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Abstract. Poverty is the inability to meet the basic needs of life, both for food, clothing, and shelter that might happiness of the people’s life. By collecting both primary and secondary data, the main objective of this study is to determine the level of happiness of the people divided into poor and non-poor households, so that this research might bring a better understanding of poverty in Indonesia, with special case of Kedungkandang District, Malang City through the measurement of Happiness Index covering three dimensions. Happiness threshold is at a scale of 60-79.9 namely Happy level, result research indicates that the district has a quite happy level for the people whole live in it with an average value of the HI at about 44.62. Some important variables to be noticed from the three dimensions are the LSI indicates that in general district residents have higher social satisfaction than their personal, the LAI whereby variables of unworried and undepressed at some sub-districts indicate the very low value, and the LMI wherein neighborhood control has the very low value. For future research, it seems important to scrutinize the social structure of the community to find better possibilities on dealing with poverty through their social ties.
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1. Introduction

Happiness is the accommodation of positive conditions from the psychological, emotional, and cognitive aspects felt by individuals in the form of pleasure, calm, and happiness (Ilham & Farid, 2019). Everyone has different obstacles in achieving happiness so as a result, some are able to achieve happiness with their efforts, some are not able to achieve or partly achieve, but part of the meaning of their happiness in life (Ilham & Farid, 2019). Human welfare is the ability to take part in community life, be free to move, and have the freedom to choose to be the person you want and be able to do anything (Amalia & Nurpita, 2017).

As for the inability to fulfill needs, it is identical to the status of poverty and poverty is not a condition of meeting primary needs which require individuals to work extra, even during work breaks, as a result, the opportunity to rest, calm down and enjoy life is not possible (Ilham & Farid, 2019). Poverty is a multidimensional problem because it is related to the inability to access economically, socially, culturally, politically, and participate in society. Poverty has a broader meaning than simply a person's lower level of income or consumption than measured welfare standards such as the minimum calorie requirement or poverty line, but poverty has a deeper meaning because it relates to the inability to
achieve aspects outside of income (non-income factors) such as access to minimum needs, health, education, clean water and sanitation (Nurwati, 2008).

Poverty appears in the social reality of society, various symptoms appear and cause poverty, one of the main factors is insufficient income. When viewed from an economic point of view, the meaning of happiness according to each community will certainly not be the same, so departing from these differences, this study focuses on research on happiness according to poor and non-poor groups (Ilham & Farid, 2019). In the context of society as an object of development, an indicator is needed to measure the development of life or the level of welfare of the community itself. The level of community welfare can be measured in two ways, namely using the same standard (objective indicators) and different standards (subjective indicators). One of the welfare indicators that measure achievement based on unequal standards for each individual is the happiness index (HI) (Angela, 2017).

The HI is calculated based on the assessment of community satisfaction covering 10 aspects of life such as household income, housing conditions and assets, employment, education, health, availability of free time, social relations, family harmony, security conditions, and environmental conditions. In achieving a high happiness index, several aspects need to be improved by each local government, including education, job availability, household income, housing, and health (Prasetijaningsih, 2015).

One of the urban areas in Indonesia that are still experiencing poverty problems is Malang City. Malang City consists of five sub-districts, of which Kedungkandang District is one of the districts that have the highest number of poor people (Rukmi et al, 2019). Based on previous research, it is known that Kota Lama Village has the highest number of poor families – at about 816 families, meanwhile, the lowest number of poor families lives in Arjowinangun Village at around 167 families (Rukmi et al, 2019). Therefore, the main objective of this study is to determine the level of happiness of the people divided into poor and non-poor households, so that this research might bring a better understanding of the poverty characteristic of Kedungkandang District, Malang City.

2. Methods
Calculation of the HI is sourced from the dimension and indicator components issued by the Central Statistics Agency (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2017). According to the Central Bureau of Statistics (2017), the HI consists of three dimensions covering i) dimension of life satisfaction (personal life satisfaction & social life satisfaction), ii) dimension of feeling, and iii) dimension of life meaning. The three dimensions have a total of 19 indicators with a scale value of the HI between 0 – 100 (unhappy – very happy)

Each dimension, sub-dimension, and indicator have an unequal contribution in preparing the HI. The amount of weight for each dimension, sub-dimension, and the indicator is not determined with the same value or based on subjective assessments, but it is calculated based on the distribution of data using statistical methods, namely Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) with Principal Component Analysis (PCA) as the method of factor extraction. The process of factor extraction is processed using SPSS software so that the weights of each dimension will be known (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2017).

