed.) *Data-driven multivalence in the built environment*. (317-335). S.M.A.R.T. Environments. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-12180-8_16
- Bouranta, N., Chitiris, L., & Paravantis, J. (2009). The relationship between internal and external service quality. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 21(3), 275-293. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110910948297>

- Cummins, R. A. (2019). Wellbeing across cultures. In Kenneth D. Keith (Ed.) *Cross-cultural psychology: Contemporary themes and perspectives* (2nd ed., 516–530). Wiley Online Library. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119519348.ch25>
- Drews, S., & van den Bergh, J. C. J. M. (2016). Public views on economic growth, the environment and prosperity: Results of a questionnaire survey. *Global Environmental Change*, 39, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.04.001>
- Durkin, M., Beaumont, E., Martin, C. J. H. & Carson, J. (2016). A pilot study exploring the relationship between self-compassion, self-judgement, self-kindness, compassion, professional quality of life and wellbeing among UK community nurses. *Nurse Education Today*, 46, 109–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2016.08.030>
- Gilbert, A., Colley, K., & Roberts, D. (2016). Are rural residents happier? A quantitative analysis of subjective wellbeing in Scotland. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 44, 37–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.01.002>
- Guidetti, G., Cortini, M., Fantinelli, S., Di Fiore, T., & Galanti, T. (2022). Safety management and wellbeing during COVID-19: A pilot study in the manufactory sector. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(7), 3981. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19073981>
- Hale, A. J., Ricotta, D. N., Freed, J., Smith, C. C., & Huang, G. C. (2018). Adapting Maslow's hierarchy of needs as a framework for resident wellness. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, 31(1), 109–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10401334.2018.1456928>
- Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M. & Sarstedt, M. (2017). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). SAGE Publication.
- Hosokawa, R., Katsura, T., & Taira, K. (2022). Experience of annual events in the family and social adjustment of school-age children. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 16(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13034-022-00475-w>
- Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (Eds.). (1999). *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kullberg, A. (2010). *Residential well-being and perceived safety in different types of housing areas in Sweden*. Linköping University.
- Krys, K., Capaldi, C. A., Zelenski, J. M., Park, J., Nader, M., Kocimska-Zych, A., Kwiatkowska, A., Michalski, P., & Uchida, Y. (2021). Family well-being is valued more than personal well-being: A four-country study. *Current Psychology*, 40(7), 3332–3343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00249-2>
- Lee, J., Meejung, C. & Miao, S. (2020). How has COVID-19 changed family life and well-being in Korea? *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 51(3–4), 301–313. <https://doi.org/10.3138/JCFS.51.3-4.006>
- Lindgren, T., & Nilsen, M. R. (2012). Safety in residential areas. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 103(2), 196–208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2011.00679.x>
- Malaysia Investment Development Authority. (2023). *Smart tourism: Future of tourism in Malaysia*. <https://www.mida.gov.my/smart-tourism-future-of-tourism-in-malaysia/>
- Malhotra, N.K. (2008). Review of Marketing Research. *Review of Marketing Research*, 4, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Leeds, pp. ix-xiv. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1548-6435\(2008\)0000004004](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1548-6435(2008)0000004004)
- Mansfield, L., Daykin, N., & Kay, T. (2020). Leisure and wellbeing. *Leisure Studies*, 39(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2020.1713195>

