

UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

COMMUNITY HAPPINESS INDEX FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN PUTRAJAYA, MALAYSIA

MUSA HARUNA DANLADI

FPAS 2017 6



COMMUNITY HAPPINESS INDEX FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN PUTRAJAYA, MALAYSIA



MUSA HARUNA DANLADI

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

April 2017

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holders. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



DEDICATION

To:

ALLAH (SWT),

The Most Beneficent, the Most Merciful.

My Mother,

Your love is always with me no matter where I go.

My Father (Late),

You enlightened me to do all right things and only the right,

reminding me that there can be no gain without pain

My Brother,

Your unconditional support is treasured for always.

My Wife,

For all that you have been, for all that you are and will always be.

My Children,

For your scarifies, love and prayers, I am grateful.

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

COMMUNITY HAPPINESS INDEX FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN PUTRAJAYA, MALAYSIA

By

MUSA HARUNA DANLADI

April 2017

Chairman: Associate Professor Mohd Rusli Yacob, PhDFaculty: Environmental Studies

Urbanisation in Malaysia has led to significant pressure on local and state governments to provide planning and urban development strategies that are intended to improve the quality of urban services in ensuring citizens' well-being or happiness. Cities are facing increasing complex issues and rapid changes that challenge their future direction. The problems in cities have highlighted the need for policy makers to foster well-being as an essential element of sustainable development. Thus, creating healthy and viable communities aim to provide high quality of life has become a focus of contemporary public policies that target city communities across the nation, especially in a new town development including Putrajaya. However, the mainstream sustainable community development frameworks neglect to make happiness a goal. The general objective of this study therefore, is to develop a community happiness index (CHindex) framework to measure resident's satisfaction based on sustainable development indicators in Putrajaya city, from subjective well-being context. The study utilised mixed method approach with triangulation design in the development of this framework to achieve the primary research aim and specific objectives. Two sources of data sets were collected and used in this research analysis. Combined qualitative and quantitative data were collected from a two-round Delphi survey from a purposively sampled panel of experts in the sustainable development field in Malaysia, and the quantitative data gathered from the public survey of residents. The Delphi expert's panel identified and selected relevant indicators, assigned weights to indicators, dimensions and domains attribute required to develop community wellbeing framework that facilitate urban policy initiatives. Consensuses were reached on 37 key indicators within four-sustainability dimensions with a high level of group agreement (Kendall's W= 0.485, p < 0.001), and high correlation in rounds rankings (rho = 0.945, p < 0.01). Before application to the case study, the framework was tested to validate the psychometric property using Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) to establish its robustness in measuring community happiness. Linear Additive aggregation model was used with the weightings to construct composite indices that consider the unique characteristics of communities and municipalities in Malaysia. Following a cross-sectional survey using the newly constructed composite framework to measuring level of community happiness in Putrajaya, we found out that the municipality has medium-high level of community happiness (6.866) on a 10-point response scale at almost sustainable level. The framework provide provides a mechanism for continuous monitoring and assessment of sustainable interventions, facilitate comparison of trends of sustainability over time and guide urban planning and policy making decisions process to evaluate progress and impact to promote appropriately efficient happiness and further sustainability.

Keywords: Community happiness, index, measuring instruments, subjective wellbeing, urban planning, urban sustainability.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Doktor Falsafah

INDEKS KEBAHAGIAAN KOMUNITI BAGI PEMBANGUNAN MAMPAN DI PUTRAJAYA, MALAYSIA

Oleh

MUSA HARUNA DANLADI

April 2017

Pengerusi: Profesor Madya Mohd Rusli Yacob, PhDFakulti: Pengajian Alam Sekitar

Urbanisasi di Malaysia telah menyebabkan tekanan yang signifikan ke atas kerajaan tempatan dan negeri bagi menyediakan strategi perancangan dan pembangunan bandar yang diharap dapat memperbaiki kualiti perkhidmatan bandar dalam memastikan kebahagiaan atau kesejahteraan rakyat. Bandar-bandar sedang menghadapi peningkatan isu yang kompleks dan perubahan cepat yang mencabar arah tuju masa hadapan mereka. Masalah di bandar telah memperlihatkan keperluan bagi penggubal polisi supaya dapat menggalakkan kesejahteraan sebagai elemen yang penting bagi pembangunan mampan. Oleh sebab itu, mewujudkan komuniti yang sihat dan berdaya maju yang bertujuan untuk memberikan kualiti hidup tinggi merupakan fokus polisi awam kontemporari yang mensasarkan komuniti bandar merentas negara, terutama dalam pembangunan bandar baharu, termasuk Putrajaya. Walau bagaimanapun, kerangka pembangunan komuniti mampan lazim telah mengabaikan pelaksanaan kebahagiaan sebagai suatu matlamat. Objektif umum kajian ini adalah untuk membangunkan kerangka Indeks Kebahagiaan Komuniti (indeks CH) bagi mengukur kepuasan penduduk berdasarkan indikator pembangunan mampan di Putrajaya, dari konteks kesejahteraan subjektif. Kajian ini menggunakan reka bentuk penyelidikan kaedah campuran dengan reka bentuk triangulasi dalam pembangunan kerangka ini bagi memperoleh matlamat utama penyelidikan dan juga objektif spesifik. Dua sumber set data telah dikumpul dan digunakan dalam analisis penyelidikan ini. Gabungan data kualitatif dan kuantitatif telah diperoleh dari dua pusingan tinjauan Delphi daripada panel sampel pakar dalam bidang pembangunan mampan di Malaysia, dan data kuantitatif diperoleh daripada tinjauan awam penduduk. Panel pakar Delphi mengenal pasti dan memilih indikator relevan yang terpilih, memberi pemberatan pada indikator, dimensi, dan atribut domain yang diperlukan untuk membangunkan kerangka kebahagiaan komuniti bagi menggalakkan inisiatif polisi bandar. Konsensus telah diperoleh ke atas 37 indikator utama dalam empat dimensi kemampanan dengan tahap tinggi persetujuan kumpulan (Kendall W= 0.485, p < 0.4850.001), dan korelasi yang tinggi dalam ranking pusingan (rho = 0.945, p < 0.01). Sebelum pengaplikasian pada kajian kes, kerangka tersebut telah diuji bagi

iii

menvalidasikan ciri psikometrik menggunakan Permodelan Persamaan Berstrukur Kuasa Dua Terkecil Separa (PLS-SEM) bagi menentukan kekukuhannya dalam mengukur kebahagiaan komuniti. Model Agregasi Tambahan Linear telah digunakan dengan pemberatan untuk mengkonstruk indeks komposit yang mempertimbangkan ciri unik komuniti dan majlis pembandaran di Malaysia. Mengikut tinjauan keratan rentas menggunakan kerangka komposit yang baharu dikonstruk bagi mengukur tahap kebahagiaan komuniti di Putrajaya, kajian ini mendapati bahawa majlis perbandaran mempunyai tahap kebahagiaan yang sederhana - tinggi (6.866) pada respon skala 10 mata pada hampir setiap tahap kemampanan. Kerangka tersebut diharap dapat menyediakan suatu mekanisme untuk pemantauan dan penilaian yang berterusan dan penilaian intervensi kemampanan, menggalakkan perbandingan trend kemampanan bagi sesuatu jangka masa dan membimbing perancangan bandar dan proses membuat keputusan polisi untuk menilai perkembangan dan impak bagi menggalakkan kebahagiaan berkesan yang sesuai dan kemampanan seterusnya.

Kata kunci: Kebahagiaan komuniti, indeks, pengukuran instrumen, kesejahteraan subjektif, perancangan bandar, kemampanan bandar.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of ALLAH, the Beneficient, the Compassionate, who always gave me wisdom, strenght and patience to complete this study regardless of the many challenges.

I would like to sincerely thank my principal supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Mohd Rusli Yacob, whose assistance, guidance, research expertise, patience and encouragement throughout the preparation of this dissertation was highly motivating. Special thanks to my co-supervisors, Associate Professor Dr. Ahmad Makmom Abdullah and Dr. Mohd Yussof Ishak for their positive encouragement and constructive comments throughout the preparation of this dissertation.

Finally, I want to express my deepest and utmost appreciation and love to my family, my dear wife, Zuwaira, my son, Irfan, and my daughter Qanita, for their unstinting support, encouragement, love, patients and prayers they offered throughout this lengthy journey. And to my brothers Attahiru, Mohammed, Usman, Ibrahim and Yakubu, to my sisters Fatima, Aisha, Khadija, and Adama for their prayers. A special thanks goes to brother Mohammed and his family for their support and encouragement. Thank you brother, I own it all to you, and I truly appreciate you. Lastly, thanks to my dear mother, Ramatu (Atu) for your everlasting love, prayers, support and encouragement. Mum, I thank you. Also, it important to reconize my research colleagues, especially Buhari Abdulkarim, Abdullahi Adamu,Sanusi Ibrahim, Ibrahim Gamawa, Hamisu Alhaji Basiru and others for the time we shared together.

I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 6 April 2017 to conduct the final examination of Musa Haruna Danladi on his thesis entitled "Community Happiness Index for Sustainable Development in Putrajaya, Malaysia" in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Normala binti Halimoon, PhD

Senior Lecturer Faculty of Environmental Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

Yuhanis binti Ab Aziz, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Economics and Management Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

Latifah binti Abd Manaf, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Environmental Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

Muhammad Firdaus, PhD

Professor Bogor Agricultural University Indonesia (External Examiner)

NOR AINI AB. SHUKOR, PhD Professor and Deputy Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 2 June 2017

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of the Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Mohd Rusli Yacob, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Environmental Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

Ahmad Makmon Abdullah, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Environmental Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

Mohd Yusoff bin Ishak, PhD

Senior Lecturer Faculty of Environmental Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

ROBIAH BINTI YUNUS, PhD

Professor and Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software

Signature:	Date:

Name and Matric No.: Musa Haruna Danladi / GS38111

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) were adhered to.

Signature: Name of Chairman	
Committee:	Associate Professor Dr. Mohd Rusli Yacob
Signatura	
Manual Manular	
Name of Member	
of Supervisory	
Committee:	Associate Professor Dr. Ahmad Makmon Abdullah
Signature: Name of Member	
of Supervisory	
Committee	Dr. Mahd Vugoff hir Jahol
Commutee:	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

 	ABSTRA ABSTRA ACKNOV APPROV DECLAR LIST OF LIST OF LIST OF	CT K WLE AL RATI TAB FIG ABB	DGEMENTS ON BLES URES BREVIATIONS	i iii v vi viii xiii xviii xv xvii
(СНАРТЕ	R		
1	I I	NTR	ODUCTION	1
	1	.1	Background of the Study	1
	1	.2	Statement of Research Problem	3
	1	.3	Research Questions	5
	1	.4	Research Objectives	5
			1.4.1 Specific Objectives	5
	1	.5	Putrajaya: Sustainability Issues and Quality of life	6
	1	.6	Significance of the Research	7
			1.6.1 Practical Significance	8
			1.6.2 Theoretical Significance	8
	1	.7	Definition of Terms	9
			1.7.1 Theoretical definitions	9
			1.7.2 Operational definitions	9
	1	8	Scope of the Resaerch and Limitations	10
	1	9	Organisation of the Thesis	10
	1	.10	Chapter Summary	11
2	2 1	ITE	RATURE REVIEW	12
	2	2.1	Happiness: Definition, Philosophy and Measurement	12
			2.1.1 Definition of Happiness	12
			2.1.2 Philosophy of Happiness	13
			2.1.3 Measurement of Happiness	16
	2	2.2	Sustainability, Sustainable Development	18
			2.2.1 Definition of Sustainability	18
			2.2.2 Components of Sustainability: Theoretical Approach	18
	2	2.3	Happiness, Environment and Place	20
			2.3.1 Sustainable Happiness	20
			2.3.2 Environment Health, Human well-being and Happiness	22
			2.3.3 Happiness and Quality of Place	24
	2	2.4	Sustainability Indicators and Assessment	25
			2.4.1 Criteria for Selection of Sustainability Indicators	25
			2.4.2 Delphi Techniques for Selection of Indicators	28
	2	2.5	Index Framework for Sustainability Assessment	30
			2.5.1 Developing an Indicator-Based Composite Index	31

Page

		2.5.2 Multidimensional Indicator and Causal Modelling	34
		2.5.3 Measuring Community Happiness in Urban Context	38
	2.6	Review of Sustainable Development Assessment in Malaysia	38
		2.6.1 Review of Major Empirical Findings of Happiness	41
		Research	
	2.7	Conceptual Community Happiness Index (CH-index)	43
		Framework	
		2.7.1 Proposed dimensions of Community Happiness	45
		Index framework	
	2.8	Summary	48
3	MET	THODOLOGY	49
	3.1	Research Design	49
	3.2	Case Study	51
	3.3	Delphi Survey Data Collection to Select Indicators	51
		3.3.1 Justitification for Delphi Study	51
		3.3.2 Developing Delphi Questionnaire	52
		3.3.3 Pre-test and Pilot Survey	54
		3.3.4 Reliability of Delphi Questionnaire	54
		3.3.5 Delphi Experts Selection Criteria	55
		3.3.6 Experts Sample Population and Techniques	55
		3.3.7 Administration of Delphi Survey	56
		3.3.8 Determining Consensus and Stability	59
	3.4	Analysis of Delphi Survey Data	60
		3.4.1 Analysis to identify relevant indicators of community	60
		Well-being	
		3.4.2 Analysis to identify Key contributing indicators of	61
		Community Well-being	
	3.5	Framework Development and Process	61
		3.5.1 Development of Assessment Framework Model	62
	3.6	Survey Data Collection for Validation and Measure of	68
		Community Happiness	
		3.6.1 Sampling	69
		3.6.2 Case Study Profile : Federal Territory of Putrajaya	71
		3.6.3 Preliminary Data Analysis	74
	3.7	Validation of CH-index Framework Model	76
		3.7.1 Community Happiness Index Scale (Questionnaire)	76
		3.7.2 Pre-testing CH-index Questionnaires and Pilot Study	76
		3.7.3 Psychometric Validation of Framework Model	77
	3.8	Calculation of Community Happiness Index (CH-index)	84
	3.9	Chapter Summary	84
		1 2	-
4	DAT	A ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS	85
	4.1	Delphi Survey Result to Identification Community Well-	85
		being Indicators	
		4.1.1 Expert Respondents Profile	85
		4.1.2 Identification of Relevant Community Well-being	86
		Indicators	

xi

		4.1.3 Identification of Key Community Well-being	90
		Indicators for Measuring Community Happiness	
		Level	
		4.1.4 Key Indicators of Community Well-being	94
	4.2	Development of CH-index Framework Assessment Model	95
		4.2.1 Indicator Weighting, Dimensions and Domains	95
		Aggregation	
		4.2.2 Composite CH-index Construction (Aggregation)	99
	4.3	Validation and Measurement of Community Happiness	99
		Level in Putrajaya City	
		4.3.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Residents	100
		4.3.2 Psychometric Property Evaluation of CH-index Scale	101
		4.3.3 Indicators Measurement Score: Residents satisfaction	114
		of Services	
		4.3.4 Analysis of Dimensions Performance to asses	120
		Putrajaya Sustainability	
		4.3.5 Measure of Community Happiness Index (CH-index)	122
		in Putrajaya	100
	4.4	Chapter Summary	126
5	DOL	ICV IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION	127
3	1 OL 5 1	Overview of the study	127
	5.1	Findings in relation to the Research Objectives	127
	5.2	5.2.1 Objective 1: Identification of environmental social	127
		economic and urban governance. Indicators which	127
		can	
		be use to Measure Level of Community Happiness	
		5.2.2 Objective 2: Development of a valid Assessment	129
		Framework Model of Community Happiness Index	
		based on the identified Indicators.	
		5.2.3 Objective 3: Apply the Assessment Framework	130
		Model to Measure Residents Satisfaction and Level	
		of Community Happiness in Putrajaya	
	5.3	Summary of key findings	134
		5.3.1 Case study findings	134
		5.3.2 Overall findings	135
	5.4	Implication of the Research	136
		5.4.1 Theoretical implications	136
		5.4.2 Methodological Implications	137
		5.4.3 Practical implications	138
	5.5	Limitations and future research direction	139
	5.6	Conclusions	140
RIRIT		рну	147
APPEN	VOINA	S	188
BIOD	ATA O	S F STUDENT	217
LIST (OF PUI	BLICATIONS	218

(C)

LIST OF TABLES

	Table		Page
	2.1	Summary of frameworks developed by agencies and scholars in Malaysia	40
	3.1	Compilation of Potential Sustainable development Indications	53
	3.2	Potential Experts for Delphi Survey	56
	3.3	Stratified Random Sampling of Residents	70
	3.4	Skewness and kurtosis analysis for each variable item	75
	4.1	Demographic characteristics and descriptive statistic of expert panel	86
	4.2	Result of Round 1 Delphi Questionnaire	88
	4.3	Result of Round 2 Delphi Questionnaire	92
	4.4	Overall Kendall's W of Expert's agreement in the Delphi rounds	94
	4.5	Result of Expert ratings of indicator relative importance (Weights)	97
	4.6	The Mean importance ratings of Dimension	98
	4.7	Expert Mean important ratings of Domain variables	99
	4.8	Socio-demographic profile of the urban residents	100
	4.9	Tolerance and VIF value of indicators	104
	4.10	Result of Indicators Significance Test for Social Well-being Construct	107
	4.11	Result of Indicators Significance Test for Economic Well-being Construct	108
	4.12	Result of Indicators Significance Test for Environmental Well- being Construct	109
	4.13	Result of Indicators Significance Test for Urban Governance Construct	110
	4.14	Second-Order Path Coefficient Estimates of the Structural Model	112

4.15	Result of Significance testing of Total effect Estimates of the Structure Model	112
4.16	Third-Order Path Coefficient Estimates of the Structural Model	113
4.17	Significance testing of Total effect estimates of the Third-Order Model	113
4.18	Mean and Standard Deviation of Indicators Ratings for Environmental, Social, Economic and urban Governance	115
4.19	Result of Community Happiness level using the assessment framework	124

