

PRIMARY RESEARCH

Socioeconomic Development Based on *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*: The Case of Selected OIC Countries

Hafiz Abdur Rehman^{1*}, Hamid Hasan², Malik Muhammad³

^{1, 2, 3} International Institute of Islamic Economics (IIIE), International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan

Keywords

Socioeconomic development
Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah
Holistic welfare

Received: 20 January 2022

Accepted: 30 May 2022

Abstract.

Purpose: The measures of development keep on changing over time. Starting from economic growth, structural change models, GNI per capita, and nowadays HDI, which includes inequality and environmental concerns, are considered as measures of development. However, the meaning and goals of development for Muslims are different from the contemporary concept of development. Based on Islamic approach to development, we have constructed a *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*-based index of socioeconomic development using the data of WVS 7 for 15 OIC member countries.

Methodology: The Alkire and Foster dual count methodology of constructing multidimensional poverty index has been used to measure the *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* based index of socioeconomic development.

Findings: According to our findings, the most *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* (MS) deprived country is Nigeria and the least deprived is Tajikistan.

Significance: The relative ranking of the countries based on the score of indices of MS dimensions will help these countries to divert policy focus and resources for the betterment of their people.

Limitations: The data used in the construction and measurement of MS index (and MS dimensions indices) are borrowed questions taken from the World Value Survey 7 for 15 OIC member countries.

Practical Implication: The measured value of MS index will help in ranking of Muslim countries on the basis of five dimensions of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*. The given MS ranking of countries can be compared with HDI ranking of UNDP.

KAUJIE Classification: B1, B2, B5

JEL Classification: O1, P5

INTRODUCTION

The prevalent concept of development is based on the belief that development requires acquisition of wealth and material welfare as endorsed by most economics textbooks (Guru &

*Corresponding author: Hafiz Abdur Rehman

†Email: hafiz.abdurrehman@iiu.edu.pk; ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4882-6947>

Yadav, 2019; Kim et al., 2016; Todaro & Smith, 2012). The idea that wealth is an input to improve human welfare and so economists should work on the methods and means to bring ease and comfort to human lives, seems revolutionary. However, after adopting development techniques based on traditional growth theories, Mahboob-ul-Haq, a renowned development economist of the twentieth century, gave a completely different perspective. He shifts the focus of development from conventional wealth-oriented views to a human-centered approach and states, “*We were told to take care of our GNP as that would take care of people—let us reverse this and take care of people as this will take care of our GNP*”¹. He further goes on by saying that humans are both the means to and ends of economic development.

Similarly, under Sen (1985) and Sen (1999) capability approach, humans’ capabilities to function are considered as real development rather than accumulation of wealth. In his views, if one does not have the ability to benefit from given resources, it is just like an illiterate person possessing a book or a sick man having good nutritious food at his disposal (Sen, 1999). World Bank reemphasizes the role and potential of human beings when it quotes that most of the wealth on the globe is produced by the skills and capabilities of people rather than natural or accumulated capital. Thus, the role and scope of humans are important in the process of development.

A study of considerable empirical work reveals that the unnecessary over-emphasis on the material components of development at the cost of moral/spiritual values, has proved an incomplete/wrong approach (Ahmed, 2011; Easterlin & O’Connor, 2020). After World War II, in many countries of the world, real income increased many times but wellbeing and happiness failed to increase, rather worsened in many cases². This is because real income is positively associated with happiness only to a certain extent where one’s biological needs are fulfilled. After that level, some other needs should be fulfilled for an ever-increasing level of happiness and satisfaction. These are mostly spiritual and non-material needs which do not necessarily require income or wealth to get satisfied. The dedicated wealth-oriented approach may in fact hurt the satisfaction of these needs. One of the important reasons for these needs to be fulfilled is achievement of mental peace and inner satisfaction which are not related to income and piling up of wealth through greed and selfish attitude (Easterlin & O’Connor, 2020; Frank, 2012). The foremost of these needs are justice, cooperation and social responsibility which demand fair, respected and dignified treatment of every individual irrespective of his color, race, gender and nationality. Equally important are spiritual and moral values which serve as pre-requisites for resource efficiency and justice in distribution to fulfill all other social and material needs of the society (Haq, 2018; Sen, 1999; Zaman, 2013, 2019). Further down the list are security of honor, life and property, education (both religious and contemporary), marriage, family and social solidarity.