2.1. Data Collection and Sampling
Referring to Sugiyono (2017), the source of data is collected from primary and secondary. Primary data collection techniques were carried out by researchers through field observation as well as interviews by distributing questionnaire forms to respondents. The research questionnaire is designed based on the survey guidelines for measuring the level of happiness issued by the Central Statistics Agency in 2017. In addition, this study also collects secondary data from related agencies namely Kedungkandang District Government and Malang City Central Statistic Agency.

In order to answer properly the main purpose of the research of measuring the life HI in the Kedungkandang District, the research unit of analysis is in the sub-district. Primary data are collected through a face-to-face questionnaire survey to 348 selected heads of households at the 12 sub-districts. The selected respondents are distributed through stratified proportional sampling consist of poor and non-poor households.
Table 1. Kedungkandang District Population (household) and Sampling Proportion.

| No | Sub District     | Poor Households | Non-Poor Households | Total of Households | Poor Households Sample | Non Poor Households Sample |
|----|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1  | Arjowinangun     | 167             | 1960                | 2127                | 2                      | 19                         |
| 2  | Tlogowaru        | 179             | 1120                | 1299                | 2                      | 13                         |
| 3  | Wonokoyo         | 281             | 1005                | 1286                | 3                      | 12                         |
| 4  | Bumiayu          | 466             | 2964                | 3430                | 4                      | 26                         |
| 5  | Buring           | 741             | 1737                | 2478                | 7                      | 17                         |
| 6  | Mergosono        | 620             | 2933                | 3553                | 6                      | 26                         |
| 7  | Kotalama         | 816             | 5321                | 6137                | 7                      | 44                         |
| 8  | Kedungkandang    | 287             | 1833                | 2120                | 3                      | 18                         |
| 9  | Sawojajar        | 333             | 4843                | 5176                | 3                      | 41                         |
| 10 | Madyopuro        | 394             | 3572                | 3966                | 3                      | 31                         |
| 11 | Lesanpuro        | 621             | 3248                | 3869                | 5                      | 29                         |
| 12 | Cemorokandang    | 355             | 2259                | 2614                | 4                      | 21                         |
|    | Kedungkandang District | 5260       | 32795               | 38055               | 49                     | 299                        |

Source: Kedungkandang District Office, 2018 *stratified proportional sampling

2.2. Happiness Index (HI) Method

The HI is a comprehensive survey instrument that assesses happiness, well-being, and aspects of sustainability and resilience (Musikanski, et al, 2017). The instrument for calculating the happiness index can be used for organizations, governments, researchers, or communities that want to calculate the wellbeing index of subjects and data. Instruments can be used to measure life satisfaction and living conditions. In addition, it can define income inequality, trust in government, sense of community, and other aspects of well-being in certain demographics of a population (Musikanski, et al, 2017). The indicators for calculating the HI according to the BPS (2017) are divided into three dimensions. Then, level of the average of HI is in the range of 0–100 that is classified within 5 levels: i) 0-19,9 = Unhappy; ii) 20-39,9 = Less Happy; iii) 40-59,9 = Quite Happy; iv) 60-79,9 = Happy; and v) 80-100 = Very Happy.

2.2.1. Life Satisfaction Index (LSI). The LSI is used as a measure of subjective well-being. The level of happiness or life satisfaction of the Indonesian population is divided into a scale of 0-100 (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2017). The higher the happiness index value, the happier the population’s conditions are. The unidirectional pattern when paired with a data index macro-economic indicators shows that progress has implemented economic development go hand in hand with an increase in subjective well-being. The calculation of dimensional weights uses the SPSS software with data input on all happiness index variables. So that the dimensional weights will be generated for each dimension variable of the happiness index. The LSI consists of the index of personal satisfaction and social satisfaction index. Therefore several scores must be obtained from the respondent, such as: satisfaction of education & skills, profession, income, healthy, house facility & condition (Personal Satisfaction Index); and then the satisfaction of family relation, free time, social realtion, neighborhood condition and safety (Social Satisfaction Index).

\[
\text{Life Satisfaction Index (LSI)} = \frac{W_1 \times \text{Personal Satisfaction Index} + W_2 \times \text{Social Satisfaction Index}}{W_1 + W_2}
\]  

(Eq.1)