G

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.1	Malaysian Urbanization Trend	3
1.2	Malaysian Urbanization Rates (%)	3
2.1	Four Quality of Life	14
2.2	Hierarchical Happiness Model	17
2.3	The Three Dimensional Model of Sustainable Development	19
2.4	The Four interconnected Dimensions of Sustainable Development:Economic, Environment,Social and Governance	20
2.5	The interrelationship between Well-being and Sustainable Development	21
2.6	The Links (cause-and-effect) between Human Well-being and Environment	22
2.7	The Paradoxical balance underlying the Concept of Sustainable Development	23
2.8	Indicator Pyramid showing the relationship among data, indicators, and indices, also their primary user group	32
2.9	Stages of Index Construction	32
2.10	Reflective and Formative Measurement Models	35
2.11	Higher-Order Formative Models	37
2.12	Structure of Community Happiness index(CH-index)	45
2.13	Hierarchical Conceptual Structure of CH-index Model	47
3.1	Research Conceptual Framework	50
3.2	Flow Chart of the Rounds Delphi Survey Process	58
3.3	Framework Development Process	62
3.4	Hierarchical Structural Model of CH-index	65
3.5	The Location of Putrajaya, the Study Area	72

3.6	Putrajaya Landuse Map	73
3.7	Typical Nature of Landscape Environment in Putrajaya City	74
3.8	Hierarchical Constructs of CH-index Model	78
4.1	Subjective Sustainable Development Indicators of Community Well-being	95
4.2	Convergent Validity Assessment of CH-index Scale Measurement Model	102
4.3	Theoretical Model of CH-index Structure	114
4.4	Overall Performance of Key Indicators in the Study Area	116
4.5	Average Performance rating of indicators of Environmental Well-being Dimension	117
4.6	Mean Indicator performance in Social Well-being Dimension	118
4.7	Mean Indicators performance in Urban Governance Dimension	119
4.8	Mean Indicators performance in Economic Well-being Dimension	120
4.9	Perceptions of Community Well-being Dimension Means Score	121
4.10	Sector Rank Performances of Sustainable Well-being Dimension	121
4.11	Overall Level of Urban Sustainability	122
5.1	Community Happiness-index Framework	129
5.2	Overall Performance of indicators, Domains and CH-index	132
5.3	Community Happiness index in Global Context Comparison	133
5.4	Community Happiness index in Malaysia Context	134

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

GNI	Gross National Income
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
UGEC	Urbanisation and Global Environmental Change
UNCSD	United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ORD	Office of Research and Development
USEPA	United State Environmental Protection Agency
CH-index	Community Happiness index
SWB	Subject Well-being
CWB	Community Well-being
MQOLI	Malaysian Quality of Life Index
MYI	Malaysian Youth Index
SUD	Sustainable Urban Development
MURNInet	Malaysian Urban Rural National Indicator network
MWR	Malaysian Well-being Report
WLS	Whole Life Satisfaction
НМ	Happiness Measure
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UN WCED	United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development
WI	Well-being Index
ESI	Environmental Sustainability Index
EFA	Ecological Footprint Assessment

	EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
	SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
	MCA	Multi Criteria Assessment
	CBA	Cost Benefit Analysis
	BM	Biocapacity Measure
	LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
	BREEAM	Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology
	UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
	LCD	Least Developed Countries
	DC	Developed Countries
	OLS	Ordinary Least Square
	SCI	Sustainable City Index
	MUQOL	Malaysian Urban Quality of Life
	HW	Human Well-being
	EW	Eco-environmental Well-being
	SoW	Social Well-being
	EcW	Economic Well-being
	EnW	Environmental Well-being
	UGv	Urban governance
	UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
	CALC	Centre for the Advancement of Language Competence
	AVE	Average Variance Extracted
	VIF	Variance Inflation Factor
	TOL	Tolerance
	PLS	Partial Least Square

SEM	Structural Equation Modeling
PLS-SEM	Partial Least Square - Structural Equation Modeling
LISREL	LInear Structural RELations
AMOS	Analysis Moment of Structure
LV	Latent Variable
IQR	Inter Quartile Range
CV	Coefficient of Variance
BAP	Budget Allocation Process

C

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Creating a place where people want and choose to live is a top agenda in today's globally mobile world (The New ClimateEconomy, 2015). People are now attracted by the quality of life or happiness that cities offer. Everyone wants to be happy in life and to live in a happy society (Changrian, 2010). Human satisfaction is a basic requirement in determine quality of one's life (Jirava et al., 2010). Quality of life takes into account the material standard of living and also the intangible aspects that constitute human life such as leisure, safety, social connectedness, physical health, environmental quality issues, etc.

In the past few decades, sustainability measures have been increasingly used in efforts to conserve natural resources for future generations. Many communities seek to maintain and improve the economic, social, and environmental conditions for present and future generations through such sustainability initiatives (Mascarenhas et al., 2010). Sustainability includes environmental, economic and social conditions (Cloutier et al., 2014). However, Because of the complex relationships between these factors, sustainability has been defined and redefined by many researchers trying to make the concept tangible (Doka et al., 2011).

Sustainability of a community's well-being is a concern for all its citizens (Gourley et al., 2013). Quality of life and well-being are important motivators of local sustainability initiatives and progress toward sustainable development (McCrea et al, 2015). In every community, there are unique conditions that affect the well-being of the people living within the community (Quercia et al., 2012). Sustainability begins with local communities because no matter the size of the community, the underlying social, economic and environmental interactions connect people (Mascarenhas et al., 2010). Happiness offers a new approach that reflect on sustainability issues with opportunities to improve quality of life and contribute to individual, community, and global well-being (Rosly & Rashid, 2014). Bhutan has developed an official happiness index in 1972 and declared that Gross National Happiness (GNH) rather than Gross National Income (GNI) would be the principal benchmark for measuring the nation's progress (Ura et al, 2012). The framework presented at the UN General Assembly resolution A/65/L.86 in 2011 call for "holistic approach to development aimed at promoting sustainable happiness and well-being" (General Assembly of the United Nations, 2011).

Urban development is significant in the context of sustainability (Xing et al., 2009), and holds the key to several challenges faced in interactions with the environment (UGEC, 2008). Presently, urban population accounting for 3.4 billion people of the global population (7 billion), with expected increase of more than 6.25 billion people

to live in cities by 2050 (United Nations, 2013; World & Bank, 2011). Rapid urbanisation underlined the urgency to address multiple sustainable development challenges due to consequences for population distribution and huge challenges for national and local governments such as constrained capacity and finance for delivery of basic urban services, infrastructures, proper planning and governance (World Economic and Social Survey, 2013). Nevertheless, this global urban transition presents significant opportunities, with vast potential for emerging cities to act as powerful and inclusive development tools (Hall & Pfeiffer, 2013).

Cities are the economic driver and powerhouses of the global economy. In 2015, 85% of global GDP was generated in cities (The New ClimateEconomy, 2015). However, economic prosperity has caused an undesirable outcome that creates a negative impact on people living in community and society. In Malaysia, urbanisation and industrial processes have led to the emergence of big towns such as Kuala Lumpur, Shah Alam, Johor Bahru, Malacca and Penang (Choon et al., 2011) with the growing pressure on the living environment such as increase pollutions, congestion, decrease in safety, decline in the well-being of the community. Consequences of which led to the creation of a new town such as Putrajaya to have a healthy urban environment for residents (Hamsa et al., 2015; Moser, 2010). In Putrajaya, the socio-cultural needs of the inhabitants are a top priority. However, quality urban living goes beyond just providing places of work and residence (D. B. Omar, 2006), it also includes essential facilities and amenities for individual fulfilment and community life (John, 2006). Furthermore, public services have not always been effective in improving communities when public policies are created without regard for the local communities needs (Lee et al., 2015). Quality of life in a city has often been linked with the public services and the city environment without consideration to the perceptions of the dwellers that live in the communities (Y. Kim & Lee, 2014), and fundamental in gauging the quality of life (Hamsa et al., 2015).

Sustainability has become the pillar of development and is assuming profound implications for the quality of life and livelihood of local communities (Dahlia Rosly & Rashid., 2014). However, cities sustainability has a broader concept which integrates environmental management, social development, economic development, and urban governance (Hamzah, 2014). This study, therefore, is motivated to measure the level of community happiness based on the perceptions of the residents in Putrajaya a new urban setting, based on sustainable development. The study integrates four sustainability dimensions (social, economic, environmental and governance) and the subjective well-being (SWB) approach which evaluates the residents' perception and satisfaction in an assessment framework to mirror resident living condition in the community based on sustainable development. Such investigation in Putrajaya is new, and the finding from the study will increase the understanding of community well-being and provide vital information for urban planning policy to improve the quality of life holistically for a more sustainable urban community.

1.2 Statement of Research Problem

Urbanisation in Asia is proceeding at a rate much higher than the world average due to rural–urban migration (United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2014). Asian cities remained home to 1.76 billion people (Dahiya, 2012). In Malaysia, at least 62% (16 millions) of people live in towns and cities (Siong, 2008) and over 70% of the populations projected to live in urban areas by the year 2020 (Economic Planning Unit(EPU), 2010). Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2 present the trend and rate of urbanisation in Malaysia. In Malaysia, cities are confronted with social, economic and environmental challenges related with urbanisation such as pollutions, increase mobility; and a decline in quality of living (Choon et al., 2011).



Figure 1.1 : Malaysian Urbanization Trend (Source: Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2013)



Figure 1.2 : Malaysian Urbanization Rates (%) (Source: Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2016)

In Malaysia, urbanisation has caused increase mobility with consequences of traffic congestion. According to (Memon et al., 2016), vehicle ownership, especially the private car, have rapidly increased, 90,046 cars were registered in May 2015 and increased to 99,013 cars in June 2015. According to Road Transport Department of Malaysia, average of 64,516.93 cars are registered per month between 1988 to 2015. Also, the energy demand primary energy consumption has increased by an average of 6.8% and electricity consumption by 9.2% annually (Shafie et al., 2011). The rise in demand for transport services and energy has caused the CO₂ emissions level to increase as well in Malaysia. The transportation sector accounts for 22% of total CO₂ emissions, of which 85% comes from road transport, Electricity generation (46%), manufacturing (19%), and other sectors contributed (13%) of the total CO₂ emissions with annual growth increases of 4.4%, 6.4%, 3.6% and 13.9% in the sector respectively (Mustapa & Bekhet, 2015). The situation threaten the nation's vision to achieve 'developed status' by the year 2020 (Federal Department of Town and Country Planning, 2013). Rapid urbanization has also caused rising cost of living, the urban populace suffers from issues such as unemployment, inadequate public services, income inequality, affordable housing, urban poor, overburdened public amenities, public safety, declined health condition and well-being and other socioeconomic conditions (Rani & Mardiah, 2012; Dahlia Rosly & Rashid., 2014).

Presently, Malaysia is an emerging economy (Dow Jones Indexes, 2011), and a newly industrialised country (Mankiw, 2008). The country has significantly achieved economic growth as well as socio-economic development over the years. Since the independence in 1957, Malaysia Growth Domestic Product (GDP) has annually increased at 6.5% for over the past 50 years (Bakar et al., 2015). The economic growth has placed pressure on the environment and caused negative effects on communities and the need for better living standards (Choon et al., 2011; Dahlia Rosly & Rashid., 2014), by efficiently monitor urban progress through assessment of well-being in existing cities and new urban (Putrajaya) community (Hamsa et al., 2015). Since community which is intimately connected to the quality of life of the people (Kim & Lee, 2014). However, there has been few studies in the Malaysian context compared to developed countries like Canada, United States and United Kingdom where happiness research has gained considerable attention.

Previous research revealed that, overall, urbanisation, economic growth and dearth of public services affect quality of life of the community and threaten sustainability (Dahlia Rosly & Rashid., 2014). Well-being relies on well-functioning communities, strong and stable family relationships, security of personal happiness, lack of violence, and social connectedness (O'Riordan, 2013). Several factors such as public security, education, transportation, health, housing, environment, social participation, culture and entertainment, population influence happiness in urban areas (Hamsa et al., 2015; Hassan et al., 2013). However, the dearth of comprehensive and reliable subjective indicators of well-being for sustainable development in the present national measures of well-being disregard the intangible aspects of well-being (Fakhruddin & Khan, 2011), and consequently disregarded the subjective well-being satisfaction of the citizen (Bakar et al., 2015).

 \bigcirc

Also, studied have highlight lack of suitable items for measuring and defining community well-being in an appropriate operationalization to design an instrument that specifically and directly measures community well-being (McCrea et al., 2015; Morton & Edwards, 2013; Sirgy et al., 2010). In this context, studies on community well-being are desirable to help researchers and policy-makers understand relevant indicators and appropriate applications (Norouzian-Maleki, Bell, Hosseini, & Faizi, 2015). Therefore, Community happiness index framework is proposed to measure the level of subjective well-being of residents in the municipal/city specifically Putrajaya city in Malaysia. Although, the conceptualization would produce community happiness index score which emphasis is important in providing potential assessment between resident happiness and sustainable development in Putrajaya. However, they have rarely (if ever) been translated and assessed.

1.3 Research Questions

This study develop a community happiness index framework to measure residents satisfaction of sustainable development based on subjective well-being context in Putrajaya. In other words, the study develop an indicator-based framework to assess subjective well-bing of resident community based on sustainable development indicators in the city. Three research questions are addressed as follows:

- 1. What factors are important in public service delivery and influence quality of life in Putrajaya?
- 2. How can public service be delivered effectively and efficiently at the municipal level based on existing sustainable development in Putrajaya?
- 3. How to find public service citizens are satisfied with, factors that involve good service delivery, and perceived residents happiness in Putrajaya?

1.4 Research Objectives

The general objective of this study is to develop a community happiness index framework to measure residents satisfaction based on sustainable development indicators in Putrajaya city, from subjective well-being context.

1.4.1 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study are as follows:

- 1. To identified environmental, social, economic and governance indicators which can be used to measure residents level of community happiness.
- 2. To develop a valid assessment framework of community happiness index based on the indicators identified.
- 3. To validate appropriateness of the framework to measure level of community happiness in Putrajaya

1.5 Putrajaya: Sustainability Issues and Quality of life

Putrajaya city is designed and developed as a leading model green city that is increasingly committed to quality of life, and initiatives towards carbon emission reduction from its urban activities (Azmi & Romle, 2015). There are lots of green open spaces and lake to capture airflow and create natural ventilation. Air and noise pollution from vehicular traffic flow and other human activities (e.g. Construction) that cause mental and physical health problems are counter-balanced with the provision of green open spaces with lush vegetation to prevent negative effect of toxic air particle and decrease pathogens (Shahidan et al., 2012). The city provides state of the art facilities that offered the inhabitants with any systematic lifestyle possible for good living. Putrajaya 2025 vision continues the city's aspiration and vision to address the city challenges and continues effort to be a well-managed, vibrant, liveable and successful Federal Government Administrative Centre that fulfils socio-economic, recreational and spiritual needs of the inhabitants, workers and visitors (Azmi & Romle, 2015; Putrajaya Corporation, 2011).

However, despite the emphasis on creating a good community with good values as the overall mission defined to exemplify Putrajaya to other Malaysian cities, little can be said about the overall community well-being or happiness of the inhabitants. As the population of the cities grows, the demand for basic services and infrastructure also increases. The overutilization of the existing infrastructural facilities due to greater demand has made the present living conditions in the cities poor and vulnerable (Ismail et al., 2008). In this context, it is imperative to evaluate the residents' perceptions on the level of dissatisfaction with the living conditions urban environment (Raduwan & Ismail, 2015). The quality of life is a subjective issue and that each respondent may have different views or perceptions concerning subject matter (Marans, 2015; Pacione, 2012). It is of theoretical interest to investigate the connection between the built environment and the satisfaction level of different urban areas (Mulligan et al., 2012).

Currently, the community lacks the social cohesion and sense of place the envisioned plan accorded the city (Azmi & Romle, 2015; Mulligan et al., 2012). Many of its inhabitant's civil servants live outside Putrajaya and commute to work, while others return to their communities on weekends (Ismail et al., 2008). (Azahan et al., 2009) in his study of the quality of life of urban dwellers in intermediate cities in Malaysia, find out that housing, family living and the social security have a significant contribution to the quality of life status. Putrajaya is a new planned city developed based on comprehensive land use policies and guidelines for utilities, infrastructure, housing, transportation system, public amenities, parks and gardens for modern living (Moser, 2010). Hence, it is expected to meet all the basic neighbourhood needs. However, the city is faced with urbanisation and sustainability problems which make it necessary for case study in this study context. The problems are as follows:

1. Despite Putrajaya is planned with residential land use type been the second largest with a total area of 2,888.8 acres (25.5%) (Yuen et al., 2006), there is housing problem. The residential land is divided into 14 precincts with 57,033 housing units at the Periphery, and 10,119 units within the Core area. A total

6

of 52% housing units allocated for Government servants and the remaining 48% or 32,000 units for private sector . However, the numbers of residential units in the core area are quite limited (Rani & Mardiah, 2012; Rani, 2014).

- 2. Putrajaya is conceptualised to provide a contemporary and sustainable transportation system through its long and short term efforts (Putrajaya Corporation, 2011). However, the city is faced with transport problem because the urban rail system has not yet been implemented. This delay has led to increasing dependence on private vehicles thus, causing traffic congestion and lack of parking space for most government offices in the core area of Putrajaya (Rani, 2014).
- 3. Also, the existing public transport system in the city lacks the quality and availability, and it takes longer travelling times (Mustapa & Bekhet, 2015). Putrajaya is a new administrative Federal Capital of Malaysia set to achieve 70% share of all travels by public transport in the city area. However, the current modal split between the public transport and private transport is 15: 85 (Borhan et al., 2014).
- 4. Based on the inception reports, 344.27 hectares of land is reserved for the provision of public services and facilities for Putrajaya residents (Putrajaya Corporation, 2011). These public services and facilities include healthcare, education, religious, safety and security and others. However, the current services and facilities in the city are inadequate and not appropriately distributed (Rani, 2014). For instance, there are provision for five public clinics (healthcare). However, only one presently exist in Precinct 9, the most populated residential area (Rani & Mardiah, 2012).
- 5. Also, the rising rates of the dengue disease were recognised as a major public health issue in Putrajaya (Mulligan et al., 2012).
- 6. Additionally, Omar (2006) study residents quality of life in Putrajaya. The purpose was to find information related to community life in Putrajaya which was specifically planned to deliver good quality of life for the inhabitants. Based on the study outcome, he observed that "there are several planning and implementation issues that need to be reviewed to achieve the planning goals and objectives for better quality of life in Putrajaya". He recommended further research on integration of quality of life dimensions into overall Putrajaya development and other new developments (Omar, 2005).