Different definitions of development are presented by Islamic economists with consensus on two points; (1) the ultimate goal of economic development is to achieve happiness or

¹See Bari (2011)

²The increase in income happened because of structural development projects by the World Bank and other donor countries and organizations in war-torn countries and/or former colonies of world powers. SAP (Structural Adjustment Program) by WB and IMF is one example of such programs.

success, and (2) this happiness is achieved by having complete development in both material and spiritual dimensions. According to Hasan (1995), the material needs of human life are related to consumption of goods and services, and the spiritual needs are related to moral, ethical and social aspects of life. The material and spiritual needs may seem conflicting but factually are interrelated and complementary to each other³.

Since Islam is a divine religion and complete code of life for all people of all times, it stands for the welfare of the whole mankind⁴. The set of rules derived from the teachings of Qur'ān and Sunnah is called the Sharī'ah. The objectives of the Sharī'ah are deduced from the principles, laws and moral codes contained therein. The first and foremost of these principles is having belief in the Oneness of Allah (SWT) , which then helps in achieving higher level of each objective of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*. The objectives of Sharī'ah principles are meant to achieve satisfied progress in broader socioeconomic aspects of life. The scholars who have studied and analyzed Sharī'ah laws have found that the implementation of these laws will ensure the progress and prosperity of humanity (Anto, 2011; Chapra et al., 2008; Syed Ali & Hasan, 2018). Therefore, according to Islam, development is focused on material and moral progress, both of which can be accomplished through *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* (MS). Based on above discussion the specific objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To construct and measure an index for each dimension of the *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* in selected OIC countries.
2. To rank and compute the policy score of each dimension of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* for policy purposes.
3. To construct and measure a composite index of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* dimensions for selected OIC countries.

Following the introduction, the remainder of the paper is organized as follows: section 2 contains Islamic socioeconomic development measures. The theoretical framework and methodology are discussed in Section 3. The results and discussions are presented in Section 4. Conclusion and policy implications are found in Section 5.

Islamic Measures of Socioeconomic Development

The pioneering work in Islamic literature on socioeconomic development is presented by Al-Ghazali (1901); Ibn-Ashur (1945). Among the contemporary leading economists who have written on the subject are Ahmed (2011) and Chapra et al. (2008).

The first formal study on the measurement of Human Development Index embodied with

³A number of Islamic teachings are testament to this interrelation between the material and the spiritual. For example, “O ye who believe! When the call is heard for the prayer of the day of congregation, haste unto remembrance of Allah and leave your trading. That is better for you if ye did but know”. (Al-Qur’ān, 62:09) “Give not unto the foolish (what is in) your (keeping of their) wealth, which Allah hath given you to maintain; but feed and clothe them from it, and speak kindly unto them”. (Al-Qur’ān, 04:05)

⁴“O mankind! Worship your Lord, Who hath created you and those before you, so that ye may ward off (evil). Who hath appointed the earth a resting-place for you, and the sky a canopy; and caused water to pour down from the sky, thereby producing fruits as food for you. And do not set up rivals to Allah when ye know (better)”. (Al-Qur’ān; 2:21-25)

ethical, environmental and freedom aspects is by Dar (2004). The important indicators included in the measurement of Human Development Index are life expectancy, GDP, carbon dioxide emission, freedom Index, family value, and faith Index. Ahmed (2011) and Chapra et al. (2008) are two main studies which provided leading theoretical framework on Islamic values and socioeconomic development. Chapra et al. (2008) and others in their studies, discussed five dimensions of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* along with necessary indicators for measurement. Ahmed (2011) emphasized the issue of development theories' failure in Muslim and developing nations in general during the previous half-century. According to the author, this is due to a faulty approach that ignores religious and cultural considerations. The study has discussed the importance of non-economic aspects such as cultural, social, political, and religious factors in the development process.

Rehman & Askari (2010) measured Islamicity Index for 208 Muslim and non-Muslim countries based on *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*. They constructed four sub-indices related to Legal, Human and Political Rights, Economic and Governance, namely; Islamicity Economic Index, Islamicity International Relations Index, Islamicity Governance Index, and Islamicity Human and Political Rights Index. Another prominent study on the measurement of Islamic Human Development Index (IHDI) is by Anto (2011) for OIC countries. The author adopted the same methodology used by UNDP⁵ to construct HDI. However, in the construction of IHDI, the author used dimensions of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*. The main contribution of the study is exploring the best available proxies for the indicators used to measure dimension of MS. Amir Ud Din (2014) emphasizes the need of incorporating the normative aspects of human societies within the measurement of development. Like many other studies, the author also uses the theory of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* to measure socioeconomic holistic development based on this life and the life hereafter. For the construction of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* Index (MSI), the author used the methodology of Chakravarty (2003) which is an extension of the standardized HDI method.