Whereas,

\( W_1 = \text{the weight of personal satisfaction dimension} \)
\( W_2 = \text{the weight of social satisfaction dimension} \)
2.2.2. **Life Affect Index (LAI).** The LAI is a measure for people's affect. The scale of the feeling of the Indonesian people is between 0 - 100, plus the value of the feeling of feeling in a positive condition is high. The calculation of dimensional weights uses the SPSS software with data input on all happiness index variables. So that the dimensional weights will be generated for each dimension variable of the happiness index.

\[
\text{Life Satisfaction Index} (\text{LAI}) = \frac{W_1 \times \text{Happy Affect Score} + W_2 \times \text{Unworried Affect Score} + W_3 \times \text{Undepressed Affect Score}}{W_1 + W_2 + W_3} \tag{Eq. 2}
\]

Whereas,

\begin{align*}
W_1 &= \text{the weight of happy affect dimension} \\
W_2 &= \text{the weight of unworried affect dimension} \\
W_3 &= \text{the weight of undepressed affect dimension}
\end{align*}

2.2.3. **Life Meaning Index (LMI).** The LMI is a measure of the Life Meaning of the population. The scale of the assessment of the Life Meaning in society is also in the range of 0-100, meaning the higher the index value of the dimension of the Life Mining, the more meaningful the living conditions are. The calculation of dimensional weights uses the SPSS software with data input on all happiness index variables. So that the dimensional weights will be generated for each dimension variable of the happiness index.

\[
\text{Life Meaning Index} (\text{LMI}) = \frac{W_1 \times I_1 + W_2 \times I_2 + W_3 \times I_3 + W_4 \times I_4 + W_5 \times I_5 + W_6 \times I_6}{W_1 + W_2 + W_3 + W_4 + W_5 + W_6} \tag{Eq. 3}
\]

Whereas,

\begin{align*}
I_1 &= \text{Independence Score} \\
I_2 &= \text{Neighborhood Control Score} \\
I_3 &= \text{Self Development Score} \\
I_4 &= \text{Positive Relations with Other People Score} \\
I_5 &= \text{Purpose of Life Score} \\
I_6 &= \text{Self Acceptance Score}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
W_1 &= \text{the weight of Independence dimension} \\
W_2 &= \text{the weight of Neighborhood Control dimension} \\
W_3 &= \text{the weight of Self Development dimension} \\
W_4 &= \text{the weight of Positive Relations with Other People dimension} \\
W_5 &= \text{the weight of Purpose of Life Score dimension} \\
W_6 &= \text{the weight of Self Acceptance Score dimension}
\end{align*}

After calculating the overall index, the HI can be calculated as follows (Eq.4)

\[
\text{Life Happiness Index} = \frac{W_1 \times \text{Life Satisfaction Index} + W_2 \times \text{Life Affect Index} + W_3 \times \text{Meaning of Life Index}}{W_1 + W_2 + W_3} \tag{Eq. 4}
\]

Whereas,

\begin{align*}
W_1 &= \text{the weight of life satisfaction dimension} \\
W_2 &= \text{the weight of life affect index dimension} \\
W_3 &= \text{the weight of life meaning dimension}
\end{align*}

3. **Result & Discussion**

The indicators for calculating the HI according to the BPS (2017) are divided into three dimensions. Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4 display results of the index calculation per dimension whereby each sub-district is divided into poor and non-poor households. At each dimension also calculate a score for each subdimension or variable.
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Table 2. Kedungkandang District Life Satisfaction Index (LSI) Calculation.

| Sub District   | Households Classification | Life Satisfaction |   |   |   |
|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|
|                |                           | Personal Life Satisfaction | Social Life Satisfaction | Average |
| Arjowinangun   | Non Poor                  | 31.74              | 57.90 | 44.82 |
|                | Poor                      | 39.42              | 64.73 | 52.08 |
| Wonokoyo      | Non Poor                  | 33.37              | 62.62 | 47.99 |
|                | Poor                      | 15.36              | 62.50 | 38.93 |
| Cemorokandang  | Non Poor                  | 30.95              | 56.05 | 43.50 |
|                | Poor                      | 28.96              | 57.18 | 43.07 |
| Tlogowaru      | Non Poor                  | 30.98              | 58.53 | 44.75 |
|                | Poor                      | 21.50              | 64.98 | 43.24 |
| Sawojajar      | Non Poor                  | 40.46              | 60.16 | 50.31 |
|                | Poor                      | 32.77              | 63.56 | 48.16 |
| Mergosono      | Non Poor                  | 38.83              | 61.64 | 50.24 |
|                | Poor                      | 27.31              | 48.11 | 37.71 |
| Madyopuro      | Non Poor                  | 41.23              | 60.30 | 50.76 |
|                | Poor                      | 41.57              | 61.60 | 51.59 |
| Lesanpuro      | Non Poor                  | 41.77              | 61.52 | 51.65 |
|                | Poor                      | 34.82              | 53.57 | 44.19 |
| Kotalama       | Non Poor                  | 38.43              | 60.15 | 49.29 |
|                | Poor                      | 30.49              | 51.09 | 40.79 |
| Buring         | Non Poor                  | 38.61              | 59.87 | 49.24 |
|                | Poor                      | 38.62              | 59.52 | 49.07 |
| Kedungkandang  | Non Poor                  | 31.40              | 52.00 | 41.70 |
|                | Poor                      | 24.58              | 54.31 | 39.44 |
| Bumiayu        | Non Poor                  | 37.57              | 61.11 | 49.34 |
|                | Poor                      | 32.26              | 63.98 | 48.12 |