The aforementioned problems motivated the need to adopt Putrajaya city as an ideal case study in this study context to measure the resident perceived satisfaction based on an evaluation of existing sustainable development services in the city.

1.6 Significance of the Research

An urban environment is a multi-dimensional, diverse, dynamic, complex and evolving, as the essential features for human health and well-being (Corvalan et al., 2005). Understanding community well-being helps decision makers gauge prosperity and progress and can shade light on where sustainable interventions can be made to improve well-being (Gallup-Healthways, 2015). The significance of this study is discussed below based on policy implications.

1.6.1 Practical Significance

The community happiness index framework model may contribute practically by providing fundamental information and guidelines on community happiness to aid local and national policymakers, urban planners, and governance in translating broad goal into actions for urban sustainability and national development (Alberti, 1996).

For urban development, the framework will help local decision makers understand development process and performance of sustainable intervention. The framework would help planners understand the effects on the sustainability of alternative policies and actions, and also help to establish priorities and exclusive proposals to promote sustainability. The framework would help to facilitate effectiveness in assessing the existing developmental policies through proper data analysis and interpretation of results for the purpose systematic monitoring of urban environmental change and assessing current subjective well-being or happiness signal by urban sustainability. Also, framework help to assess current environmental, economic, social and governance trends that reflect sustainability shifts to determine in response the most critical obstacles to sustainability.

At municipal level, the integrated sustainability concept will enhance quality of decision-making and planning. For example, to determine the performance of interventions targeted at improving the quality of life and happiness through practical policy recommendations translated into local planning scheme. The index score will provide general information about the sustainability of urban area, and enable comparison and ranking of performance among communities.

At the societal level, the framework may potentially act as an educational medium to encourage learning process, and increases participation in decision-making among community stakeholders. In this way, it would help the development of new knowledge to stimulate needed changes in the community. Also, communities ranking higher on CH-index value might use it to help showcase the desirability and potential of the residents, businesses, and governments in that urban area. This by implication may help to influence competitive advantage required for the cities to attract the best people, resources, and services which influence potential development opportunities (Donald, 2001). To the government, the framework could serve as a guide for planning and policy system to promote sustainable development and national happiness in Malaysia. Also, the framework model could serve as a reference to develop community happiness index for other communities in the states of Malaysia than the Putrajaya focused in this research.

1.6.2 Theoretical Significance

The study also contributes theoretically to the body of literature by extending the knowledge gap on the link between sustainable development and community happiness in Malaysia in particular Putrajaya. The lacks of relevant local dataset give the restraints thecapacity of the local government to effectively link indicator

instruments with planning and policy-making (Cox et al., 2010). Thus, the study contributes to the advancement of subjective well-being research and initiatives to change development assessment to a satisfactory measure of subjective well-being in Malaysia.

The concern of well-being in the city has become progressively important discourse in Putrajaya and therefore, deserves a study (Calvin, 2010; Hamsa et al., 2015; Omar, 2006). The study is significant because it provides an inclusive framework called Community Happiness index which integrates subjective well-being and sustainability in measuring residents satisfaction of sustainable services and community Happiness. Also, the study helps to build consensus among other studies concerning the quality of life and well-being issues in Putrajaya City.

1.7 **Definition of Terms**

1.7.1 Theoretical definitions

Community happiness. "Satisfaction with the local place of residence taking into account the social and physical environment, and the services and facilities" (Forjaz et al, 2011).

Indicator. "A statistical measure of relevant phenomena that picture current conditions or changes in order to set goals, strategies and solutions" (Heink & Kowarik, 2010).

Domain-based framework. "Framework comprises of sustainability dimensions and identifies indicators for each" (Maclaren, 1996).

Subjective Wellbeing (SWB). "Measure by individual's self-reports in response to appropriate questioning (such as how satisfied they are with their lives)" (Diener et al., 2009).

1.7.2 Operational definitions

Community happiness index. For this study, community happiness is defined as the extent of individual's subjective satisfaction based on their experience of social, economic, environmental and urban governance interventions in their place of living.

Community happiness measure. For this study, community happiness measure is a subjective community well-being with the individual level of satisfaction regarding various aspects of the city.

Sustainable services: For this study, sustainable services referred to public services and facilities delivered to fulfil community well-being.



Community happiness, well-being, or **subjective well-being**. For this study, Community happiness, well-being, or subjective well-being will be interchangeably used.

1.8 Scope of the Resaerch and Limitations

The study developing framework to measure resident perceived satisfaction of wellbeing and level of community happiness based on sustainability services was conducted in Malaysia Federal Territory of Putrajaya. The city is preferred among other towns because of it unique conceptualisation and development as a planned modern city with experience of rapid growth. This study is to determine perceived residents satisfaction of sustainable services and level of community happiness in the city. Thus, sustainability indicators employed in developing the framework model for the study was based on subjective well-being context. Academic expert was engaged in creating indicators. The psychometric validation and application of the framework model are limited to resident community in Putrajaya the case study area. Thus, the interpretability and explanatory strength of the framework model depend on the data availability and quality from the field.

The main limitation of this study was the lack of reliable information on the study area during the indicator selection. Even though the expert opinion provides the key indicators, data was still a major issue due to the unavailability and variance of information on quality of life in the study area. At the Delphi survey stage of the study, a comprehensive list of reviewed indicators was presented to the experts; however, indicators were selected based on the availability of data. Also, the size and nature of the sample, because the study only selects a portion of the whole population in the study area. Financial and time constraints are also another limitations. With financial support and time, the researcher would have had manage the household survey to avoid survey bias by including ethnic variation and income category in the happiness measure in the city, and also could have cover wider range of case studies.

1.9 Organisation of the Thesis

This thesis is organised and structured into five chapters as follows:

Chapter One covers the introductory aspects of the study. This chapter give details of the study background and statement of problem, research questions and research objectives. The chapter also provide information on the research scope and limitations, as well as the definition of key findings.

Chapter Two focuses on the theoretical review of the related studies drawn from related academic literature. It gives the essential discussion on theoretical background on the core aspect of this study: Happiness or subjective well-being and urban sustainability. Each section thoroughly discussed and how the subject is related to this studies. The researcher also critically review previous studies related to community well-being and sustainable urban development.

 \bigcirc

Chapter Three, present discussion on the detail of the methodology used in this study. It provides thorough discussion on the research design, data collection, surveys, and pilot study. Also, it provides clear discussion on data analysis procedures to enable the replication of this study in another further study.

Chapter Four give account of the research findings and analyses. This include the descriptive analysis of the Delphi study to select indicators and determine weightings of the variables. The chapter also provides the psychometric evaluation of the framework model relationships (significance testing) to see if the relationship predict the theoretical construct (community happiness) developed. Also, the main theme of the study residents assessment, i.e. perceptions and satisfaction sustainable services based on the composite indicators were analysed, and community happiness level determine.

Chapter Five discusses the implications of the research findings based on research objectives. This chapter also provides policy implications of the study based on the key findings, limitations of this research and conclusion.

1.10 Chapter Summary

This chapter has introduced the research background, research problem and provide research questions. It also provided the research objectives, research scope, significance, and outlined the thesis structure. The subsequent chapter gives detail review of the salient literature related to the study context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Afacan, Y. (2015). Resident satisfaction for sustainable urban regeneration. In *In Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers–Municipal Engineering* (p. Vol. 168, No. 4, pp. 220–234).
- Afthanorhan, W. M. A. B. W. (2014). Hierarchical component using reflectiveformative measurement model in partial least square structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). *International Journal of Mathematics and Statistics Invention (IJMSI)*, 2(2), 55–71.
- Akins, R. B., Tolson, H., & Cole, B. R. (2005). Stability of response characteristics of a Delphi panel: application of bootstrap data expansion. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 5, 37. http://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-5-37
- Alberti, M. (1996). Measuring urban sustainability. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 16(4–6), 381–424. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255(96)00083-2
- Ally, M. (2010). Usage and preference of traditional and alternative payment methods by online consumers in the Australian marketplace. University of Southern Queensland).
- Amato, P. R., & Zuo, J. (1992). Rural Poverty, Urban Poverty, and Psychological Well-Being. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 33(2), 229–240.
- Amiel, M., Godefroy, P., & Lollivier, S. (2012). Low income city-dwellers accumulate the most difficulties in terms of quality of life. Portrait Social, INSEE Références. France.
- Aminoff, B. Z. (2013). Entropic definition of human happiness and suffering. *Philosophy Study*, 3(7), 609–618. Retrieved from http://www.davidpublishing.org/DownLoad/?id=13874
- Amole, D. (2009). Residential satisfaction in students' housing. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 29(1), 76–85.
- Andelman, R., Board, R., Carman, L., Cummins, R., Ferriss, A., & Friedman, P., ... Veenhoven, R. (1998). Quality of life definition and terminology: A discussion document from International Society of quality of life studies(Monograph). *International Society of Quality of Life Studies*.
- Anderson, L. (2013). Measuring Sustainable Cities : An approach for assessing indicator systems in Sweden Measuring Sustainable Cities : An approach for assessing municipal-level sustainability indicator systems in Sweden Measuring Sustainable Cities : An approach for assessi.

- Andreev, P., Heart, T., Maoz, H., & Pliskin, N. (2009). Validating Formative Partial Least Squares (PLS) Models: Methodological Review and Empirical Illustration. In *International Conference on Information Systems* (pp. 1–17).
- Ariffini, S. B. (2003). Putrajaya, Malaysia. *Australian Planner*, 40(3), 40–42.
- Astrachan, C. B., Patel, V. K., & Wanzenried, G. (2014). A comparative study of CB-SEM and PLS-SEM for theory development in family firm research. *Journal* of *Family Business Strategy*, 5(1), 116–128. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2013.12.002
- Atkinson, G., Dietz, S., Neumayer, E., & Agarwala, M. (2014). Handbook of sustainable development ((Eds.)). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Atkisson, A. (1996). Developing Indicators of Sustainable Community : Lessons from FROM S ustainable Seattle, 0(96), 337–350.
- Attieh, R., Gagnon, M.-P., Estabrooks, C. A., Legare, F., Ouimet, M., Vazquez, P., & Nuno, R. (2014). Organizational readiness for knowledge translation in chronic care: a Delphi study. *BMC Health Services Research*, 14(1), 534. http://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-014-0534-0
- Attwood, H. E. (2013). The influence of quality-of-life research on quality-of-life: CLIQ case studies from KwaZulu-Natal, south Africa. In *In Community quality-of-life indicators: Best cases VI* ((pp. 1–18). Springer Netherlands.
- Avery, A. J., Savelyich, B. S. P., Sheikh, A., Cantrill, J., Morris, C. J., Fernando, B., Teasdale, S. (2005). Identifying and establishing consensus on the most important safety features of GP computer systems: e-Delphi study. *Informatics* in Primary Care, 13, 3–11.
- Azahan, A., Jamaluddin, M. J., Lukman, Z. M., Kadaruddin, A., & Kadir, A. (2009).
 The Quality of Life in Malaysia's Intermediate City: Urban Dwellers Perspective. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(1), 61–167.
- Azevedo, S. G., Govindan, K., Carvalho, H., & Cruz-Machado, V. (2012). An integrated model to assess the leanness and agility of the automotive industry. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, *66*, 85–94.
- Azevedo, S. G., Govindan, K., Carvalho, H., & Cruz-Machado, V. (2013). Ecosilient Index to assess the greenness and resilience of the upstream automotive supply chain. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *56*, 131–146.
- Bailie, J. (2011). Effective online instructional competencies as perceived by online university faculty and students: A sequel study. *Journal of Online Learning* and *Teaching*, 7(1), 82–89. Retrieved from http://jolt.merlot.org/vol7no1/bailie_0311.htm
- Bakar, A. A., Osman, M. M., Bachok, S., Ibrahim, M., & Mohamed, M. Z. (2015). Modelling Economic Wellbeing and Social Wellbeing for Sustainability: A Theoretical Concept. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, 28, 286–296. http://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.proenv.2015.07.037
- Baker, J., Lovell, K., & Harris, N. (2006). How expert are the experts? An exploration of the concept of 'expert' within Delphi panel techniques. *Nurse Researcher*. http://doi.org/10.7748/nr2006.10.14.1.59.c6010
- Baker, T. L. (1994). Doing Social Research (2nd Edn..). New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Bakhtiar, B., & Ibrahim, R. (2012). Identifying affordable quality housing components for developing a smart growth model. ALAM CIPTA,. *International Journal of Sustainable Tropical Design Research and Practice*, 2(1).
- Bakhtyar, B., Zaharim, a, Sopian, K., Saadatian, O., & Abdulateef, J. (2012).
 Affordable Quality Housing for Urban Low Income Earners in Malaysia. 8th WSEAS/IASME International Conference on ENERGY and Environment Technologies and Equipment (EEETE'12), 60–73. http://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2184629
- Balasubramanian, R., & Agarwal, D. (2012). Delphi Technique- A Review. International Journal of Public Health Dentistry, 3, 16–25. Retrieved from http://journalgateway.com/ijphd/article/view/444
- Ballas, D. (2013). What makes a 'happy city'? *Cities*, 32, S39–S50. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2013.04.009
- Bartlett, J. E., Kotrlik, J. W., & Higgins, C. C. (2001). Organizational Research: Determining Appropriate Sample Size in Survey Research. Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal, 19(1), 43–50. http://doi.org/10.1109/LPT.2009.2020494
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544–559.
- Beck, A. T. (1967). *Depression: Clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Becker, J. M., Klein, K., & Wetzels, M. (2012). Hierarchical Latent Variable Models in PLS-SEM: Guidelines for Using Reflective-Formative Type Models. *Long Range Planning*, 45(5–6), 359–394. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2012.10.001
- Beilin, R., & Hunter, A. (2011). Co-constructing the sustainable city: how indicators help us 'grow' more than just food in community gardens. *Local Environment*, *16*(6), 523–538.

- Bell, S., & Morse, S. (2013). Towards an understanding of how policy making groups use indicators. *Ecological Indicators*, 35(0), 13–23. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.12.023
- Berry, B. J. L., & Okulicz-Kozaryn, A. (2011). An Urban-Rural Happiness Gradient. Urban Geography, 32(6), 871–883. http://doi.org/10.2747/0272-3638.32.6.871
- Birkeland, J. (2009). Eco-retrofitting from managerialism to design. The Proceedings of Global Forum 2009 - Business as an Agent of World Benefit, (June), 2–5. Retrieved from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/29052/1/29052.pdf
- Boarini, R., Johansson, Å., & d'Ercole, M. M. (2006). Alternative measures of wellbeing.
- Böhringer, C., & Jochem, P. E. P. (2007). Measuring the immeasurable A survey of sustainability indices. *Ecological Economics*, 63(1), 1–8. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.03.008
- Bolger, F., & Wright, G. (2011). Improving the Delphi process: Lessons from social psychological research. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 78, 1500–1513. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2011.07.007
- Bollen, A. K. (2011). Evaluating Effect, Composite, and Causal Indicators in Structural Equation Models. *MIS Quarterly*, *35*(2), 350–372.
- Bollen, K. a, & Bauldry, S. (2011). Three Cs in measurement models: Causal indicators, composite indicators, and covariates. *Psychological Methods*, 16(3), 265–284. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0024448
- Bonini, A. N. (2008). Cross-national variation in individual life satisfaction: Effects of national wealth, human development, and environmental conditions. *Social Indicators Research*, 87, 223–236. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9167-6
- Boone, H. N., & Boone, D. A. (2012). Analyzing likert data. Journal of Extension, 50(2), 1–5.
- Borhan, M. N., Syamsunur, D., Mohd Akhir, N., Mat Yazid, M. R., Ismail, A., & Rahmat, R. A. (2014). Predicting the use of public transportation: a case study from Putrajaya, Malaysia. *The Scientific World Journal*, 9. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/784145
- Boulanger, P.-M. (2008). Sustainable development indicators: a scientific challenge, a democratic issue. *Surveys and Perspectives Integrating Environment and Society*, 1(1), 59–73. http://doi.org/10.5194/sapiens-1-59-2008
- Boulkedid, R., Abdoul, H., Loustau, M., Sibony, O., & Alberti, C. (2011). Using and reporting the Delphi method for selecting healthcare quality indicators: a systematic review. *PLoS One*, 6(6), e20476. http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0020476

- Bourgeois, J., Pugmire, L., Stevenson, K., Swanson, N., & Swanson, B. (2006). (2006). The Delphi Method: A qualitative means to a better. Retrieved from url: http://www. freequality. org/documents/knowledge/Delphimethod. pdf (Citirano 2. 11. 2011).
- Brambilla, M., Michelangeli, A., & Peluso, E. (2013). Equity in the City: On Measuring Urban (Ine)quality of Life. Urban Studies, 50, 3205–3224. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/10.1177/00420 98013484539
- Brehm, J.M., Eisenhauer, B.W., & Stedman, R. C. (2013). Environmental concern: Examining the role of place meaning and place attachment. *Society and Natural Resources*, 26(5), 522–538. http://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2012.715726
- Brereton, F., Clinch, J. P., & Ferreira, S. (2008). Happiness, geography and the environment. *Ecological Economics*, 65(2), 386–396. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.07.008
- Bryman, A., & Cramer, D. (2001). *Quantitative Data Analysis with SPSS Release 10* for Windows. Analysis (Vol. 1st editio). http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203471548
- Bunting, S. W. (2010). Assessing the stakeholder Delphi for facilitating interactive participation and consensus building for sustainable aquaculture development. *Society & Natural Resources: An International Journal*, 23(8), 758–775. http://doi.org/10.1080/08941920802178180
- Butler, J., & Kern, M. L. (2013). The PERMA-Profiler: A brief multidimensional measure of flourishing. International Positive Psychology Association.
- Cabello Eras, J. J., Covas Varela, D., Hernández Pérez, G. D., Sagastume Gutiérrez, A., García Lorenzo, D., Vandecasteele, C., & Hens, L. (2014). Comparative study of the urban quality of life in Cuban first-level cities from an objective dimension. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 16(1), 195–215. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-013-9470-0
- Calvin, C. E. (2010). *Planning Citizens: Putrajaya and the 21st Century Malaysian*. University Of Chicago.
- Campbell, S. M., & Cantrill, J. A. (2001). Consensus methods in prescribing research. Journal of Clinical Pharmacy and Therapeutics, 26(1), 5–14.
- Campbell, L., & Wiesen, A. (2011). *Restorative Commons: Creating Health and Well-Being Through Urban Landscapes*.
- Carmona, M., & Sieh, L. (2008). Performance measurement in planning Towards a holistic view. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 26(2), 428–454. http://doi.org/10.1068/c62m

- Carretero-Dios, H., & Pérez, C. (2007). Standards for the development and review of instrumental studies: Considerations about test selection in psychological research. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 7(3), 863– 882.
- Catalina Turcu. (2013). Re-thinking sustainability indicators: local perspectives of urban sustainability. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 56(5), 695–719. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2012.698984
- Cattano, C. (2013). Development of a Rating System to Measure the Vulnerability of Residential Homes to Natural Hazards.
- Cavric, B. I. (2011). Integrating tourism into sustainable urban development: Indicators from a Croatian coastal community. In *In Community Quality-of-Life Indicators: Best Cases V* (pp. 219–265). Netherland: Springer.
- Cenfetelli, R. T., & Basselier, G. (2009). Interpretation of formative measurement in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*, *33*(4), 689–707.
- Chambers, N., Simmons, C., & Wackernagel, M. (2014). Sharing nature's interest: ecological footprints as an indicator of sustainability. Routledge.
- Changrian, C. (2010). Happiness and its influencing factors among household heads in urban and rural areas of Thailand. Retrieved from http://repository.nida.ac.th/handle/662723737/807
- Chava, S., Stefanescu, C., & Turnbull, S. (2011). Modeling the Loss Distribution. *Management* Science, 57(7), 1267–1287. http://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1110.1345
- Chin, W. W. (1998). Commentary: Issues and Opinion on Structural Equation Modeling. *MIS Quarterly*, 22(1), 1. http://doi.org/Editorial
- Chmiel, M., Brunner, M., Martin, R., & Schalke, D. (2012). Revisiting the structure of subjective well-being in middle-aged adults. *Social Indicators Research*, *106*(1), 109–116. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9796-7
- Choguill, C. L. (2008). Developing sustainable neighbourhoods. *Habitat International*, 32(1), 41–48. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2007.06.007
- Choon, S.-W., Siwar, C., Pereira, J. J., Jemain, A. A., Hashim, H. S., & Hadi, A. S. (2011). A sustainable city index for Malaysia. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 18(1), 28–35. http://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2011.543012
- Christakopoulou, S., Dawson, J., & Gari, A. (2001). The community well-being questionnaire: Theoretical context and initial assessment of its reliability and validity. *Social Indicators Research*, *56*(3), 321–351.