Amin et al. (2015) provided a detailed and comprehensive conceptual and theoretical framework for understanding and measuring the five dimensions of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*. This study is quite similar to Ahmed (2011); Chapra et al. (2008). Ali et al. (2018) measured deprivation index based on *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* for OIC Countries using Alkire-Foster dual count methodology. The authors have applied the proposed methodology to a wider range of data and in the broader context of setting policy goals. The authors use the data of World Values Survey (WVS) 6 for measuring the five dimensions of MS for 20 OIC member countries. Similarly, Syed Ali & Hasan (2018) develop a *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* based development index for Pakistan using data from WVS 6. Results of the study reveal that that posterity is the least deprived dimension whereas property is the most deprived dimension.

Although different development measures have included the aspects related to human rights, freedom, morality and ethics but they are still facing certain practical and measurement problems. For example, there are issues in the measurement of certain qualitative variables such as freedom and faith (or level of Iman) and their threshold levels for policy purposes. Then, in case of composite Index, the issue of weightages assigned to different dimensions

⁵United Nations Development Programme.

seems a matter of subjective choice. However, for comparison purposes, some globally agreed standards are required for accurate and efficient analysis of welfare indices.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

Based on Sharī'ah principles, the fulfillment of the five objectives of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* is the theoretical foundation for achieving socioeconomic development. These objectives cover both material and non-material welfare of human beings. *Hifz al-māl* is materialistic in nature and is the bases of material welfare of the people. It is related to the ownership of resources and their distribution. Islam recognizes the importance of material resources and allows its private ownership along with just distribution among society members as a means for achieving welfare (Rahim, 2013; Zaman, 2018). The Islamic scheme of dealing resources prefers a relatively lower level of ownership with a just distribution as compared to a higher level of ownership with unequal distribution⁶. The better the resource ownership and its distribution, the higher the level of material welfare and vice versa.

The other four objectives of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* are all non-material aspects but are fundamental for achieving *maṣlaḥah* (public welfare). These include the safety and security of lives (*hifz al-naḥs*), intellect – related to education and science (*hifz al-'aql*), expansion and extension of posterity (*hifz al-nasl*), and above all establishing the belief of people on Allah (*hifz al-din*).

Ensuring peace and security has always been taken as top priority under state objectives. It includes better law and order, strong defense, health and living situation etc. consequently, it causes businesses to grow, and leads to foreign investment, economic prosperity and healthy, wealthy and longer lives (Polat & Uslu, 2013). The longer the life (*hifz-ul-naḥs*), the better an individual is in relative terms. As a longer life could be assumed as a wider opportunity for doing many good things that is beneficial for achieving *Maslahah*. As mentioned in a hadith of the Prophet (PBUH) regarding the longevity of life and performance of deeds (*al-amal*), narrated by Abu Huraira (RTA⁷): “The Prophet (PBUH) said, Allah will not accept the excuse of any person whose instant of death is delayed till he is sixty years of age”⁸.

The third objective of the protection of Knowledge and Science (*Hifz-ul-'aql*), plays a key role in growth and development, and so every member of society must be able to do well in education and learning. The protection of this objective is inherent in learning education and skills along with necessary measures to preserve human intellect and wisdom (Hanushek & Woessmann, 2020; Harrison, 2005). This is what has been proved in the history of human beings. It causes nations to achieve increased productivity, higher earning, better living and play leading roles in the world. The importance and attainment of education is beyond any doubt as per Sharī'ah teachings⁹. The first ayah (verse) of Divine Revelation (wahi)

⁶ “Whatever (from the possessions of the towns’ people) Allah has bestowed on His Messenger belongs to Allah, and to the Messenger, and to his kinsfolk, and to the orphans, and to the needy, and to the wayfarer, so that it may not merely circulate between the rich among you”. (Al-Qur’ān, 59:7)

⁷ RTA stands for *Radi Allahu Ta’ala ‘Anhu*, meaning ‘Allah be pleased with him’.

⁸ (Sahih Bukhari:6419)

⁹ “Ask them, can those who know and those who do not know ever be equal”? (Al-Qur’ān, 39:9)

is all about knowledge/learning and the creation of human beings¹⁰. No particular type of knowledge is mentioned here, rather there is an open message about knowledge and learning. Nevertheless, Divine Knowledge is undoubtedly the most authentic knowledge, which cannot be ignored and underestimated¹¹.