| Kedungkandang  | Non Poor                  | 47.80              |   |   |   |
| District       | Poor                      | 44.70              |   |   |   |

The overall calculation of the LSI indicates that there is a slightly higher value of the non-poor households compare to the poor households, at about 0.10. The comparison of life satisfaction between personal and social aspects depicts that the social life satisfaction of the whole sub-districts has a higher value than the personal aspect. For the value of personal life satisfaction, there are 9 sub-districts whereby the non-poor households have a higher value than the poor households. Then, for the social life satisfaction, there are 6 sub-districts among the total whereby the non-poor households have a higher value than the poor. The overall calculation, the LSI in Kedungkandang district indicates the lowest value compares to others at about 41.70 and 39.44 for the non-poor and poor households, respectively.

Table 3. Kedungkandang District Life Affection Index (LAI) Calculation.

| Sub District   | Households Classification | Life Affection |   |   |   |
|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|---|---|---|
|                |                           | Happy          | Unworried | Undepressed | Average |
| Arjowinangun   | Non Poor                  | 67.40          | 53.75     | 41.94       | 54.36   |
|                | Poor                      | 72.89          | 45.06     | 22.76       | 46.90   |
| Wonokoyo      | Non Poor                  | 79.14          | 36.05     | 26.81       | 47.33   |
|                | Poor                      | 47.20          | 33.65     | 30.35       | 37.07   |
| Cemorokandang  | Non Poor                  | 70.34          | 34.85     | 24.62       | 43.27   |
|                | Poor                      | 73.78          | 15.45     | 10.41       | 33.21   |
| Tlogowaru      | Non Poor                  | 68.72          | 46.26     | 35.41       | 50.13   |
|                | Poor                      | 77.75          | 43.26     | 42.49       | 54.50   |
| Sawojajar      | Non Poor                  | 70.92          | 18.95     | 14.57       | 34.81   |
|                | Poor                      | 74.97          | 33.99     | 29.48       | 46.15   |
| Mergosono      | Non Poor                  | 71.77          | 33.83     | 23.35       | 42.98   |

5
in whole, households also have a slightly higher value than non-poor ones. Calculation of each variable indicates that in general life affection of the poor households show a lower value than the poor households regarding the affection of life (1,25), whereby 5 of 12 sub-districts of the poor households show a higher value of the LAI than the non-poor households. Amongst the three variables, the life affection of the happy variable has the highest value at the whole sub-districts compare to the other two variables. Calculation of each variable indicates that in general life affection of the poor households also have a slightly higher value than non-poor households that is happened in at about 8/12, and 7/12 subdistricts for happy and undepressed variables, meanwhile for the unworried variable the number of poor households which have a higher value than the non-poor is about 5/12 sub-districts. As a whole, the Kedungkandang sub-district has the lowest LAI value for both the non-poor and poor households, at about 27,31 and 26,71 respectively.

Table 3 illustrates the measurement of LAI consist of 3 sub-dimensions of variables namely happy, unworried, and undepressed. The overall result displays that the non-poor households have a slightly lower value than the poor households regarding the affection of life (1,25), whereby 5 of 12 sub-districts of the poor households show a higher value of the LAI than the non-poor households. Amongst the three variables, the life affection of the happy variable has the highest value at the whole sub-districts compare to the other two variables. Calculation of each variable indicates that in general life affection of the poor households also have a slightly higher value than non-poor households that is happened in at about 8/12, and 7/12 subdistricts for happy and undepressed variables, meanwhile for the unworried variable the number of poor households which have a higher value than the non-poor is about 5/12 sub-districts. As a whole, the Kedungkandang sub-district has the lowest LAI value for both the non-poor and poor households, at about 27,31 and 26,71 respectively.