- Clibbens, N., Walters, S., & Baird, W. (2012). Delphi research: Issues raised by a pilot study. *Nurse Researcher*, 19, 37–43. http://doi.org/10.7748/cnp.v1.i7.pg21
- Cloutier, S., Jambeck, J., & Scott, N. (2014a). The Sustainable Neighborhoods for Happiness Index (SNHI): A metric for assessing a community's sustainability and potential influence on happiness. *Ecological Indicators*, 40, 147–152. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.01.012
- Cloutier, S., Jambeck, J., & Scott, N. (2014b). The Sustainable Neighborhoods for Happiness Index (SNHI): A metric for assessing a community's sustainability and potential influence on happiness. *Ecological Indicators*, 40, 147–152. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.01.012
- COCHRAN, W. G. (1977). The estimation of sample size. Cochran, WG Sampling techniques, *3*, 72–90.
- Cohen, J. (1975). Partialed products are interactions; partialed powers are curve components. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85(4), 858.
- Colantonio, A., & Dixon, T. (2011). Urban Regeneration & Social Sustainability: Best Practice from European Cities. Urban Regeneration & Social Sustainability: Best Practice from European Cities. http://doi.org/10.1002/9781444329445
- Cole, Z. D., Donohoe, H. M., & Stellefson, M. L. (2013). Internet-based Delphi research: Case based discussion. *Environmental Management*, 51(3), 511–523. http://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-012-0005-5
- Coltman, T., Devinney, T. M., Midgley, D. F., & Venaik, S. (2008). Formative versus reflective measurement models: Two applications of formative measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(12), 1250–1262. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.013
- Community Indicators Victoria. (2013). Retrieved 10 June 2014, from http://www.communityindicators.net.au/.
- Conroy, K. M., Elliott, D., & Burrell, A. R. (2013). Developing content for a processof-care checklist for use in intensive care units: a dual-method approach to establishing construct validity. *BMC Health Services Research*, *13*(1), 380.
- Conway, S., Aguero, J., & Navis, I. L. (2009). The Clark County Monitoring System– An Early Warning Indicator System for Clark County, Nevada. In *in Community Quality-of-Life Indicators: Best Cases III* (p. I 41-77). Netherlands.: Springer.
- Cook, D., & Te Linde, J. (2010). The Indices of Community Well-Being for Calgary Community Districts: A Neighborhood-Based Approach to Quality of Life Reporting. In *In Community Quality-of-Life Indicators: Best Cases III* (p. 165– 179.). Netherlands.: Springer.

- Corvalan, C., Hales, S., & McMichael, A. J. (2005). *Ecosystems and human well*being: health synthesis. World health organization.
- Costanza, R. (2014). A theory of socio-ecological system change. Journal of Bioeconomics, 16, 39–44. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10818-013-9165-5
- Cox, D., Frere, M., West, S., & Wiseman, J. (2010). Developing and using local community wellbeing indicators: Learning from the experience of Community Indicators Victoria. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 45, 71–88.
- Cramer, C. K., Klasser, G. D., Epstein, J. B., & Sheps, S. B. (2008). The Delphi process in dental research. *The Journal of Evidence-Based Dental Practice*, 8(4), 211–20. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebdp.2008.09.002
- Creswell, B. J. W., Piano, V. L., & Published, C. (2007). Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 31(4), 388–388. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-6405.2007.00096.x
- Creswell, J., Klassen, L., & Clark, V. (2011). Best practices for mixed methods research in the health sciences. *Sciences Research*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crivello, G., Camfield, L., & Woodhead, M. (2009). How can children tell us about their wellbeing? Exploring the potential of participatory research approaches within young lives. *Social Indicators Research*, 90(1), 51–72. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-008-9312-x
- Croft, A. G., & Lawson, R. (2008). Applying the international wellbeing index to investigate subjective wellbeing of New Zealanders with European and with Maori heritage. *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, 3(May 2014), 57–72. http://doi.org/10.1080/1177083X.2008.9522432
- Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *11*(1), 100.
- Cummins, R. a. (2010). Fluency disorders and life quality: Subjective wellbeing vs. health-related quality of life. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, *35*(3), 161–172. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2010.05.009
- Cummins, R. A., Eckersley, R., Pallant, J., Van Vugt, J., & Misajon, R. (2003). Developing a national index of subjective wellbeing: The Australian Unity Wellbeing Index. *Social Indicators Research*, 64(2), 159–190.

- Cummins, R. A., & Lau, A. L. D. (2005). *Personal wellbeing index, 2006:* (3rd ed.). Published by the Australian Centre on Quality of Life, School of Psychology, Deakin University.
- Cummins, R. A., Mellor, D., Stokes, M. A., & Lau, A. L. D. (2010). Measures of subjective well-being. In E. Mpofu & T. Oakland (Eds.), Rehabilitation and health assessment: Applying ICF guidelines. New York, NY: Springer.
- Cummins, R. A., Woerner, J., Hartley-Clark, L., Perera, C., Gibson-Prosser, A., Collard, J., & Horfiniak, K. (2011). Australian Unity Wellbeing Index Survey 25.0. Part A: The report. The Wellbeing of Australians—Relationships and the Internet.
- Czinkota, M. R., & Ronkainen, I. a. (2005). A forecast of globalization, international business and trade: Report from a Delphi study. *Journal of World Business*, 40(2), 111–123. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.02.006
- D'Acci, L. (2014). Monetary, Subjective and Quantitative Approaches to Assess Urban Quality of Life and Pleasantness in Cities (Hedonic Price, Willingnessto-Pay, Positional Value, Life Satisfaction, Isobenefit Lines). *Social Indicators Research*, 115(2), 531–559.
- Dahiya, B. (2012). Cities in Asia, 2012: Demographics, economics, poverty, environment and governance. *Cities*, 29(SUPPL.2), S44–S61. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2012.06.013
- Dawson, M. D., & Brucker, P. S. (2001). The utility of the Delphi method in MFT research. *American Journal of Family*, 29(2), 125–140.
- de Araújo, G. C., Pimenta, H. C. D., Reis, L. M. M., & Campos, L. M. D. S. (2013). Diagnosis of Sustainability in the Brazilian City of Touros: An Application of the Barometer of Sustainability. *HOLOS*, 2, 161–177.
- De Clercq, B., De Fruyt, F., De Bolle, M., Van Hiel, A., Markon, K. E., & Krueger, R. F. (2014). The hierarchical structure and construct validity of the PID-5 trait measure in adolescence. *Journal of Personality*, 82(2), 158–169. http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12042
- De Vet, E., Brug, J., De Nooijer, J., Dijkstra, A., & De Vries, N. (2005). Determinants of forward stage transitions: A Delphi study. *Health Education Research*, 20(2), 195–205. http://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyg111
- de Villiers, M. R., de Villiers, P. J. T., & Kent, A. P. (2005). The Delphi technique in health sciences education research. *Medical Teacher*, 27(7), 639–643. http://doi.org/10.1080/13611260500069947
- Decoster, J., & Hall, G. P. (2005). Scale Construction Notes. *Construction*, 9(2), 177–204. http://doi.org/10.1300/J027v09n02_12

- Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H., & Gustafson, D. H. (1979). *Group techniques for* program planning: A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Delle Fave, A., Brdar, I., Freire, T., Vella-Brodrick, D., & Wissing, M. P. (2011). The Eudaimonic and Hedonic Components of Happiness: Qualitative and Quantitative Findings. *Social Indicators Research*, 100(2), 185–207. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9632-5
- Diamantopoulos, A. (2011). Incorporating Formative Measures Into Covariance-Bases Structural Equation Models. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(2), 335–358.
- Diamantopoulos, A., Riefler, P., & Roth, K. P. (2008). Adavancing formative measurement models. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(12), 1203–1218. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.009
- Diamantopoulos, A., & Siguaw, J. a. (2006a). Formative versus reflective indicators in organizational measure development: A comparison and empirical illustration. *British Journal of Management*, 17(4), 263–282. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00500.x
- Diamantopoulos, A., & Siguaw, J. a. (2006b). Formative versus reflective indicators in organizational measure development: A comparison and empirical illustration. *British Journal of Management*, 17(4), 263–282. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00500.x
- Diamantopoulos, A., & Winklhofer, H. M. (2001). Index Construction with Formative Indicators: An Alternative to Scale Development. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2), 269–277. http://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.2.269.18845
- Diener, E., Lucas, R., Schimmack, U., & Helliwell, I. (2009). Well-being for public policy. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Diener, E., & Chan, M. Y. (2011). Happy People Live Longer: Subjective Well-Being Contributes to Health and Longevity. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 3(1), 1–43. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2010.01045.x
- Diener, E. D., & Suh, E. (1997). Measuring quality of life: economic, social, and subjective indicators. *Social Indicators Research*, 40(1/2), 189–216. http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006859511756
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. a, Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *J Pers Assess*. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. (2009). Subjective Well-Being: The Science of Happiness and Life Satisfaction. In *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 63–73). http://doi.org/0.1093/oxfordhb/9780195187243.013.0017

- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2015). National accounts of subjective wellbeing. *American Psychologist*, 70(3), 234–242. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0038899
- Dietz, T., & Jorgenson, A. K. (2014). Towards a new view of sustainable development: human well-being and environmental stress. *Environmental Research Letters*, 9(3), 31001. http://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/3/031001
- Dietz, T., Rosa, E. a, & York, R. (2009). Environmentally Efficient Well-Being : Rethinking Sustainability as the Relationship between Human Well-being and Environmental Impacts. *Human Ecology Review*, *16*(1), 114–123.
- Dijken, K., Grisel, M., & Hafkamp, W. (2008). Levers of public action for the development of sustainable cities. NICIS.
- Dizdaroglu, D. (2013). A micro-level indexing model for the assessment of sustainable urban ecosystems. Queensland University of Technology. Retrieved from eprints.qut.edu.au
- Dobbie, M. J., & Dail, D. (2013). Robustness and sensitivity of weighting and aggregation in constructing composite indices. *Ecological Indicators*, 29, 270–277. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.12.025
- Doka, J. B., Mcnamara, E., Robinson, J., & Chung, M. (2011). The ! Greater ! Peterborough ! Area ! Community ! Vitality ! Indicator ! Project !!, (April).
- Dolan, P., & Metcalfe, R. (2012). Measuring Subjective Wellbeing: Recommendations on Measures for use by National Governments. *Journal of Social Policy*, 41(2), 409–427. http://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279411000833
- Donald, B. (2001). Economic competitiveness and quality of life in city regions: Compatible concepts? *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 10(2), 259–274. http://doi.org/Abstract
- Donohoe, H. M. (2011). Defining culturally sensitive ecotourism: a Delphi consensus. *Current Issues in Tourism*. http://doi.org/10.1080/13683500903440689
- Donohoe, H. M. (2011). Defining culturally sensitive ecotourism: A Delphi consensus. *Current Issues in Tourism, 14*(1), 27–45. http://doi.org/10.1080/13683500903440689
- Douglas, I. (2012). Urban ecology and urban ecosystems: Understanding the links to human health and well-being. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2012.07.005
- Dow Jones Indexes. (2011). Country Classification System. Retrieved 15 January 2014, from http://www.djindexes.com/mdsidx/downloads/brochure_info/Dow_Jones_In dexes_Country_Classification_System.pdf

- Duncan, G. (2010). Should happiness-maximization be the goal of Government? In *Journal of Happiness Studies* (Vol. 11, pp. 163–178). Springer. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-008-9129-y
- Easterlin, R. A., Angelescu, L., & Zweig, J. S. (2011). The impact of modern economic growth on urban-rural differences in subjective well-being. *World Development*, 39(12), 2187–2198. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2011.04.015
- Economic Planning Unit(EPU). (2010). *Tenth Malaysia Plan 2011-2015*. Putrajaya: The Economic Planning Unit Prime Minister's Department. http://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-375089-1.10004-2.
- Economist Intelligence Unit. (2005). 'The Economist Intelligence Unit's quality-oflife index.", 17, 245–77.
- Edwards, J. R. (2001). Multidimensional Constructs in Organizational Behavior Research: An Integrative Analytical Framework. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(2), 144–192. http://doi.org/10.1177/109442810142004
- Efron, B., & Tibshirani, R. J. (1993). An Introduction to the Bootstrap. *Refrigeration* And Air Conditioning, 57(57), 436. http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9639.00050
- Eibich, P., Krekel, C., Demuth, I., & Wagner, G. G. (2016). Associations between Neighborhood Characteristics, Well-Being and Health Vary over the Life Course. *Gerontology*. http://doi.org/10.1159/000438700
- Ekins, P. (2014). Strong sustainability and critical natural capital. In *Handbook of* Sustainable Development (pp. 55–71).
- El Hedhli, K., Chebat, J.-C., & Sirgy, M. J. (2013). Shopping well-being at the mall: Construct, antecedents, and consequences. *Scientific Advancements in Consumer-Retailer Relationships Internationalization of Marketing Communication and Consumer Research*, 66(7), 856–863. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.06.011
- Emerson, J. W., Hsu, A., Levy, M. ., de Sherbinin, A., Mara, V., Esty, D. ., & Jaiteh.,
 M. (2012). Environmental performance index and pilot trend environmental performance index. New Haven: Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy. Retrieved from www.epi.yale.edu
- Epley, D. R., & Menon, M. (2008). A method of assembling cross-sectional indicators into a community quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 88(2), 281–296.
- Ernstson, H., Sörlin, S., & Elmqvist, T. (2009). Social Movements and Ecosystem Services — the Role of Social Network Structure in Protecting and Managing Urban Green Areas in Stockholm. *Ecology And Society*, *13*(2), 39. http://doi.org/10.1002/pad

- Eurostat. (2015). Eurostat regional yearbook. Publications Office of the European Union, Georgia Anargyrou-Hahn. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu
- Fakhruddin, S. A., & Khan, M. F. (2011). Quality of Urban Environment: Some Theoretical and Methodological Considerations. *National Geographical Journal of India*, 54(4), 73–82.
- Fan, X., & Sivo, S. A. (2005). Sensitivity of Fit Indexes to Misspecified Structural or Measurement Model Components: Rationale of Two-Index Strategy Revisited. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 12(3), 343–367. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1203 1
- Feagan, B. G., Lemann, M., Befrits, R., Connell, W., D'Haens, G., Ghosh, S., ... Rutgeerts, P. (2012). Recommendations for the treatment of Crohn's disease with tumor necrosis factor antagonists: an expert consensus report. *Inflamm Bowel Dis*, 18(1), 152–160. http://doi.org/10.1002/ibd.21870
- Federal Department of Town and Country Planning, P. M. (2013). Planning for susutainable future cities. *Malaysia Town Plan*, 10(1).
- Federal Department of Town and Country Planning Peninsular Malaysia. (2014). Malaysia Urban Sustainability Report.
- Feldman, F. (2008). Whole Life Satisfaction Concepts of Happiness.pdf.pdf. *Theoria*, 74(3), 219–238.
- Feldman, F. (2010). What is this thing called happiness?. Oxford University Press.
- Felix, R., & Garcia-Vega, J. (2012). Quality of Life in Mexico: A Formative Measurement Approach. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 7(3), 223–238. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-011-9164-4
- Ferreira, S., & Moro, M. (2010). On the use of subjective well-being data for environmental valuation. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 46(3), 249–273.
- Fiksel, J., & Frederickson, H. (2012). A Framework for Sustainability Indicators at EPA A Framework for Sustainability Indicators at EPA Authors, 59. Retrieved from http://www.epa.gov/sustainability/docs/framework-for-sustainability-indicators-at-epa.pdf
- Finn, A., & Wang, L. (2014). Formative vs. reflective measures: Facets of variation. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(1), 2821–2826. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.08.001
- Fiorino, D. J. (1990). Citizen Participation and Environmental Risk: A Survey of Institutional Mechanisms. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 15(2), 226– 243. http://doi.org/10.1177/016224399001500204

- Fiorino, D. J. (2014). 21. Sustainable cities and governance: what are the connections? In Elgar Companion to Sustainable Cities: Strategies, Methods and Outlook (p. 413.). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Fischer, J. (2009). Subjective Well-Being as Welfare Measure: Concepts and Methodology. Online. Retrieved from http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/16619/
- Fischer, J., Dyball, R., Fazey, I., Gross, C., Dovers, S., Ehrlich, P. R., ... Borden, R. J. (2012). Human behavior and sustainability. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 10(3), 153–160. http://doi.org/10.1890/110079
- Florida, R. (2002). The Rise of the Creative Class. *Washington Monthly*. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2006.00398.x
- Florida, R. (2008). Who is your city. How the creative economy is making where to live the most important decision of your life. New York.: A member of the perseus books group,.
- Florida, R., Mellander, C., & Stolarick, K. (2008). Inside the black box of regional development - Human capital, the creative class and tolerance. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 8(5), 615–649. http://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbn023
- Florida, R., Rentfrow, P., Sheldon, K. M., Kashdan, T. B., & Steger, M. F. (2011). Place and well-being. *Designing Positive Psychology: Taking Stock and Moving Forward*, 385–395.
- Foa, R., & Tanner, J. C. (2007). Methodology of the Indices of Social Development. *Human Development*, 1–66.
- Fordyce, M. W. (1988). A review of research on the happiness measures: A sixty second index of happiness and mental health. *Social Indicators Research*, 20(4), 355–381. http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00302333
- Forgeard, M. J. Jayawickreme, E., Kern, M. L., & Seligman, M. E. (2011). Doing the right thing: Measuring wellbeing for public policy. *Nternational Journal of Wellbeing*, 1(1).
- Forjaz, M. J., Prieto-Flores, M. E., Ayala, A., Rodriguez-Blazquez, C., Fernandez-Mayoralas, G., Rojo-Perez, F., & Martinez-Martin, P. (2011). Measurement properties of the Community Wellbeing Index in older adults. *Quality of Life Research*, 20(5), 733–743.
- Forjaz, M. J., Prieto-Flores, M. E., Ayala, A., Rodriguez-Blazquez, C., Fernandez-Mayoralas, G., Rojo-Perez, F., & Martinez-Martin, P. (2011). Measurement properties of the Community Wellbeing Index in older adults. *Quality of Life Research*, 20, 733–743. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-010-9794-2
- Fosso Wamba, S., & Ngai, E. W. T. (2013). Importance of issues related to RFIDenabled healthcare transformation projects: results from a Delphi study. *Production Planning & Control*, (ahead-of-print), 1–15.