Further, the process of development will be more effective and efficient if the family and social structure (*hifz-ul-nasl*) is strong and based on moral and ethical values. There is an inevitable role of the family system and standards in building generations to come, ultimately proving helpful for sustainable development¹². Islamic teachings always advocate for social life over individual life. The modern growth theories added this concept in growth models under the title of social capital. Empirical findings reveal that nations with better social capital can better grow and sustain their growth (Aldrich & Meyer, 2015; Schuller, 2001; Whiteley, 2000). Similarly, connected societies have better resilience against natural and artificial upheavals as compared to isolated ones.

And lastly, the importance of religiosity (*hifz-ul-din*) of society is paramount according to Islamic perspective. This is the foremost right of Allah upon mankind. Every son of Adam AS must bear witness (*shahdah*) on the oneness of Allah and Muhammad (PBUH) being the last prophet. This is such an important requirement in Islam that has no substitute. In the Qur'ān, whenever there is a discussion on *falah* (success), which is an end outcome of all development activities, it is always made conditional upon faith and righteous deeds, "Whosoever acts righteously – whether a man or woman - and embraces belief, we will surely grant him a good life; and will surely grant such persons their reward according to the best of their deeds".

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that the meaning of development in Islam is to achieve both material and non-material welfare so as to enjoy holistic welfare in this temporary life as well as in the life hereafter, which is the permanent and forever life. The ingredients of material welfare are four dimensions of MS except faith. However, there is an inevitable role of faith in the protection and preservation of the four dimensions of material welfare.

The next step is to develop indicators, measurable for above dimensions. The World Value Survey (WVS) is a best publicly available source for getting data on the five dimensions mentioned above. The indicators for the measurement of five dimensions of *maqāṣid* are selected from the latest round of World Values Survey, WVS-7 (2017-2020).

Construction and Measurement of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* based Poverty Index

The widely recognized Alkire and Foster (2011) methodology of multidimensional poverty is used to construct MS Index of human development. The Alkire & Foster (2011) methodology

¹⁰ "Read: In the name of thy Lord Who created", (Al-Qur'ān, 96:1)

¹¹ "Among them are unlettered folk who know the Scripture not except from hearsay. They but guess." (Al-Qur'ān, 2:78)

¹² "And hold fast, all of you together, to the cable of Allah, and do not separate. And remember Allah's favor unto you: How ye were enemies and He made friendship between your hearts so that ye became as brothers by His grace." (Al-Qur'ān, 3:103)

satisfies useful properties for analysis and policy perspectives. A key property is decomposability which allows the outcomes to be broken down into subgroups of regions and ethnicity. It helps in detailed analysis of individual dimensions of *maqāṣid al-Sharī‘ah* based headcount of poverty (MSH) within regions which is not possible in case of simple measure of standard head count ratio.

After finalizing the relevant questions of each dimension, a subjective type of first cut off was applied to each question on the basis of statement of question and number of responses to each question. The threshold values (or cutoff-point) of each indicator are chosen in the light of Sharī‘ah guidance and general perception in Islamic society . The cutoff point of each question is decided so as to clearly define deprivation of an individual on the basis of the question asked. For example, in the dimension of faith, a question included in the survey states, ‘In the conflict between religion and science, religion is always right’, there are four responses with 1 (strongly agree), 2 (agree), 3 (disagree) and 4 (strongly disagree). Clearly in this question, all those with responses 1 and 2 are non-poor and those with responses of 3 and 4 are poor (or deprived in faith dimension). It was quite easy to decide about deprived or non-deprived in such a clear situation of responses. Here we assign 1 to all those who are poor or deprived and zero otherwise.

In case of questions where the list of responses are long ranging from 1 to 10, we applied cut off criteria similar to the one used by UNDP in the construction of HDI which is 33% level. For example, a question related to dimension of life (*hifz-ul-nafs*) states that “do you have free choice and control over your life” and response ranges from 1 (No Choice at all) to 10 (A great deal of choice). By applying the cutoff of 33%, all those with responses 4 and below were called poor or deprived in life dimension. In this way, on the basis of subjective cut-off criteria each selected indicator or question of a given dimension is transformed into the category poor and non-poor.