Table 4. Kedungkandang District Life Meaning Index (LMI) Calculation.

| Sub District | Happy | Unworried | Undepressed | Average |
|--------------|-------|-----------|-------------|----------|
| Madyopuro    | 70.81 | 48.07     | 35.41       | 51.43    |
| Poor         | 71.35 | 25.08     | 16.89       | 37.77    |
| Lesanpuro    | 79.97 | 41.82     | 21.85       | 47.88    |
| Poor         | 74.97 | 17.90     | 14.02       | 35.63    |
| Kotalama     | 72.12 | 55.97     | 44.73       | 57.61    |
| Poor         | 64.79 | 54.48     | 37.77       | 52.34    |
| Buring       | 69.09 | 12.30     | 11.07       | 30.82    |
| Poor         | 69.02 | 9.7       | 9.54        | 29.28    |
| Kedungkandang| 38.87 | 24.83     | 18.21       | 27.31    |
| Poor         | 54.15 | 10.82     | 15.18       | 26.71    |
| Bumiayu      | 70.66 | 45.25     | 35.37       | 50.43    |
| Poor         | 74.97 | 57.68     | 45.53       | 59.39    |

Table 3 illustrates the measurement of LAI consist of 3 sub-dimensions of variables namely happy, unworried, and undepressed. The overall result displays that the non-poor households have a slightly lower value than the poor households regarding the affection of life (1,25), whereby 5 of 12 sub-districts of the poor households show a higher value of the LAI than the non-poor households. Amongst the three variables, the life affection of the happy variable has the highest value at the whole sub-districts compare to the other two variables. Calculation of each variable indicates that in general life affection of the poor households also have a slightly higher value than non-poor households that is happened in at about 8/12, and 7/12 subdistricts for happy and undepressed variables, meanwhile for the unworried variable the number of poor households which have a higher value than the non-poor is about 5/12 sub-districts. As a whole, the Kedungkandang sub-district has the lowest LAI value for both the non-poor and poor households, at about 27,31 and 26,71 respectively.

Table 4. Kedungkandang District Life Meaning Index (LMI) Calculation.
The LMI covers 6 sub-dimensions or variables, whereby the average result of the LMI indicates that the poor households have a higher value than the non-poor households with a difference of around 2.01. Amongst the sixth variables, the value of neighborhood control indicates the lowest value in a range between 7.96 – 19.90. Then for the whole LMI value, again Kedungkandang district has the lowest value than others at about 31.84 and 41.94 for the non-poor and poor households, respectively.

The following Table 5 indicates the result of the average of HI covering the three dimensions whereby each sub-district is also divided into poor and non-poor households. In general, this research still assumes that the non-poor households might have higher life happiness than the poor households since each variable at each dimension is very close to the forming of a happy life.
Table 5. Kedungkandang District Life Happiness Index.

| No | Sub District | Households Categories | Life Satisfaction Index | Life Affect Index | Life Meaning Index | Life Happiness Index Average |
|----|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1  | Arjowinangun | Non-Poor              | 44,82                   | 54,36            | 46,97             | 49,05                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 52,08                   | 46,90            | 45,76             | 48,24                      |
| 2  | Wonokoyo     | Non-Poor              | 47,99                   | 47,33            | 47,95             | 47,73                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 38,93                   | 37,07            | 26,74             | 34,57                      |
| 3  | Cemorokandang| Non-Poor              | 43,50                   | 43,27            | 42,33             | 43,06                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 43,07                   | 33,21            | 39,72             | 38,38                      |
| 4  | Tlogowaru    | Non-Poor              | 44,75                   | 50,13            | 46,80             | 47,38                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 43,24                   | 54,50            | 48,39             | 49,00                      |
| 5  | Sawojajar    | Non-Poor              | 50,31                   | 34,82            | 45,45             | 43,06                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 48,16                   | 46,15            | 46,48             | 46,90                      |
| 6  | Mergosono    | Non-Poor              | 50,24                   | 42,98            | 46,33             | 46,35                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 37,71                   | 51,43            | 47,46             | 45,77                      |
| 7  | Madyopuro    | Non-Poor              | 50,76                   | 37,77            | 46,06             | 44,50                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 51,59                   | 47,88            | 47,63             | 49,01                      |
| 8  | Lesanpuro    | Non-Poor              | 51,65                   | 35,63            | 46,39             | 44,08                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 44,19                   | 42,70            | 45,39             | 43,99                      |
| 9  | Kotalama     | Non-Poor              | 49,29                   | 57,61            | 46,93             | 51,69                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 40,79                   | 52,34            | 40,95             | 45,15                      |
| 10 | Buring       | Non-Poor              | 49,24                   | 30,82            | 45,38             | 40,57                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 49,07                   | 29,28            | 44,19             | 40,84                      |
| 11 | Kedungkandang| Non-Poor              | 41,70                   | 27,31            | 31,84             | 33,36                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 39,44                   | 26,71            | 41,94             | 35,44                      |
| 12 | Bumiayu      | Non-Poor              | 49,34                   | 50,43            | 49,63             | 49,83                      |
|    |              | Poor                  | 48,12                   | 59,39            | 49,79             | 52,84                      |