- Fraser, E. D., Dougill, A. J., Mabee, W. E., Reed, M., & McAlpine, P. (2006). Bottom up and top down: Analysis of participatory processes for sustainability indicator identification as a pathway to community empowerment and sustainable environmental management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 78(2), 114–127.
- Friend, J. G. (2001). A Delphi study to identify the essential tasks and functions for ADA coordinators in public higher education. *Digital Abstracts International*, 62(4), 1339.
- Fujiwara, D. (2013). A general method for valuing non-market goods using wellbeing data: three-stage wellbeing valuation.
- Furchtgott-Roth, D. (2012). The elusive and expensive green job. *Energy Economics*, 34, S43–S52.
- Gahin, R., Veleva, V., & Hart, M. (2003). Do indicators help create sustainable communities? *Local Environment*, 8(6), 661–666.
- Galinha, I. C., & Pais-Ribeiro, J. L. (2011). Cognitive, affective and contextual predictors of subjective wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 2(1), 34–53. http://doi.org/doi:10.5502/ijw.v2i1.3
- Gallopin, G. C. (1997). Indicators and their use: information for decision-making. scope-scientific committee on problems of the environment. *International Council of Scientific Unions*, 58, 13–27.
- Gallup-Healthways. (2015). State of American Well-being:2015 Community Well-Being Rankings and Access to Care. Retrieved from http://www.wellbeingindex.com/2015-community-rankings
- Gallup-Healthways Global Well-Being Index. (2014). State of the Global Wellbeing:2014 Country Well-Being Rankings. Retrieved from http://www.wellbeingindex.com/2014-global-report
- Garrod, B. (2012). Applying the Delphi method in an ecotourism context: a response to Deng et al.'s 'Development of a point evaluation system for ecotourism destinations: a Delphi method'. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 11(3), 219–223.
- Garson, G. D. (2009). Path analysis. from Statnotes: Topics in multivariate analysis. *Retrieved*, 9(5).
- Garson, G. D. (2014). *The Delphi method in quantitative research. Asheboro, NC:* Statistical Associates Publishers.
- Gasparatos, A. (2010). Embedded value systems in sustainability assessment tools and their implications. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *91*, 1613–1622. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2010.03.014

- Gefen, D., Rigdon, E. E., & Straub, D. (2011). An Update and Extension to SEM Guidelines for Administrative and Social Science Research. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(2), iii-A7.
- General Assembly of the United Nations. (2011). Happiness: towards a holistic approach to development. A/67/697.Sixty-Seventh Session Agenda Item 14 Integrated and Coordinated Implementation of and Follow-up to the Outcomes of the Major United Nations Conferences and Summits in the Economic, Social and Related Fields.
- Gertner, J. (2010, May 16). The Rise and Fall of the G.D.P. New York Times,.
- Giannarou, L., & Efthimios, Z. (2014). Using Delphi technique to build consensus in practice. *Int. Journal of Business Science and Applied Management*, 9(2).
- Giannetti, B. F., Almeida, C. M. V. B., & Bonilla, S. H. (2010). Comparing emergy accounting with well-known sustainability metrics: The case of Southern Cone Common Market, Mercosur. *Energy Policy*, 38(7), 3518–3526. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.02.027
- Giovanna Boccuzzo, & Mario Fordellone. (2015). Comments about the use of PLS path modeling in building a Job Quality Composite Indicator (No. Working Paper Series, N. 2, June 2015).
- Giovannini, E., Hall, J., Morrone, A., & Ranuzzi, G. (2011). A Framework to Measure the Progress of Societies. *Revue d'Economie Politique*, 121(1), 93–118. http://doi.org/10.1787/5km4k7mnrkzw-en
- Glass, J. H., Scott, A. J., & Price, M. F. (2013). The power of the process: Coproducing a sustainability assessment toolkit for upland estate management in Scotland. Land Use Policy, 30(1), 254–265. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2012.03.024
- Gliem, J. a, & Gliem, R. R. (2003). Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales, 2003 Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, (1992), 82–88. http://doi.org/10.1109/PROC.1975.9792
- Golob, A. (2009). The Long Island Index. In *In Community quality-of-life indicators: Best cases IV* (pp. 25–58). Netherlands.: Springer.
- Golusin, M., & Munitlak Ivanovic, O. (2011). Kyoto Protocol implementation in Serbia as precognition of sustainable energetic and economic development. *Energy Policy*, 39, 2800–2807. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.02.052
- Gonzalez, A., Donnelly, A., Jones, M., Klostermann, J., Groot, A., & Breil, M. (2011). Community of Practice Approach To Developing Urban Sustainability Indicators. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management*, 13(4), 591–617. http://doi.org/10.1142/S1464333211004024

- Götz, O., Liehr-Gobbers, K., & Krafft, M. (2010). Evaluation of Structural Equation Models Using the Partial Least Squares (PLS) Approach. In *Handbook of Partial Least Squares* (pp. 691–711). http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-32827-8 30
- Gourley, R., Prokosch, A., Sullivan, S., & Wangwongwiroj, C. (2013). Supporting Urban Sustainability through Subjective Well-Being Measurement.
- Graham, C. (2010). Hearing the voices of general staff: a Delphi study of the contributions of general staff to student outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 32(3), 213–223. http://doi.org/10.1080/13600801003743315
- Grainger, A. (2012). Forest sustainability indicator systems as procedural policy tools in global environmental governance. *Global Environmental Change*, 22(1), 147–160. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.09.001
- Greve, G. (2014). The moderating effects of service and ambience on customer satisfaction in a fast-casual restaurant: a German case study. *International Journal of Hospitality and Event Management, 1*(2), 147–163. http://doi.org/10.1504/IJHEM.2014.066990
- Greyling, T. (2013). A composite index of quality of life for the Gauteng city-region:
- Guion, L. A., Diehl, D. C., & McDonald, D. (2011). *Triangulation: Establishing the validity of qualitative studies*.
- Habibi, A., Sarafrazi, A., & Izadyar, S. (2014). Delphi Technique Theoretical Framework in Qualitative Research. *The International Journal of Engineering* and Science (IJES), 3(4), 8–13.
- Hackett, S., Masson, H., & Phillips, S. (2006). Exploring Consensus in Practice with Youth Who Are Sexually Abusive: Findings from a Delphi Study of Practitioner Views in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland. *Child Maltreatment*, 11(2), 146–156. http://doi.org/10.1177/1077559505285744
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis. vectors.* http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2011.02.019
- Hair, J. F. J., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). Long Range Planning (Vol. 46). http://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2013.01.002
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a Silver Bullet. *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139–152. http://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679190202
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2013). Editorial-partial least squares structural equation modeling: Rigorous applications, better results and higher acceptance. *Long Range Planning*, 46((1-2)), 1–12.

- Hair Jr, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). Sage Publications.
- Hák, T., Moldan, B., & Dahl, A. L. (2012). Sustainability indicators: a scientific assessment (Vol. 67). Island Press.
- Hale, J., Knapp, C., Bardwell, L., Buchenau, M., Marshall, J., Sancar, F., & Litt, J. S. (2011). Connecting food environments and health through the relational nature of aesthetics: Gaining insight through the community gardening experience. *Social Science & Medicine*, 72(11), 1853–1863.
- Hall, P., & Pfeiffer, U. (2013). Urban future 21: a global agenda for twenty-first century cities. Routledge.
- Hallowell, M. R. (2009). Techniques to minimize bias when using the Delphi method to quantify construction safety and health risks. In *In Building a Sustainable Future-Proceedings of the 2009 Construction Research Congress* (pp. 1489–1498).
- Hallowell, M. R., & Calhoun, M. E. (2011). Interrelationships among Highly Effective Construction Injury Prevention Strategies. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 137(11), 985–993. http://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000354
- Hallowell, M. R., & Gambatese, J. A. (2010a). Population and Initial Validation of a Formal Model for Construction Safety Risk Management. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management. http://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000204
- Hallowell, M. R., & Gambatese, J. A. (2010b). Qualitative Research: Application of the Delphi Method to CEM Research. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*. http://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000137
- Hallowell, M. R., & Gambatese, J. A. (2012). Qualitative research: Application of the Delphi method to CEM research. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 136(1), 99–107. http://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000137
- Hamsa, K., Azeez, A., Sugaya, D., & Miura, M. (2015). Analysis of living environment settings in residential areas in Kuala Lumpur and Putrajaya. ACE: Architecture, City and Environment = Arquitectura, Ciudad Y Entorno, 10(28), 33–56. http://doi.org/10.5821/ace.10.28.2663
- Hamzah, W. (2014). Urbanisation and sustainable development of cities: a ready engine to promote economic growth and cooperation.
- Hardi, P., Barg, S., Hodge, T., & Pinter, L. (1997). Measuring sustainable. Development: Review of current practice. *Occasional Paper*, 17.

- Hardi, P., & Pinter, L. (2006). City of Winnipeg quality-of-life indicators. In *In Community Quality-of-Life Indicators* (pp. 127–176). Netherlands.: Springer.
- Harris, P. (2011). Future proofing the organization through sustainable corporate reputation. *Journal of PublicAffairs*, 1(1), 1–3.
- Hassan, N., Jaafar, N. I. M., Ariffin, R. N. R., Samah, A. A., & Jaafar, M. N. (2013). Perceptions on Quality of Life in Malaysia: The Urban-Rural Divide. *Planning Malaysia Journal*, 11(3), 21–40.
- Hasson, F., & Keeney, S. (2011). Enhancing rigour in the Delphi technique research. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 78(9), 1695–1704. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2011.04.005
- Haughton, G. (1999). Developing sustainable urban development models. *Cities*, 14(4), 189–195.
- Haybron, D. M. (2005). On Being Happy or Unhappy1. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 71(2), 287–317.
- Haybron, D. M. (2010). Mood Propensity as a Constituent of Happiness: A Rejoinder to Hill. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 11(1), 19–31.
- Heijungs, R., Huppes, G., & Guinée, J. B. (2010). Life cycle assessment and sustainability analysis of products, materials and technologies. Toward a scientific framework for sustainability life cycle analysis. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*, 95(3), 422–428. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2009.11.010
- Heink, U., & Kowarik, I. (2010). What are indicators? On the definition of indicators in ecology and environmental planning. *Ecological Indicators*, 10(3), 584– 593. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2009.099
- Helliwell, J. F., & Huang, H. (2008). How's your government? International evidence linking good government and well-being. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38(4), 595–619.
- Helliwell, J. F., Wang, H. A. I. F. A. N. G., & Wang, S. H. U. N. (2015). The Geography of world happiness. In *Word Happiness Report* (pp. 12–41).
- Helmstetter, C., Mattessich, P., Egbert, A., Brower, S., Hartzler, N., Franklin, J., & Lloyd, B. (2011). Sustaining the Operations of Community Indicators Projects: The Case of Twin Cities Compass. In *In Community Quality-of-Life Indicators: Best Cases* (pp. 47–66). Netherlands.: Springer.
- Henseler, J., & Fassott, G. (2010). Testing Moderating Effects in PLS Path Models: An Illustration of Available Procedures. *Handbook of Partial Least Squares*, 713–735. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-32827-8

- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2009). The use of Partial Least Squares Path Modeling in International Marketing. *Advances in International Marketing*, 20, 277–319. http://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8116(92)90003-4
- Hezri, A. A., & Dovers, S. R. (2009). Australia's Indicator-Based Sustainability Assessments and Public Policy. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 68(3), 303–318. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2009.00641.x
- Hezri, a. a., & Nordin Hasan, M. (2006). Towards sustainable development? The evolution of environmental policy in Malaysia. *Natural Resources Forum*, 30(1), 37–50. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2006.00156.x
- Hlavac, M. (2011). Subjective Life Satisfaction in the European Union: Determinants and Policy Implications.
- Hoernig, H., & Seasons, M. (2004). Monitoring of indicators in local and regional planning practice: concepts and issues. *Planning Practice & Research*, 19(1), 81–99. http://doi.org/DOI: 10.1080/0269745042000246595
- Holey, E. A., Feeley, J. L., Dixon, J., & Whittaker, V. J. (2007). An exploration of the use of simple statistics to measure consensus and stability in Delphi studies. BMC Medical Research Methodolog, 7(1), 52.
- Hopwood, B., Mellor, M., & O'Brien, G. (2005). Sustainable development: Mapping different approaches. Sustainable Development, 13(1), 38–52. http://doi.org/10.1002/sd.244
- Horner, K., Islam, M., Flygare, L., Tsiklakis, K., & Whaites, E. (2014). No TitleBasic principles for use of dental cone beam computed tomography: consensus guidelines of the European Academy of Dental and Maxillofacial Radiology. *Dental and Maxillofacial Radiology, 38*(4). http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1259/dmfr/74941012
- Hsu, C., & Sandford, B. (2007). The delphi technique: making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 12, 1–8.* http://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2070(99)00018-7
- Hsu, S. H., Chen, W. H., & Hsieh, M. J. (2006). Robustness testing of PLS, LISREL, EQS and ANN-based SEM for measuring customer satisfaction. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, *17*(3), 355–372.
- Hu, F. (2013). Homeownership and Subjective Wellbeing in Urban China: Does Owning a House Make You Happier? Social Indicators Research, 110, 951– 971. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9967-6
- Huang, H. C., Lin, W. C., & Lin, J. D. (2008). Development of a fall-risk checklist using the Delphi technique. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *17*(17), 2275–2283. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2008.02337.x

- Huang, L., Wu, J., & Yan, L. (2015). Defining and measuring urban sustainability: a review of indicators. *Landscape Ecology*, 30(7), 1175–1193. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-015-0208-2
- Hung, H. L., Altschuld, J. W., & & Lee, Y. F. (2008). Methodological and conceptual issues confronting a cross-country Delphi study of educational program evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *31*(2), 191–198.
- Hur, M., Nasar, J. L., & Chun, B. (2010). Neighborhood satisfaction, physical and perceived naturalness and openness. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(1), 52–59.
- Inglehart, R., Foa, R., Peterson, C., & Welzel, C. (2008). Development, Freedom, and Rising Happiness: A Global Perspective (1981-2007). *Psychological Science*, 3(4), 264–285. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00078.x
- Insch, A., & Florek, M. (2008). Place to live, work and play Conceptualising place satisfaction in the case of a city's residents. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 1(2), 138–149.
- Inter-American Development Bank. (2011). Urban sustainability in Latin America and the Caribbean. Washington, DC.
- Inter-American, Development, & Bank. (2011). Urban sustainability in Latin America and the Caribbean,. Washington, DC.
- Ismail, I. S., Shamsuddin, S., & Sulaiman, A. B. (2008). an Evaluation of Residents Perception of Identity in Putrajaya New Town. *Jurnal of Alam Bina*, 13(4), 37–51.
- Israel, D. (2009). Data analysis in business research: a step-by-step nonparametric approach. Sage Publications.
- IUCN/UNEP/WWF. (1991). Caring for the Earth.A Strtegy for Sustainable Living. Switzerland: Gland.
- Jahner, S., Leimeister, J.M., Knebel, U., and Krcmar, H. (2008). 'A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Perceived Strategic Importance of RFID for CIOs in Germany and Italy,'. In proceedings of the Proceedings of the 41st Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, IEEE Computer Society,.
- Jany-Catrice, F., & Marlier, G. (2013). Regional Indicators of Well-Being: The Case of France. In *In Community Quality-of-Life Indicators: Best Cases VI* (pp. 19– 44). Netherlands.: Springer.
- Jarosz, A. (2015). Good Governance and Civil Society: Selected Issues on the Relations between State, Economy and Society. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

- Jarvis, C.B., MacKenzie, S.B., and Podsakoff, P. M. (2003). 'A Critical Review of Construct Indicators and Measurement Model Misspecification in Marketing and Consumer Research,'. *Journal of Adolescence of Consumer Research*, 30, 199–218. http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004
- Jeste, D. V., Ardelt, M., Blazer, D., Kraemer, H. C., Vaillant, G., & Meeks, T. W. (2010). Expert consensus on characteristics of wisdom: A delphi method study. *Gerontologist*, 50(5), 668–680. http://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnq022
- Jex, S. M., Adams, G. A., Elacqua, T. C., & Lux, D. J. (1997). A comparison of incident-based and scale measures of work stressors. Work and Stress, ol 11(3), 229–238. http://doi.org/10.1080/02678379708256837
- Jirava, P., Mandys, J., Kašparová, M., & Křupka, J. (2010). System approach to determinants of quality of life within a region. *WSEAS Transactions on Systems*, 9(3), 243–252.
- John, J. I. (2006). Creating the essnce of cities: The Putrajaya's Exprience. *Planning Malaysia Journal*, 2(1).
- Joint UNECE, Eurostat, OECD, & Task Force. (2013). Framework and suggested indicators to measure sustainable development.
- Juhola, S. (2014). Assessing Adaptive Capacity of Cities and Regions: Concerns Over Methodology and Usability. In *Sustainable Cities and Military Installations* (pp. 49–62). Springer.
- Jurado, A., & Perez-Mayo, J. (2012). Construction and Evolution of a Multidimensional Well-Being Index for the Spanish Regions. Social Indicators Research, 107, 259–279. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9835-4

K.Yogeesvaran. (2013). Malaysian Well-being Report 2013.