Following [Alkire & Foster \(2011\)](#) (2011), we assign weights to the outcome of each indicator according to the number of indicators of the given five dimensions. For example, since we used 8 indicators for the dimension of faith, a weight of 1/8 is assigned to the outcome of each indicator of the faith dimension and they are added together. In this case the equation for faith dimension can be written as

$$Faith = \frac{1}{8}(F160 + F164 + F165 + F166 + F169 + F171 + F172 + F173) \quad (1)$$

An individual will be considered as poor in faith dimension if the weighted sum of faith indicators is equal to or greater than 0.33¹³ and non-poor otherwise. A similar method is used for the calculations of the other four dimensions. The indicators used to measure each dimension along with their cut-off levels are given in Table 1.

Next, we applied the second cutoff across dimensions to complete the identification process. Therefore, the third step involved is the implementation of the second cut-off of dimensions. A person is known as poor if he/she is deprived in 33%¹⁴ or more in total deprivations of

¹³According to 33% criteria of UNDP used in the measurement of MPI. If value of faith 0.33, an individual is poor and non-poor otherwise.

¹⁴A 33% deprivation criteria is based on Global Multidimensional Poverty index methodology of UNDP.

all dimensions of *maqāṣid al-Sharī‘ah*. In this way, the second cut off is applied on the number and level of dimensions by having a matrix of dimensions for everyone based on the given methodology. An equal weight is assigned to each dimension. Thereafter, based on deprivations in dimensions, individuals are categorized as deprived/non-deprived in *maqāṣid al-Sharī‘ah* perspectives.

$$\text{Value of MS} = \frac{1}{5}(\text{Faith} + \text{Life} + \text{Intellect} + \text{Posterity} + \text{Wealth}) \quad (2)$$

If the value of MS for an individual country is 0.33 or higher, such country is categorized as poor.

The calculation of headcount Index (MSH) and adjusted head count called as Multidimensional Poverty (MSPI) are calculated by using the formulae below:

$$= \frac{q}{n} \quad (3)$$

Where q is the number of poors and N is total population

The average poverty gap (A) can be calculated by using the formula

$$\frac{\sum_1^q c}{N} \quad (4)$$

Where C is the deprivation score of a multidimensional poor and is obtained by adding the deprivation score in each dimension. Next we will calculate the adjusted headcount (M0) as

$$M0 = H0.A \quad (5)$$

Then we decompose by group and breakdown by dimension as:

$$\text{Contribution}_j = \frac{\sum_i^q C_j / N}{M0} \quad (6)$$

It shows the contribution of dimension j to multidimensional poverty.

Data

For the MS Index of OIC countries, suitable proxy measures of MS dimensions are used from the last round of World Values Survey (WVS-7) conducted in 2020. This is an international survey on social, political, religious and cultural values of people in the world, based in Austria. Starting in 1981, it has conducted seven waves so far within 120 countries of the world. The five dimensions of MS are measured by selecting relevant questions of each dimensions from the survey. A list of the questions/indicators along with cut-off levels used in the measurement of five dimensions of *maqāṣid al-Sharī‘ah* are given below in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Indicators used in the Measurement of Dimensions of *Maqāṣid al-Sharī‘ah*