- Maslow, A. H. (1999). *Toward a psychology of being* (3rd ed.). John Wiley.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- Mcleod, S. (2023). *Maslow's hierarchy of needs*. Simple Psychology. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html>
- Michalos, A. C. (2017). Education, happiness and wellbeing. In *Connecting the quality of life theory to health, well-being and education: The selected works of Alex C. Michalos* (p. 277–299). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51161-0_12
- National Population and Family Development Board Malaysia. (2011). *Family Well-Being Index*. [https://mprh.lppkn.gov.my/family-well-being-index/#:~:text=The%20NPFDB%20\(2011\)%20defines%20family,health%3B%20political%3B%20and%20sustainability.](https://mprh.lppkn.gov.my/family-well-being-index/#:~:text=The%20NPFDB%20(2011)%20defines%20family,health%3B%20political%3B%20and%20sustainability.)
- Newland, L. A. (2015). Family well-being, parenting, and child well-being: Pathways to healthy adjustment. *Clinical Psychologist*, 19(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cp.12059>
- Nur Farhanah Rosli, Noor Suzilawati Rabe, Mariana Mohamed Osman & Muhammad Faris Abdullah. (2018). Perception of quality of life among community in Selangor. *Journal of the Malaysian Institute of Planners*, 16(2), 12-20. <https://doi.org/10.21837/pm.v16i6.456>
- Nuri, R. P., Batorowicz, B., & Aldersey, H. M. (2020). Family support and family and child-related outcomes among families impacted by disability in low- and middle-income countries: A scoping review. *Journal of Child Health Care*, 24(4), 637–654. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367493519883456>
- Nurshuhada Zainin, Faizul Azli Mohd-Rahim, Syazwani Sulaiman, Saipol Bari Abd-Karim & Atikah Hamzah. (2017). Factors affecting the demand of affordable housing among the middle-income groups in Klang Valley Malaysia. *Journal of Design and Built Environment*, 17, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.22452/jdbe.sp2017no1.1>
- Nurul Shahnaz Mahdzan, Rozaimah Zainudin, Mohd Edil Abd Sukor, Fauzi Zainir, Wan Marhaini Wan Ahmad. (2020). An exploratory study of financial well-being among Malaysian households. *Journal of Asian Business and Economic Studies*, 27(3), 285–302. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jabes-12-2019-0120>
- Otis, N. (2017). Subjective well-being in China: Associations with absolute, relative, and perceived economic circumstances. *Social Indicators Research*, 132(2), 885–905. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-016-1312-7>
- Sano, Y., Mammen, S., & Houghten, M. (2021). Well-being and stability among low-income families: A 10-year review of research. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 42(s1), 107–117. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-020-09715-7>
- Swamy, V. (2014). Financial Inclusion, Gender Dimension, and Economic Impact on Poor Households. *World Development*, 56, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.10.019>
- Smrke, U., Sočan, G., & Blenkuš, M. (2018). Residential satisfaction questionnaires: A systematic review. In *Urbani Izziv* (Vol. 29, Issue 2, pp. 67–82). *Urban Planning Institute of the Republic of Slovenia*. <https://doi.org/10.5379/urbani-izziv-en-2018-29-02-001>
- Ruggeri, K., Garcia-Garzon, E., Maguire, Á., Matz, S., & Huppert, F. A. (2020). Well-being is more than happiness and life satisfaction: A multidimensional analysis of 21 countries.

- Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 18(192), 1–16.
<https://hqlo.biomedcentral.com/track/pdf/10.1186/s12955-020-01423-y.pdf>
- Schwanen, T., & Atkinson, S. (2015). Geographies of wellbeing: An introduction. *The Geographical Journal*, 181(2), 98–101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12132>.
- Suzana Md Samsudi. (2022). Family well-being index based on Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah. *TAFHIM: IKIM Journal of Islam and the Contemporary World*, 15(2), 1–25.
<https://doi.org/10.56389/tafhim.vol15no2.3>
- Taherdoost, H. (2019). What is the best response scale for survey and questionnaire design: Review of different lengths of Rating Scale / Attitude Scale / Likert Scale. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management (IJARM)*, 8(1), 2296–1747.
<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02557308>
- Tammaru, T., Marcin'czak, S., Aunap, R., van Ham, M., & Janssen, H. (2020). Relationship between income inequality and residential segregation of socioeconomic groups. *Regional Studies*, 54(4), 450–461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2018.1540035>
- Teoh, S. (2018). *Malaysia's income gap doubled in two decades: Study*. <https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/se-asia/malaysias-income-gap-doubled-in-two-decades-study>
- The Malaysian Insight (2023, August 31). *A renewed commitment to inclusive protection*. <https://www.themalaysianinsight.com/s/459812>
- Thomas, P. A., Liu, H., & Umberson, D. (2017). Family Relationships and Well-Being. *Innovation in Aging*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igx025>
- Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2011). Needs and subjective well-being around the world. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 354–365. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023779>
- Tvaronavičienė, M., Mazur, N., Mishchuk, H., & Bilan, Y. (2022). Quality of life of the youth: Assessment methodology development and empirical study in human capital management. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja*, 35(1), 1088–1105.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2021.1956361>
- Veenhoven, R., & Ehrhardt, J. (1995). The cross-national pattern of happiness: Test of predictions implied in three theories of happiness. *Social Indicators Research*, 34, 33–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01078967>
- White, N., Packard, K., Kalkowski, J., Walters, R., Haddad, A. R., Flecky, K., Rusch, L., Furze, J., Black, L., & Peterson, J. (2023). Improving health through action on economic stability: Results of the finances first randomized controlled trial of financial Education and coaching in single mothers of low-income. *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine*, 17(3), 424–436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15598276211069537>
- Whitzman, C. (2008). Community safety indicators: Are we measuring what counts? *Urban Policy and Research*, 26(2), 197–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08111140701665849>
- The World Bank (2023). *Urban development*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/urbandevelopment/overview#:~:text=Today%2C%20some%2056%25%20of%20the,people%20will%20live%20in%20cities.>
- Xiaogang, W., & Jun, L. (2017). Income inequality, economic growth, and subjective well-being: Evidence from China. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 52, 49–58.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2017.10.003>