- Kajikawa, Y., Ohno, J., Takeda, Y., Matsushima, K., & Komiyama, H. (2007).
 Creating an academic landscape of sustainability science: An analysis of the citation network. *Sustainability Science*, 2(2), 221–231. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-007-0027-8
- Kalaian, S. A., & Kasim, R. M. (2012). Terminating sequential Delphi survey data collection. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(5). Retrieved from pareonline.net
- Kamp, I. Van, Leidelmeijer, K., & Marsman, G. (2003). Urban environmental quality and human well-being: Towards a conceptual framework and demarcation of concepts; a literature study. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 65(1), 5–18. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2046(02)00232-3

- Karabati, S., & Cemalcilar, Z. (2010). Values, materialism, and well-being: A study with Turkish university students. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 31(4), 624–633. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2010.04.007
- Karen, W., & Margaret, K. (2013). A City of Wellbeing The what, why & how of measuring community wellbeing. City of Santa Monica Office of Wellbeing. Retrieved from http://www.smgov.net/uploadedFiles/Wellbeing/wbp-Research-whitepaper-FINAL.pdf.
- Kasim, R., Md Ariffin, K., Martin, D. J., Abdul Rahman, I., Nagapan, S., & Muniandy, S. (2014). A community happiness index: the experience from Indian community group in Kluang, Johor, Malaysia.
- Katre, D., Bhutkar, G., & Karmarkar, S. (2010). Usability heuristics and qualitative indicators for the usability evaluation of touch screen ventilator systems. *IFIP* Advances in Information and Communication Technology, 316, 83–97. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-11762-6 8
- Keeney, S., Hasson, F., & McKenna, H. (2010). *The Delphi Technique. The Delphi Technique in Nursing and Health Research*. Wiley Online Library. http://doi.org/10.1002/9781444392029.ch1
- Kenny, M. (2005). The Economist Intelligence Unit's Quality-of-life Index. The world in 2005.
- Kesebir, P., & Diener, E. (2008). In Pursuit of Happiness: Empirical Answers to Philosophical Questions. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(2), 117– 125. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2008.00069.x
- Khazai, B., Merz, M., Schulz, C., & Borst, D. (2013). An integrated indicator framework for spatial assessment of industrial and social vulnerability to indirect disaster losses. *Natural Hazards*, 67(2), 145–167. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-013-0551-z
- Kim, Y., Kee, Y., & Lee, S. J. (2015). An Analysis of the Relative Importance of Components in Measuring Community Wellbeing: Perspectives of Citizens, Public Officials, and Experts. *Social Indicators Research*, 121(2), 345–369. http://doi.org/.1007/s11205-014-0652-4
- Kim, Y., & Lee, S. J. (2014). The development and application of a community wellbeing index in Korean metropolitan cities. *Social Indicators Research*, *119*(2), 533–558.
- Kim, Y., Kee, Y., & Lee, S. J. (2014). An Analysis of the Relative Importance of Components in Measuring Community Wellbeing: Perspectives of Citizens, Public Officials, and Experts. *Social Indicators Research*, 1–25. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0652-4

- Kim, Y., & Lee, S. J. (2014). The development and application of a community wellbeing index in Korean metropolitan cities. *Social Indicators Research*, 119(2), 533–558. http://doi.org/DOI 10.1007/s11205-013-0527-0
- Kjell, O. N. E. (2011). Sustainable well-being: A potential synergy between sustainability and well-being research. *Review of General Psychology*, 15(3), 255–266. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0024603
- Kloosterman, R. C., & Trip, J. J. (2011). Planning for Quality? Assessing the Role of Quality of Place in Current Dutch Planning Practice. *Journal of Urban Design*, 16(4), 455–470. http://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2011.585863
- Knight, A., & McNaught, A. (Eds.). (2011). Understanding wellbeing: An introduction for students and practitioners of health and social care. Lantern.
- Knol, A. B., Slottje, P., van der Sluijs, J. P., & Lebret, E. (2010). The use of expert elicitation in environmental health impact assessment: a seven step procedure. *Environmental Health : A Global Access Science Source*, 9, 19. http://doi.org/10.1186/1476-069X-9-19
- Kroh, E. (2011). The nitty-gritty of going beyond GDP.
- Kuo, F. (2010). Parks and Other Green Environments: Essential Components of a Healthy Human Habitat. Australasian Parks and Leisure. Retrieved from http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=076241413812440;res= IELNZC
- La Placa, V., McNaught, A., & Knight, A. (2013). Discourse on wellbeing in research and practice. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *3*, 116–125. http://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v3i1.7
- Lamb, W. F., Steinberger, J. K., Bows-Larkin, a, Peters, G. P., Roberts, J. T., & Wood, F. R. (2014). Transitions in pathways of human development and carbon emissions. *Environmental Research Letters*, 9(1), 14011. http://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/1/014011
- Lambregts, B., Kloosterman, R., Werff, M. van der, Röling, R. and Kapoen, L. (2006). Randstad Holland: Multiple Faces of a Polycentric Role Model,. In *in: P. Hall* and K. Pain (Eds) The Polycentric Metropolis – Learning from mega-city regions in Europe, (p. 137–145.). London: Earthscan.
- Landeta, J. (2006). Current validity of the Delphi method in social sciences. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 73(5), 467–482. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2005.09.002
- Landeta, J., & Barrutia, J. (2011). People consultation to construct the future: A Delphi application. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 27(1), 134–151. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2010.04.001

- Landry, C. (2008). 'The creative city: its origins and futures'. Urban Design-New Series, 106(14).
- Larsen, R. J., Diener, E., & Cropanzano, R. S. (1987). Cognitive operations associated with individual differences in affect intensity. *Journal ofPersonality and Social Psychology*, 53, 767–774.
- Larson, L. R., Jennings, V., & Cloutier, S. A. (2016). Public parks and wellbeing in urban areas of the United States. *PLoS One*, *11*(4 e0153211.). http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0153211
- Law, K. S., Wong, C. S., & Mobley, W. H. (1998). Toward a taxonomy of multidimensional constructs. Academy of Management Review, 23(4), 741– 755. http://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1998.1255636
- Layard, R. (2005). Rethinking public economics: The implications of rivalry and habit. *Economics and Happiness: Framing the Analysis*, (January 2013), 1–25. http://doi.org/10.1093/0199286280.001.0001
- Layard, R. (2010). Economics. Measuring subjective well-being. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 327, 534–535. http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1186315
- Lecklitner, G. L. (1984). Protecting the rights of mental patients: A view of the future. ((UMI No. 8504044). Digital Abstracts International, (Vol. 46).
- Lee, J., Je, H., & Byun, J. (2011). Well-being index of super tall residential buildings in Korea. *Building and Environment*, 46(5), 1184–1194.
- Lee, S. J., Kim, Y., & Phillips, R. (Eds.). (2015). Community Well-Being and Community Development: Conceptions and Applications. Springer.
- Lee, S., & Guhathakurta, S. (2013). Bridging Environmental Sustainability and Quality of Life in Metropolitan Atlanta's Urban Communities. In In Community Quality-of-Life Indicators: Best Cases VI (pp. 207–231). Netherlands.: Netherlands.
- Legendre, P. (2005). Species associations: the Kendall coefficient of concordance revisited. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*, 10(2), 226–245. http://doi.org/10.1198/108571105X46642
- Lenzen, M., & Cummins, R. (2013). Happiness versus the Environment—A Case Study of Australian Lifestyles. *Challenges*, 4(1), 56–74. http://doi.org/10.3390/challe4010056
- Levy, P. S., & Lemeshow, S. (2013). Sampling of populations: methods and applications. John Wiley & Sons.
- Leyden, K. M., Goldberg, A., & Michelbach, P. (2011). Understanding the Pursuit of Happiness in Ten Major Cities. Urban Affairs Review. http://doi.org/10.1177/1078087411403120

- Li, J., & Wang, X. (2012). Energy and climate policy in China's twelfth five-year plan: A paradigm shift. *Energy Policy*, 41, 519–528. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.11.012
- Li, Y., Ehiri, J., Hu, D., Zhang, Y., Wang, Q., Zhang, S., & Cao, J. (2014). Framework of behavioral indicators for outcome evaluation of TB health promotion: a Delphi study of TB suspects and Tb patients. *BMC Infectious Diseases*, 14(1), 268. http://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2334-14-268
- Lilja, K. K., Laakso, K., & Palomäki, J. (2011). Using the Delphi Method. In *Technology Management in the Energy Smart World (PICMET)* (pp. 1–10).
- Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (2011). Delphi: A brief look backward and forward. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 78(9), 1712–1719. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2010.09.011
- Loewe, N., Bagherzadeh, M., Araya-Castillo, L., Thieme, C., & Batista-Foguet, J. M. L. (n.d.). Life Domain Satisfactions as Predictors of Overall Life Satisfaction Among Workers: Evidence from Chile. *Social Indicators Research*, 1–16.
- Lohmoeller, J. B. (1989). Latent variable path analysis with partial least squares. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Lopes, M. N., & Camanho, A. S. (2013). Public green space use and consequences on urban vitality: An assessment of European cities. *Social Indicators Research*, *113*(3), 751–767.
- Loriaux, S. (2011). Agency and Autonomy in Kant's Moral Theory, by Andrews Reath. *Kantian Review*, 14(2), 149–151. http://doi.org/10.1017/S1369415400001503
- Loughlin, K., & Moore, L. (1979). Using Delphi To Achieve Congruent Objectives And Activities in a Pediatrics Department. *Journal of Medilca Education*, 54, 101–6. http://doi.org/Cited By (since 1996) 37\rExport Date 8 January 2013
- Lu, J., Li, H. Y., Zhou, Y. X., & Chen, L. Z. (2011). Application of confirmatory factor analysis in studying the achievements of index system in clinical sciences and technologies]. *Zhonghua Liu Xing Bing Xue Za Zhi= Zhonghua Liuxingbingxue Zazhi, 32*(12), 1285–1288.
- Luhmann, M., Hofmann, W., Eid, M., & Lucas, R. E. (2012). Subjective well-being and adaptation to life events: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(3), 592–615. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0025948
- Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). *The how of happiness: A scientific approach to getting the life you want.* Penguin,.
- Macierowski, E. M. (2011). Aristotle's Nicomachean ethics. *Choice (Conari Press)*, 49(4), 689–690. http://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226026763.001.0001

- MacKenzie, D. I., & Royle, J. A. (2005). Designing Occupancy Studies: General Advice and Allocating Survey Effort. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 42(6), 1105–1114. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2005.01098.x
- Maclaren, V. W. (1996). Urban Sustainability Reporting. Journal of the American Planning Association, 62(2), 184–202. http://doi.org/10.1080/01944369608975684
- Maclaren, V. W. (1996). Urban sustainability reporting. Journal of the American Planning Association, 62(2), 184–202. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01944369608975684
- Maggino, F., & Zumbo, B. D. (2012). Measuring the quality of life and the construction of social indicators. In *In Handbook of social indicators and quality of life research* (pp. 201–238). Springer Netherlands.
- Malaysian Institute for Research in Youth Development. (2011). Malaysian Youth Index(MYI). Retrieved 1 January 2014, from http://www.ippbm.gov.my/v3en/index.php/profile/about-ippbm.html?id=267
- Malhotra, N. K. (2006). Consumer Well-Being and Quality of Life: An Assessment and Directions for Future Research. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 26(1), 77– 80. http://doi.org/10.1177/0276146705285970
- Mankiw, N. G. (2008). *Principles of Economics (* (6th ed.). Mason: South-western Cengage Learning.
- Manuel, A. (2015). Sustainable City Index SCI 2015:... invites re ection and prompts action... Summary. The Netherlands: Sustainable Society Foundation.
- Marans, R. W. (2015). Quality of urban life & environmental sustainability studies: Future linkage opportunities. *Habitat International*, 45, 47–52. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2014.06.019
- Mascarenhas, A., Coelho, P., Subtil, E., & Ramos, T. B. (2010). The role of common local indicators in regional sustainability assessment. *Ecological Indicators*, *10*(3), 646–656.
- Mason, K. J., & Alamdari, F. (2007). EU network carriers, low cost carriers and consumer behaviour: A Delphi study of future trends. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 13(5), 299–310.
- Mayer, H., & Knox, P. L. (2009). Pace of life and quality of life: The slow city charter. In *In Community Quality-of-Life Indicators: Best Cases III (* (pp. 21–40). Netherlands.: Springer.
- McAslan, D., Prakash, M., Pijawka, D., Guhathakurta, S., & Sadalla, E. (2013). Measuring Quality of Life in Border Cities: The Border Observatory Project in the US-Mexico Border Region. In *In Community Quality-of-Life Indicators: Best Cases VI (* (pp. 143–169). Netherlands.: Springer.

- McCrea, R., Marans, R. W., Stimson, R., & Western, J. (2011). Subjective measurement of quality of life using primary data collection and the analysis of survey data. In *In Investigating quality of urban life* (p. 55–75)). Springer Netherlands. http://doi.org/doi 10.1007/978-94-007-1742-8 3
- McCrea, R., Walton, A., & Leonard, R. (2015). A conceptual framework for investigating community wellbeing and resilience. *Rural Society*, 23(3), 270– 282. http://doi.org/10.1080/10371656.2014.11082070
- Mcintyre, S., Novak, I., & Cusick, A. (2010). Consensus research priorities for cerebral palsy: A Delphi survey of consumers, researchers, and clinicians. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, 52, 270–275. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8749.2009.03358.x
- McMahon, D. M. (2006). *Happiness: A history*. Grove Press.
- Meadows, D. (1998). *Indicators and information systems for sustainable development*. Sustainability Institute Hartland.
- Meijering, J. V., Kampen, J. K., & Tobi, H. (2013). Quantifying the development of agreement among experts in Delphi studies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 80, 1607–1614. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.01.003
- Melnyk, S. a., Lummus, R. R., Vokurka, R. J., Burns, L. J., & Sandor, J. (2009).
 Mapping the future of supply chain management: a Delphi study. *International Journal of Production Research*, 47(16), 4629–4653.
 http://doi.org/10.1080/00207540802014700
- Memon, I. A., Napiah, M., Hussain, M. A., & Hakro, M. R. (2016). Influence of factors to shift private transport users to Park-and-Ride service in Putrajaya. In In Engineering Challenges for Sustainable Future: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Civil, Offshore and Environmental Engineering (ICCOEE 2016, Malaysia, 15-17 Aug 2016) (p. 385). CRC Press.
- Michalos, A. C. (1985). Multiple discrepancies theory (MDT). Social Indicators Research, 16(4), 347–413.
- Michałowski, A. (2011). Spatial environmental services in the approach of the assumptions of economics forsustainable development. *Problemy Ekorazwoju*, 6(2), 117–126.
- Michelle Gyles-McDonnough. (2014). Speech:Launch of the Malaysia Human Development Report 2013. Kuala Lumpur: United Nations Development Programme.
- Miles, R. L., Greer, L., Kraatz, D., & Kinnear, S. (2008). Measuring community wellbeing: a Central Queensland case study. *Australasian Journal of Regional Studies*, *14*(1), 73.

- Mirjana Golušin, Ivanović, O. M., Larisa Jovanović, &, & Domazet, S. (2012). Determination of the Ecological-Economic Degree of Development in Countries of SE Europe – Weight Coefficients Technique. Problemy Korozwoju- Problems of Sustainable Development, 7(1), 87–93.
- Mohanty, I., & Tanton, R. (2012). *A wellbeing framework with adaptive capacity (No. 12/17)*. (No. 12/17).
- Moldan, B., Janoušková, S., & Hák, T. (2012). How to understand and measure environmental sustainability: Indicators and targets. *Ecological Indicators*, 17, 4–13. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.04.033
- Morgan, P. J., Lam-McCulloch, J., Herold-McIlroy, J., & Tarshis, J. (2007). Simulation performance checklist generation using the Delphi technique. *Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia = Journal Canadien D'anesthésie*, 54(12), 992–7. http://doi.org/10.1007/BF03016633
- Mori, K., & Christodoulou, A. (2012). Review of sustainability indices and indicators: Towards a new City Sustainability Index (CSI). *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2011.06.001
- Morris, S. (2011). In defense of the hedonistic account of happiness. *Philosophical Psychology*, 24(2), 261–281.
- Morrison, P. S. (2011). Local Expressions of Subjective Well-being: The New Zealand Experience. *Regional Studies*, http://doi.org/10.1080/00343401003792476
- Morton, A., & Edwards, L. (2013a). Community Wellbeing Indicators : Measures for Local Government.
- Morton, A., & Edwards, L. (2013b). Community Wellbeing Indicators, Survey Template for Local Government. Sydney: Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government.
- Moser, S. (2010). Putrajaya: Malaysia's new federal administrative capital. *Cities*, 27(4), 285–297. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2009.11.002
- Moussiopoulos, N., Achillas, C., Vlachokostas, C., Spyridi, D., & Nikolaou, K. (2010). Environmental, social and economic information management for the evaluation of sustainability in urban areas: A system of indicators for Thessaloniki, Greece. *Cities*, 27(5), 377–384. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2010.06.001
- Muhammad Aqmarul Azri Bin Azmi and Abd. Rahim Romle. (2015). Sustainable Development: Development for a Sustainable Future. A Case of Putrajaya Green City. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 9(14), 30–34.