Table 5 indicates the compilation of measurement of the three dimensions of the happiness index. The average value of the HI describes that the non-poor households have a slightly higher level than the poor ones, at about 45.06 and 44.18, respectively, with the difference value at about 0/88. The final right column indicates the life of HI for each sub-district regardless of the poor and non-poor households, whereby Kedungkandang sub-district has the lowest level at about 34.40, meanwhile Bumiayu sub-district has the highest level at about 51.33. Meaning that the Kedungkandang sub-district is classified as places at the Less Happy level, meanwhile the Bumiayu sub-district at the Quite Happy level. However, it is still important to be noticed that although the Bumiayu sub-district and the other 10 sub-districts could classify into the level of Quite Happy, the value is still far from the highest range within the level at about 40-59.9. Hence, in general, the HI of the district is still in the third low level of happiness.
Figure 1 is a map that shows the two classifications of the HI of the Kedungkandang district. Two different colors indicate the classification of the HI, green means quite happy, red means less happy. As depicted in Table 5, the Kedungkandang sub-district has a value of 34.40 and classify as less happy sub-district, meanwhile, the 11 other sub-districts have a value range of 40 – 59.9 and classify as quite happy sub-district. In addition, the map displays an interesting fact that though the Kedungkandang sub-district is capital of the district, it has the lowest happiness index than the rest of sub-districts. In summary, the result study might classify Kedungkandang district of Malang City East Java Province Indonesia as a district that has a quite happy level.

4. Conclusion
Happiness threshold is at a scale of 60-79.9 namely Happy level, one level below the highest level at about 80-100 namely Very Happy. So that, as one poor district in Malang City, Kedungkandang district has a Quite Happy level for the people whole live in it with an average value of the HI at about 44.62. Of course, instead of the good news, the result of the study indicates unhappy news. Nevertheless, since the difference value between the poor and non-poor households is very slight, it seems that the gap between the poor and non-poor is not bad in the district. This one might probably generate the quite happy life for the residents.

From the result of the research, this study might notice some important variables to be improved. At the first dimension, the LSI indicates that in general district residents have higher social satisfaction than their personal. Meaning that they are still satisfied with their life due to their ‘good’ social satisfaction that it comes from their relationships with others. Regarding the dimension of LAI, there are two variables – unworried and undepressed at some sub-districts indicate the very low value, meaning that they have a quite severe worry and depression in their life. From the dimension of LMI, neighborhood control has a very low value, compared to the other variables – independence, self-development, positive relations with people, life purpose, and self-acceptance.

Among the three dimensions of the HI, only the LSI dimension indicates that the non-poor households have a slightly higher index than the poor households at about 47.80 and 44.70, respectively. However, it might difficult to just simply conclude that the research result does not meet the assumption whereby the non-poor households might have a higher level of happiness than the poor households since the difference value between the non-poor and poor households for the LAI and LMI is quite small (1.25
and 1.47) and also both has still similar classification at Quite Happy level. In addition, there is only one dimension of the LAI whereby the poor household indicates a slightly higher value than the non-poor households. Therefore, for having a more appropriate understanding of how to deal with poverty level in the district it is necessary to conduct further detailed analysis such scrutinize the social structure of the community at each sub-district to find out the value of social tie among the member of the community in the district on their possibility to generate a stronger flow of information and resources for both internal and external community to reach opportunity of break out their impoverishment (Ari et.al, 2019).
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