- Mulligan, G., & Carruthers, J. I. (2011). Amenities, QoL and regional development. In In RW. Marans & RJ. Stimson (Eds.), Investigating quality of urban life (pp. 107–134). Dodrecht: Springer.
- Mulligan, K., Elliott, S. J., & Schuster-Wallace, C. (2012). The place of health and the health of place: Dengue fever and urban governance in Putrajaya, Malaysia. *Health and Place*, 18(3), 613–620. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2012.01.001
- Mustapa, S. I., & Bekhet, H. A. (2015). Investigating factors affecting CO2 emissions in Malaysian road transport sector. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 5(4), 1073–1083.
- Mutisya, E., & Yarime, M. (2014). Moving towards urban sustainability in Kenya: A framework for integration of environmental, economic, social and governance dimensions. *Sustainability Science*. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-013-0223-7
- Nardo, M., Saisana, M., Saltelli, A., Tarantola, S., Hoffman, A., & Giovannini, E. (2008). Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide. EC Joint Research Centre and OECD Statistics Directorate and the Directorate for Science, Technology and Industry. http://doi.org/10.1787/9789264043466-en
- Nassauer, J. I., & Raskin, J. (2014). Urban vacancy and land use legacies: A frontier for urban ecological research, design, and planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *125*, 245–253.
- National Population and Family Board (NPFB). (2011). Family Well-being Index Report Malaysia 2011.
- Näyhä, A., & Pesonen, H.-L. (2014). Strategic change in the forest industry towards the biorefining business. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 81, 259–271. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.04.014
- Ness, B., Urbel-Piirsalu, E., Anderberg, S., & Olsson, L. (2007). Categorising tools for sustainability assessment. *Ecological Economics*, 60(3), 498–508. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.07.023
- Neuman, L. (2006). Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. New York: Pearson Education.
- Newton, P. W. (2012). Liveable and Sustainable? Socio Technical Challenges for Twenty-First-Century Cities. *Journal of Urban Technology*, 19(1), 81–102. http://doi.org/10.1080/10630732.2012.626703
- Nisbet, E. K., Zelenski, J. M., & Murphy, S. A. (2011). Happiness is in our Nature: Exploring Nature Relatedness as a Contributor to Subjective Well-Being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 12, 303–322. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-010-9197-7

- Norouzian-Maleki, S., Bell, S., Hosseini, S. B., & Faizi, M. (2015). Developing and testing a framework for the assessment of neighbourhood liveability in two contrasting countries: Iran and Estonia. *Ecological Indicators*, 48, 263–271.
- Nunoo, E. K. (2010). Measuring Progress towards Sustainable Forest Management and Policy Implications.
- O'Brien, C. (2008). Sustainable happiness: How happiness studies can contribute to a more sustainable future. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0013235
- O'Riordan, T. (2013). Sustainability for wellbeing. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions.*, *6*, 24–34. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2012.12.001
- OECD. (2011). Compendium of OECD well-being indicators. Paris, France.
- OECD. (2012). OECD Environmental Outlook to 2050: The Consequences of Inaction. *Outlook*, (March), 353. http://doi.org/10.1787/9789264122246-en
- OECD. (2013). OECD Guidelines on Measuring Subjective Well-being. *REPORT*, 3–265. http://doi.org/10.1787/9789264191655-en
- OECD, JRC., & EC. (2008). Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide.
- Okoli, C., & Pawlowski, S. D. (2004). The Delphi method as a research tool: an example, design considerations and applications. *Information & Management*. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2003.11.002
- Oktay, D., & Rustemli, A. (2011). The quality of urban life and neighborhood satisfaction in Famagusta, Northern Cyprus. In *In Investigating quality of urban life* (pp. 233–249). Springer Netherlands. http://doi.org/DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1742-8 10
- Olalla-Tárraga, M. A. (2006). A conceptual framework to assess sustainability in urban ecological systems. *The International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 13(1), 1–15.
- Olin, S. S., Kutash, K., Pollock, M., Burns, B. J., Kuppinger, A., Craig, N., ... Hoagwood, K. E. (2014). Developing quality indicators for family support services in community team-based mental health care. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health*, 41(1), 7–20. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0501-9
- Omar, D. B. (2005). Assessing Residents ' Quality of Life in Malaysian New Towns. *Asian Social Science*, *5*(6), 94–102.

- Omar, D. B. (2006). Urban planning and the quality of life in Putrajaya, Malaysia. *Eco-Architecture: Harmonisation Between Architecture And Nature*, 86. http://doi.org/doi:10.2495/ARC060091
- Pacione, M. (2012). Investigating Quality of Urban Life: In Robert W. Marans and Robert J. Stimson. (Ed.), *Theory, Methods, and Empirical Research*, (p. 382– 384.).
- Pallant, J. (2007). SPSS survival manual: a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS (3rd edn ed). NSW: Allen&Unwin.
- Pallant, J. F., & Tennant, A. (2007). An introduction to the Rasch measurement model: An example using the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS). *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 46(1), 1–18. http://doi.org/10.1348/014466506X96931
- Panagopoulos, T., Duque, J. A. G., & Dan, M. B. (2016). Urban planning with respect to environmental quality and human well-being. *Environmental Pollution*, 208, 137–144. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2015.07.038
- Papargyropoulou, E., Padfield, R., Harrison, O., Preece, C. (2012). The rise of sustainability services for the built environment in Malaysia. Sustainable Cities and Society, 5, 44–51.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2008). The Satisfaction With Life Scale and the emerging construct of life satisfaction. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3(2), 137– 152. http://doi.org/10.1080/17439760701756946
- Permentier, M., Bolt, G., & Van Ham, M. (2011). Determinants of neighbourhood satisfaction and perception of neighbourhood reputation. *Urban Studies*, 48(5), 977–996.
- Petter S, Straub D, R. A. (2007). Specifying formative constructs in information systems research. *MIS QUARTERLY*, *31*(4), 623–656. http://doi.org/10.2307/25148814
- Polites, G. L., Roberts, N., & Thatcher, J. (2012). Conceptualizing models using multidimensional constructs: a review and guidelines for their use. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 21(1), 22–48. http://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.10
- Ponrahono, Z., Omar, C. M. C., Abdullah, A. M., & Muda, A. (2011). Matrix Sustainable Strategies Compatibility Analysis of Malaysia's Sustainable Development Strategies in Three-Tier Development Plan System. World Applied Sciences Journal, 14(SPL ISS 1), 22–30.
- Potter, J., Cantarero, R., & Wood, H. (2012). The multi-dimensional nature of predicting quality of life. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 50, 781–790.

Prescott-Allen, R. (2001). The wellbeing of nations. Washington, DC: Island Press.

- Prescott-Allen, R. (2006). 'The structure of a well-being index', presented at JRC/OECD Workshop on 'Measuring Well-being and Societal Progress',. Retrieved from unescobkk.org
- Prilleltensky, I., Dietz, S., Prilleltensky, O., Myers, N. D., Rubenstein, C. L., Jin, Y.,
 & McMahon, A. (2015). Assessing Multidimensional Well-Being: Development and Validation of the I COPPE Scale. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 43(2), 199–226.
- Putrajaya Corporation. (2011). Putrajaya: Draft structure plan 2025. Putrajaya:Putrajaya Corporation.
- Putzhuber, F., & Hasenauer, H. (2010). Deriving sustainability measures using statistical data: A case study from the Eisenwurzen, Austria. *Ecological Indicators*, 10, 32–38. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2009.04.019
- Quercia, D., Ellis, J., Capra, L., & Crowcroft, J. (2012). Tracking gross community happiness from tweets. In *In Proceedings of the ACM 2012 conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work* (p. 965–968)).
- Quercia, D., Séaghdha, D. O., & Crowcroft, J. (2012). Talk of the city: our tweets, our community happiness. In *Paper presented at the ICWSM*.
- Raduwan, A., & Ismail, S. (2015). Assessment of public involvement in urban governance: case study in Putrajaya. ALAM CIPTA, International Journal on Sustainable Tropical Design Research & Practice, 8(1), 97–100.
- Raji, F., Qutayan, S. M. S., Ariffin, A. S., Razali, M. N., & Kamarudin, N. (2016). Resident's perception on livability in affordable housing in Malaysia. *Journal of Technology Management and Business*, 3(1).
- Rametsteiner, E., Pülzl, H., Alkan-Olsson, J., & Frederiksen, P. (2011). Sustainability indicator development-science or political negotiation? *Ecological Indicators*, *11*(1), 61–70. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2009.06.009
- Rani, W. M., & Mardiah, W. N. (2012). *Modelling the relationship between urban* form and social sustainability in Malaysian cities: access to local services and public facilities. (Doctoral dissertation, Heriot-Watt University).
- Rani, W. N. M. W. M. (2014). Evaluating the impact of Density on Access to Local Facilities in Urban Neighbourhoods. *Planning Malaysia Journal*, 12(4).
- Reed, M. S., Fraser, E. D., & Dougill, A. J. (2006). An adaptive learning process for developing and applying sustainability indicators with local communities. *Ecological Economics*, 59(4), 406–418. http://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2005.04.009

- Reis, S., Steinle, S., Morris, G., Fleming, L. E., Cowie, H., Hurley, F., ... White, M. (2012). Developing an integrated conceptual model for health and environmental impact assessment. In *Berlin conference on the human* dimensions of global environmental change on 'evidence for sustainable development', Berlin (pp. 4–5).
- Remor, E. (2013). Development and psychometric testing of the Hemophilia Wellbeing Index. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 20(4), 609–17. http://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-012-9261-2
- Rezvani, M. R., & Mansourian, H. (2011). The Development of Quality-of-Life Indicators in Rural Areas in Iran: Case Study–Khaveh Shomali District, Lorestan Province. In *In Community Quality-of-Life Indicators: Best Cases V* ((pp. 171–191). Netherlands.: Springer.
- Rezvani, M. R., Mansourian, H., & Sattari, M. H. (2012). Evaluating Quality of Life in Urban Areas (Case Study: Noorabad City, Iran). *Social Indicators Research*, *112*(1), 203–220. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0048-2
- Ricketts, A. (2008). Participation in Place-Making: Enhancing the Wellbeing of Marginalised Communities in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Victoria University of Wellington.
- Rigdon, E. E. (2012). Rethinking partial least squares path modeling: In praise of simple methods. *Long Range Planning*, 45(5), 341–358.
- Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Schlittgen, R., & Taylor, C. R. (2013). PLS path modeling and evolutionary segmentation. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(9), 1318– 1324. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.031
- Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., & Straub, D. (2012). A critical look at the use of PLS-SEM in MIS Quarterly. *MIS Quarterly (MISQ)*, 36(1), iii–xiv. http://doi.org/10.3200/JOEB.79.4.213-216
- Rinner, C., & Hussain, M. (2011). Toronto's urban heat island-exploring the relationship between land use and surface temperature. *Remote Sensing*, 3(6), 1251–1265. http://doi.org/10.3390/rs3061251
- Roberts, N., & Thatcher, J. (2009). Conceptualizing and testing formative constructs. *ACM SIGMIS Database*, 40(3), 9. http://doi.org/10.1145/1592401.1592405
- Rodríguez-Mañas, L., Féart, C., Mann, G., Viña, J., Chatterji, S., Chodzko-Zajko, W., Vega, E. (2013). Searching for an operational definition of frailty: A delphi method based consensus statement. the frailty operative definition-consensus conference project. *Journals of Gerontology - Series A Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 68(1), 62–67. http://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/gls119
- Rodwell, J., Noblet, A., Demir, D., & Steane, P. (2009). Supervisors are central to work characteristics affecting nurse outcomes. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 41, 310–319.

- Rogers, P. P., Jalal, K. F., & Boyd, J. A. (2008). Sustainable development indicators. In *In An introduction to sustainable development*. (p. 116–122).). London, UK: Earthscan.
- Rogers, D. S., Duraiappah, A. K., Antons, D. C., Munoz, P., Bai, X., Fragkias, M., & Gutscher, H. (2012). A vision for human well-being: Transition to social sustainability. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2012.01.013
- Rogers, D. S., Duraiappah, A. K., Antons, D. C., Munoz, P., Bai, X., Fragkias, M., & Gutscher, H. (2012). A vision for human well-being: transition to social sustainability. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 4(1), 61–73.
- ROHLF, M. (2013). Happiness in Kant and Rousseau. Estudos Kantianos [EK], 1(2).
- Rosly, D., & Rashid., A. A. (2014). Happiness Index towards Sustainable and Livable Cities in Malaysia. In 43rd Annual Conference of the Urban Affairs AssociaUon, 3-6 April.
- Rosly, D., & Rashid, A. A. (2013). Happiness Index Towards Sustainable and Liveable CiUes in Malaysia. In 43rd Annual Conference of the Urban Affairs AssociaUon, 3-6 April. San Francisco California, United States of America.
- Russo, A. P., & van der Borg, J. (2010). An Urban Policy Framework for Cultureoriented Economic Development: Lessons from the Netherlands. *Urban Geography*, 31(5), 668–690. http://doi.org/10.2747/0272-3638.31.5.668
- Russolillo, G. (2012). Non-metric partial least squares. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 6, 1641–1669.
- Ruut Veenhoven. (2011). Social Development and Happiness in Nations. (No. No. 2012-3).
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: a review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141–166. http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719–727. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719
- Saadatian, O. (2011). Sustainable development in Malaysia-planning and initiatives, 138–143. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=omidre za_saadatian

- Saha, S., Koley, M., Ganguly, S., Rath, P., Roy Chowdhury, P., & Hossain, S. I. (2014). Developing the criteria for evaluating quality of individualization in homeopathic clinical trial reporting: a preliminary study. *Journal of Integrative Medicine*, 12, 13–9. http://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-4964(14)60009-1
- Salvaris, M., & Wiseman, J. (2004). *Mapping Community wellbeing:using community well-being indicators to choose goals and measure progress*. Calton, Victoria.
- Sanchez, G. (2013). PLS Path Modeling with R. *R Package Notes*, 235. Retrieved from http://gastonsanchez.com/PLS_Path_Modeling_with_R.pdf
- Sandrey, M. A. & Bulger, S. M. (2008). 'The Delphi method: an approach for facilitating evidence based practice in athletic training', *Athletic Training Education Journal:*, 3(4), 135–142. Retrieved from www.nataej.irg.
- Sani, S., & Mohd Sham, A. (2007). Environmental management in Malaysia: Changing concerns and approaches. *IMPAK*, *3*, 4–6.
- SANTA CRUZ COUNTY. (2012). SANTA CRUZ COUNTY community assessment project 2012 comprehensive.
- Santos, L. D., & Martins, I. (2013). The Monitoring System on Quality of Life of the City of Porto. In *In Community Quality-of-Life Indicators: Best Cases VI* (pp. 77–98). Netherlands.: Springer.
- Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., Smith, D., Reams, R., & Hair, J. F. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): A useful tool for family business researchers. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 5(1), 105–115.
- Schimmack, U., & Diener, E. (2003). Predictive validity of explicit and implicit selfesteem for subjective well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *37*(2), 100–106. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00532-9
- Schmidt, R. C. (1997). Managing Delphi Surveys Using Nonparametric Statistical Techniques*. *Decision Sciences*, 28, 763–774. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.1997.tb01330.x
- Schremmer, C., Mollay, U., & Saringer-Bory, B. (2011). *Planning resource-efficient cities. SUME synthesis report.* Vienna: Österreichishes Institutfür Raumplanung,.
- Science for Environment Policy. (2015). *Indicators for sustainable cities*. (No. 12). UWE,Bristol. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/science-environment-policy
- Seifollahi, M., & Faryadi, S. (2011). Evaluating the Quality of Tehran's Urban Environment Based on Sustainability Indicators. *International Journal of Environmental Research*, 5(2), 545–554.

- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach (* (Fourth Edi). Unites States of America: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Shafie, S. M., Mahlia, T. M. I., Masjuki, H. H., & Andriyana, A. (2011). Current energy usage and sustainable energy in Malaysia: a review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 15(9), 4370–4377. http://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.rser.2011.07.113
- Shahidan, M. F., Jones, P. J., Gwilliam, J., & Salleh, E. (2012a). An evaluation of outdoor and building environment cooling achieved through combination modification of trees with ground materials. *Building and Environment*, 58, 245–257. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2012.07.012
- Shahidan, M. F., Jones, P. J., Gwilliam, J., & Salleh, E. (2012b). An evaluation of outdoor and building environment cooling achieved through combination modification of trees with ground materials. *Building and Environment*, 58(0), 245–257. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2012.07.012
- Shaughnessy, J. J., Zechmeister, E. B., & Zechmeister, J. S. (2008). *Research Methods in Psychology* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Shen, L. Y., Jorge Ochoa, J., Shah, M. N., & Zhang, X. (2011). The application of urban sustainability indicators A comparison between various practices. *Habitat* International, 35(1), 17–29. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2010.03.006
- Shuib, A. S. (2011). Identifying Hardware, Electronic Services and Supporting Equipment for Implementing Mobile Learning in Secondary School: A Delphi Technique. *Educational Technology*, 11(1).
- Siche, J. R., Agostinho, F., Ortega, E., & Romeiro, a. (2008). Sustainability of nations by indices: Comparative study between environmental sustainability index, ecological footprint and the emergy performance indices. *Ecological Economics*, 66(4), 628–637. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.10.023
- Simon, M. K. (2011). Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success . ((2011 ed.). Seattle, WA: Dissertation Success, LLC.
- Singh, R. K., Murty, H. R., Gupta, S. K., & Dikshit, A. K. (2009). An overview of sustainability assessment methodologies. *Ecological Indicators*. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2008.05.011
- Singh, R. K., Murty, H. R., Gupta, S. K., & Dikshit, a. K. (2007). Development of composite sustainability performance index for steel industry. *Ecological Indicators*, 7(3), 565–588. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2006.06.004
- Siong, H. C. (2006). Putrajaya –Administrative Centre of Malaysia -Planning Concept and Implementation-. In ustainable urban development and Governance conferenceat SungKyunKwan University Seoul on 16 Nov 2006- organised by SUDI, Seoul, Korea.

- Siong, H. C. (2008). Urban Governance and Rapid Urbanization Issues in Malaysia. Jurnal Alam, (4), 1–24.
- Sirgy, M. J., & Cornwell, T. (2001). Further validation of the Sirgy et al.'s measure of community quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, *56*(2), 125–143.
- Sirgy, M. J., Gao, T., & Young, R. F. (2008). How does residents' satisfaction with community services influence quality of life (QOL) outcomes?. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 3(2), 81. http://doi.org/DOI: 10.1007/s11482-008-9048-4
- Sirgy, M. J., Widgery, R. N., Lee, D. J., & Yu, G. B. (2010). Developing a measure of community well-being based on perceptions of impact in various life domains. *Social Indicators Research*, 96(2), 295–311. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9479-9
- Sirgy, M. J., Widgery, R. N., Lee, D., & Yu, G. B. (2010). Developing a measure of community well-being based on perceptions of impact in various life domains. *Social Indicators Research*, 96, 295–311.
- Skulmoski, G. J., Hartman, F. T., & Krahn, J. (2007). The delphi method for graduate research. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 6, 1. http://doi.org/10.1.1.151.8144
- Smale, B. (2012). Relationship of CIW Domain Indicators to the Overall Wellbeing of Residents of Guelph. A Technical Report for the City of Guelph, Ontario. Waterloo, ON:
- Smart, K. M., Blake, C., Staines, A., & Doody, C. (2010). Clinical indicators of 'nociceptive', 'peripheral neuropathic' and 'central' mechanisms of musculoskeletal pain. A Delphi survey of expert clinicians. *Manual Therapy*, 15(1), 80–87. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.math.2009.07.005
- Smith, L. M., Case, J. L., Smith, H. M., Harwell, L. C., & Summers, J. K. (2013).
 Relating ecoystem services to domains of human well-being: Foundation for a U.S. index. *Ecological Indicators*, 28, 79–90. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.02.032
- Soares, D., & Amaral, L. (2011). Information systems interoperability in public administration: Identifying the major acting forces through a Delphi study. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 6, 61–94. http://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-18762011000100006
- Sosik, J. J., Kahai, S. S., & Piovoso, M. J. (2009). Silver bullet or voodoo statistics? A primer for using partial least squares data analytic technique in group and organization research. *Group & Org. Management*, 34, 5–36.
- Sourani, A., & Sohail, M. (2015). The Delphi Method: review and use in construction management research. *International Journal of Construction Education and Research*, 11(11), 54–76.
- Sourani, A., & Sohail, M. (2014). The Delphi Method: review and use in construction management research.". *International Journal of Construction Education and Research*, (ahead-of-print), 1–23.
- Soutter, A. K., O'Steen, B., & Gilmore, A. (2013). The student well-being model: a conceptual framework for the development of student well-being indicators. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, (May 2014), 1–25. http://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2012.754362
- Steinert, M. (2009). A dissensus based online Delphi approach: An explorative research tool. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 76(3), 291–300. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2008.10.006
- Stinson, J. N., Connelly, M., Jibb, L. A., Schanberg, L. E., Walco, G., Spiegel, L. R., ... Rapoff. (2012). Developing a standardized approach to the assessment of pain in children and youth presenting to pediatric rheumatology providers: a Delphi survey and consensus conference process followed by feasibility testing. *Pediatr Rheumatol Online J*, 10(1), 7.
- Stubbs, J. (2009). *Measuring community wellbeing in cotton communities*. Retrieved from http://www.insidecotton.com/xmlui/handle/1/441
- Stutzer, A. (2004). The role of income aspirations in individual happiness. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 54(1), 89–109. http://doi.org/DOI 10.1016/j.jebo.2003.04.003
- Suikkanen, J. (2011). An improved whole life satisfaction theory of happiness. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 1(1), 149–166. http://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v1i1.6
- Summers, J. K., Smith, L. M., Case, J. L., & Linthurst, R. A. (2012). review of the elements of human well-being with an emphasis on the contribution of ecosystem services. *Ambio*, 41(4), 327–340. http://doi.org/DOI 10.1007/s13280-012-0256-7
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). Using Multivariate Statistics. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Tan, T. H. (2012). Meeting first-time buyers' housing needs and preferences in greaterKualaLumpur.Cities,29((6),http://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2011.11.016
- Tanguay, G. A., Rajaonson, J., Lefebvre, J. F., & Lanoie, P. (2010). Measuring the sustainability of cities: An analysis of the use of local indicators. *Ecological Indicators*, 10(2), 407–418. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2009.07.013
- The New ClimateEconomy. (2015). Seizing the global opportunity: partnerships for better growth and a better climate. Washington, DC: New Climate Economy.

- Tiberius, V., & Plakias, A. (2010). 'Well-being'. In J.Doris and the moral of Psychology Research Group (Ed.), *The moral of Psychology Handbook* (eds, pp. 403–432). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tichy, G. (2013). *Subjective well-being and socio-ecological transition*. (No. Paper, 6.).
- Tinkler, L., & Hicks, S. (2011). Measuring subjective well-being. London.
- Tomao, A., Secondi, L., Corona, P., Giuliarelli, D., Quatrini, V., & Agrimi, M. (2015). Can composite indices explain multidimensionality of tree risk assessment? A case study in an historical monumental complex. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 14(3), 456–465. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2015.04.009
- Tomyn, A. J., Fuller Tyszkiewicz, M. D., & Cummins, R. a. (2013). The Personal Wellbeing Index: Psychometric Equivalence for Adults and School Children. Social Indicators Research, 110, 913–924. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9964-9
- Trumpp, C., Endrikat, J., Zopf, C., & Guenther, E. (2015). Definition, Conceptualization, and Measurement of Corporate Environmental Performance: A Critical Examination of a Multidimensional Construct. Journal of Business Ethics, 1–20. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1931-8
- Tweed, C., & Sutherland, M. (2007). Built cultural heritage and sustainable urban development. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 83(1), 62–69. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.05.008
- Uchida, Y., & Oishi, S. (2016). The happiness of individuals and the collective. Japaniese Psychological Research, 58(1), 125–141. http://doi.org/10.1111/jpr.12103
- UGEC View. (2008). Urban Responses to Climate Change. A focus on the Americas (Vol. UGEC Viewp). Retrieved from www.ugec.org
- Ugwu, O. O., & Haupt, T. C. (2007). Key performance indicators and assessment methods for infrastructure sustainability—a South African construction industry perspective. *Building and Environment*, 42(2), 665–680. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2005.10.018
- Ujanga, N., Moulayb, A., & Khalilah, Z. (2015). Sense of Well-Being Indicators: Attachment to public parks in Putrajaya, Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 202, 487 – 494. http://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.195
- UN-Habitat. (2012). Prosperity of Cities: State of the World's Cities 2012/2013. State of the World's Cities. http://doi.org/10.1080/07293682.2013.861498
- UN-Habitat. (2008). State of the World's Cities 2008-2009: Harmonious Cities. Earthscan.

- UN WCED. (1987). Our common future. World Commission on Environment and Development. Oxford University Press.
- UNECE/Eurostat/OECD. (2013). Framework and suggested indicators to measure sustainable development.
- United Nations. (2013). World Population Prospects: The 2012 Revision. http://doi.org/21 February 2014
- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, P. D. (2014). World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision, Highlights (ST/ESA/SER.A/352).
- United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development(UNCSD). (2013). Resource Platform.
- United Nations Department of Economic & United Nations. Department of Public Information. (2009). *The millennium development goals report 2009. United Nations Publications*.
- UNU/IAS Report. (2003). *De ning an Ecosystem Approach to Urban Management and Policy Development*. Tokyo.
- Ura, K., Alkire, S., & Zangmo, T. (2012). GNH and GNH Index. The Centre for Bhutan Studies.
- Ura, K., Alkire, S., Zangmo, T., & Wangdi, K. (2012). An extensive analysis of GNH index.
- Urbach, N., & Ahlemann, F. (2010). Structural equation modeling in information systems research using partial least squares. *Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application*, 11(2), 5–40.
- Veenhoven, R. (2012). Happiness, also known as 'life satisfaction' and 'subjective well-being'. In K. Land, A. C. Michalos, & M. J. Sirgy (Eds.),. In *Handbook of social indicators and quality of life research*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Veenhoven, R. (2012). Social Development and Happiness in Nations (indices of Social Development No. No. 2012-3). The Hague. Retrieved from www.iss.nl

Veenhoven, R. (2013). Conditions of happiness. Springer Science & Business Media.

Veenhoven, R. (2014). World database of happiness. In *In Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research* (pp. 7257–7260). Springer Netherlands.

Veenhoven, R., & Ehrhardt, J. (1995). The cross-national pattern of happiness: Test of predictions implied in three theories of happiness. *Social Indicators Research*, 34(1), 33–68.

- Veenhoven, R., & Hagerty, M. (2006). Rising Happiness in Nations 1946–2004: A Reply to Easterlin. *Social Indicators Research*, 79(3), 421–436. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-005-5074-x
- Vemuri, A.W., & Costanza, R. (2006). The role of human, social, built and natural capital in explaining life satisfaction at the country level. *Ecological Economics*, 58(1), 119–133. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.02.008
- Vemuri, A. W., & Costanza, R. (2006). The role of human, social, built, and natural capital in explaining life satisfaction at the country level: Toward a National Well-Being Index (NWI). *Ecological Economics*, 58, 119–133. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.02.008
- Venkatesh, V., Brown, S. A., & Bala, H. (2013). Bridging the qualitative-quantitative divide: Guidelines for conducting mixed methods research in information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 37(1), 21–54.
- Vinzi, V. E., Trinchera, L., & Amato, S. (2010). PLS Path Modeling: From Foundations to Recent Developments and Open Issues for Model Assessment and Improvement. In *Handbook of Partial Least Squares* (pp. 47–82). http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-32827-8
- Virola, R. a, Encarnacion, J. O., & Pascasio, M. C. (2011). Improving the Way We Measure Progress of Society : The Philippine Happiness Index among the Poor and the Unhappy, 4985–4990.
- Voicu, B., & Pop, C. E. (2011). Measurement Models of Life Satisfaction: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach. *Calitatea Vieții, 2*, 137–154.
- von der Gracht, H. A. (2012). Consensus measurement in Delphi studies. Review and implications for future quality assurance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 79, 1525–1536. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2012.04.013
- Warner, K. S. (2013). Warner, K. S. (2013). The Wellbeing Index: A Landscape of Worldwide Measures and the Potential for Large-Scale Change.
- Waziri, A. G., Yusof, N., & Salleh, A. G. (2013). Residential Satisfaction with Private Housing Estate Development in Abuja-Nigeria. *ALAM CIPTA, International Journal of Sustainable Tropical Design Research and Practice*, 6(December), 3–12.
- Weidman, J. E., Miller, K. R., Christofferson, J. P., & Newitt, J. S. (2011). Best Practices for Dealing with Price Volatility in Commercial Construction. *International Journal of Construction Education and Research*, 7(4), 276– 293. http://doi.org/10.1080/15578771.2011.552936
- Weiland, U., Kindler, A., Banzhaf, E., Ebert, A., & Reyes-Paecke, S. (2011). Indicators for sustainable land use management in Santiago de Chile. *Ecological Indicators*, 11(5), 1074–1083.

- Welsch, H., & Kühling, J. (2009). Using happiness data for environmental valuation: Issues and applications. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 23(2), 385–406. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6419.2008.00566.x
- Wetzels, M., Odekerken-Schröder, G., & van Oppen, C. (2009). Using PLS path modeling for assessing hierarchical construct models: Guidelines and Empirical Illustration. *MIS Quarterly*, 33(1), 177–195. http://doi.org/Article
- White, S. C. (2010). Analysing wellbeing: a framework for development practice, (May 2014), 37–41. http://doi.org/10.1080/09614520903564199
- Whitehead, D. (2008). An international Delphi study examining health promotion and health education in nursing practice, education and policy. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *17*(7), 891–900. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2007.02079.x
- Wilhelm, W. J. (2001). Wilhelm, W. J. (2001). Alchemy of the Oracle: The Delphi Technique. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 43(1), 6–26.
- Williams, L. J., Edwards, J. R., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2003). Recent advances in causal modeling methods for organizational and management research. *Journal of Management*, 29(6), 903–936.
- Winston, N., & Pareja Eastaway, M. (2008). Sustainable housing in the urban context: International sustainable development indicator sets and housing. Social Indicators Research, 87(2), 211–221. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9165-8
- Wiseman, J., & Brasher, K. (2008). Community wellbeing in an unwell world: trends, challenges, and possibilities. *Journal of Public Health Policy*, 29(3), 353–366. http://doi.org/10.1057/jphp.2008.16
- Wolfers, J., Stevenson, B., & Wolfers, J. (2008). Economic Growth and Subjective Well-Being: Reassessing the Easterlin Paradox. *IZA Discussion Paper*, (3654), 1–87. http://doi.org/10.1353/eca.0.0001
- Wong, C. (2006). *Indicators for urban and regional planning: the interplay of policy and methods*. Routledge.
- Wong, K. K. (2013). 28/05 Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Techniques Using SmartPLS. *Marketing Bulletin*, 24, 1–32. http://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128
- World, & Bank. (2011). World Development Indicators 2011. World Development (Vol. 23). http://doi.org/10.1097/QAD.0b013e328349a414
- World Economic and Social Survey. (2013). Sustainable Development Challenges (No. E/2013/50/Rev. 1 ST/ESA/344). New York.
- WorldBank. (2008). *Cities of hope? Governance, economic and human challenges of Kenya's five largest cities.* Washington, DC.

- Wren-Lewis, S. (2010). owards a complete account of psychological happiness. *Praxis*, 2(2), 58-81.
- Wright, R. T., Campbell, D. E., Thatcher, J. B., & Roberts, N. (2012). Operationalizing Multidimensional Constructs in Structural Equation Modeling: Recommendations for IS Research. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 30(June 2012), 367–412.
- Wu, J. (2014). Urban ecology and sustainability: The state-of-the-science and future directions. Landscape and Urban Planning, 125, 209–221. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.01.018
- Wu, J., & T. Wu. (2012). Sustainability indicators and indices. In Christian N. Madu and C. Kuei (Ed.), *Handbook of Sustainable Management*. (eds, pp. 65–86). London: Imperial College Press,.
- Xing, Y., Horner, R. M. W., El-Haram, M. a., & Bebbington, J. (2009a). A framework model for assessing sustainability impacts of urban development. Accounting Forum, 33(3), 209–224. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.accfor.2008.09.003
- Xing, Y., Horner, R. M. W., El-Haram, M. a., & Bebbington, J. (2009b). A framework model for assessing sustainability impacts of urban development. In *Accounting Forum* (Vol. 33, pp. 209–224). Elsevier. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.accfor.2008.09.003
- Yanarella, E. J., & Levine, R. S. (2011). *The City as Fulcrum of Global Sustainability*. London: Anthem Press.
- Yap, Y. C., Usman, I. M. S., Tahir, M. M., & Abidin, I. S. Z. (2011). Assessment Of Perbadanan Putrajaya Office Ground Based On Urban Open Space Design Guideline. In *The International Journal on the Biology of Stress* (pp. 331– 337).
- Yarime, M., Takeda, Y., & Kajikawa, Y. (2010). Towards institutional analysis of sustainability science: A quantitative examination of the patterns of research collaboration. *Sustainability Science*, 5(1), 115–125. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-009-0090-4
- Yeung, J. F. Y., Chan, A. P. C., Chan, D. W. M., & Li, L. K. (2007). Development of a Partnering Performance Index (PPI) for Construction Projects in Hong Kong : a Delphi Study. *Construction Management and Economics*, 25, 1219– 1237. http://doi.org/10.1080/01446190701598673
- Yigitcanlar, T. (2014). Position paper: benchmarking the performance of global and emerging knowledge cities. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 41(12), 5549–5559.

- Yigitcanlar, T., & Dur, F. (2010). Developing a Sustainability Assessment Model: The Sustainable Infrastructure, Land-Use, Environment and Transport Model. Sustainability, 2, 321–340. http://doi.org/10.3390/su2010321
- Yigitcanlar, T., Dur, F., & Dizdaroglu, D. (2015). Towards prosperous sustainable cities: A multiscalar urban sustainability assessment approach. *Habitat International*, pp. 36–46. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2014.06.033
- Yigitcanlar, T., Kamruzzaman, M., & Teriman, S. (2015). Neighborhood Sustainability Assessment: Evaluating Residential Development Sustainability in a Developing Country Context. Sustainability, 7(3), 2570– 2602.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). Case study research: Design and methods. Sage publications.
- Ying, C. F., Naziaty Mohd Yaacob, & Hazreena, H. (2013). Achieving sustainable development: Accessibility of green buildings in Malaysia. Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences, 101, 120–129.
- Yuen, Ahmad, S., & Ho. (2006). Malaysia. In B. Roberts & T. Kanaley (Eds.), Urbanization and sustainability in Asia: Case studies of good practice. Asian Development Bank. Phillipines.
- Zainul Abidin Nazirah, N. (2010). Investigating the awareness and application of sustainable construction concept by Malaysian developers. *Habitat International*, 34(4), 421–426. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2009.11.011
- Zakaria, B., Abdullah, R., Ramli, M. F., & Latif, P. A. (2013). Selection criteria using the Delphi method for siting an integrated hazardous waste disposal facility in Malaysia. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 56(4), 512– 530.
- Zhang, X., Wu, Y., & Liyin, S. (2011). An evaluation framework for the sustainability of urban land use : A study of capital cities and municipalities in China.pdf. *Habitat International*, 35(1), 141–149.
- Zhao, H., Yang, L., & Li, C. (2011). The Research of GNH Based on Need-Hierarchy Theory. In Management and Service Science (MASS). In 2011 International Conference on IEEE. (pp. 1–5).
- Zhao, Z. G., Cheng, J. Q., Xu, S. L., Hou, W. L., & Richardus, J. H. (2015). A quality assessment index framework for public health services: a Delphi study. *Public Health.*, 129(1), 43–51. http://doi.org/doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2014.10.016
- Zhou, P., Ang, B. W., & Zhou, D. Q. (2010). Weighting and aggregation in composite indicator construction: A multiplicative optimization approach. Social Indicators Research, 96(1), 169–181. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9472-3

Zidanšek, A. (2007). Sustainable development and happiness in nations. *Energy*, 32(6), 891–897. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2006.09.016