Dimension	Q. No.	Survey Questions
Faith	Q 160	Do we depend too much on science and not on faith?
	Q 164	How important is GOD in your life?
	Q 165	Do you Believe in GOD?
	Q 166	Do you Believe in Life after Death?
	Q 169	In the conflict between Religion and Science, Religion is always right.
	Q 171	How often do you attend Religious Services?
	Q 172	How often do you Pray?
	Q 173	Are you a Religious / Not a Religious / Atheist Person?
Life	Q 47	How would you describe your State of Health?
	Q 48	Do you have free choice and control over your Life?
	Q 51	In the last twelve months, how often have you or your family remained without enough food?
	Q 52	In the last twelve months, how often have you or your family felt unsafe from crime in your surroundings?
	Q 131	How secure do you feel these days?
	Q 137	How frequently do street violence and fights occur in your neighborhood?
	Q 139	Do you not carry much money for reasons of security?
	Q 140	Do you prefer not to go out at night for reasons of security?
Intellect	Q 144	Have you been a victim of crime during the past year?
	Q 133	How frequently does alcohol consumption occur in your surroundings?
	Q 136	How frequently does drug sale occur in your surroundings?
	Q 143	To what degree are you worried about not being able to give your children a good education?
	Q 275	What is the highest level of education you have attained?
Posterity	Q 276	What is the highest level of education your spouse has attained?
	Q 22	Would you like to have homosexuals as your neighbors?
	Q 25	Would you like to have unmarried couples living together as your neighbors?
	Q 32	Being a housewife is just as fulfilling as working for pay.
	Q 37	It is a duty towards society to have children.
	Q 38	Adult children have the duty to provide long-term care for their parents.
	Q 46	Taking all things together, would you say you are happy / unhappy.
	Q 59	Do you trust people from your neighborhood?
	Q 135	How frequently do racist behaviors occur in your neighborhood?
	Q 182	What do you think about Homosexuality, is it justifiable?
	Q 183	What do you think about Prostitution, is it justifiable?
	Q 184	What do you think about Abortion, is it justifiable?
	Q 186	What do you think about Sex before marriage, is it justifiable?
	Q 193	What do you think about having Casual sex?
	Q 253	How much Respect is there for individual human rights in your country?
	Q 255	How close (involved) do you feel to your village/town/city?
Wealth	Q 13	Should children be encouraged at home to learn about thrift, saving money and things?
	Q 50	How satisfied are you with the financial situation of your household?
	Q 54	In the last 12 months, how often have you or your family gone without a cash income?
	Q 81	How much confidence do you have in Charitable or humanitarian organizations?
	Q 112	What are your views about corruption in your country?
	Q 132	How frequently do robberies occur in your neighborhood?
	Q 142	To what degree are you worried about losing your job or not finding a job?
	Q 279	Are you employed now or not?
	Q 287	Would you describe yourself as belonging to Upper class/ Upper middle class/ lower middle class?

Source: World Value Survey - Wave 7 (2017-2021)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The individual indices of five Dimensions

First, we constructed the individual indices of five dimensions of *maqāṣid al-Sharī‘ah*. The individual indices are more important from policy perspective than the overall index of five

dimensions. By understanding the relative situations through the ranking of indices, nations may better deal with the deterioration of individual MS aspects. Results are presented in Table 2.

The faith index's value is determined from the questions such as belief in Allah, belief in life after death, and attendance at religious services. Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan, three of the poorest countries in terms of faith, are close neighbors and have been under communist Russia's control for seventy years. As a result, these nations are heavily influenced by communism and have shown to be the least earnest in faith of the fifteen Muslim countries on the list. Nigeria, Egypt and Pakistan on the other hand, are the most religious countries, according to our index score. Pakistan and Egypt are notable Muslim countries with a Muslim population of almost 100 percent. In Nigeria, however, Muslims account for 50% of the population, while the remaining 50% are orthodox Christians who also practice a divine religion and believe in Allah .

The second in the list of *maqāṣid* is *hifz-ul-naḥs* which is a measure of the life and security of the people of the country. The value of the index is a consequence of the type of questions such as street violence and crimes, feelings of people about their safety, robbery and going out at night. Nigeria, Malaysia, and Pakistan are the countries with the lowest levels of safety and security for their residents, according to the index's rating. Tajikistan, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan and Egypt, on the other hand, are all relatively secure places to live in. Countries that score well in this category are expected to have strong policing, courts, and overall living conditions.

TABLE 2
***Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* Dimension-wise Deprivation Indices**

Country	Faith	Life	Intellect	Posterity	Wealth
Bangladesh	0.06	0.33	0.69	0.12	0.84
Indonesia	0.06	0.35	0.56	0.16	0.87
Iran	0.19	0.28	0.35	0.15	0.78
Iraq	0.14	0.34	0.67	0.27	0.96
Kazakhstan	0.48	0.34	0.47	0.56	0.74
Jordan	0.12	0.22	0.4	0.03	0.89
Kyrgyzstan	0.34	0.26	0.44	0.2	0.68
Lebanon	0.27	0.28	0.51	0.45	0.88
Malaysia	0.19	0.56	0.59	0.61	0.79
Nigeria	0.04	0.62	0.78	0.42	0.97
Pakistan	0.06	0.48	0.73	0.3	0.93
Tajikistan	0.4	0.1	0.18	0.36	0.62
Tunisia	0.24	0.42	0.78	0.29	0.92
Turkey	0.27	0.38	0.41	0.36	0.77
Egypt	0.05	0.26	0.58	0.11	0.93

The third index is a measure of deprivation in the dimension of *hifz-ul'aql* which is based on the situation of such initiatives that would serve to protect intellect (such as education,

science and research) in these countries. As *hifz-ul'aql* is one of the objectives of *maqāsid al-Sharī'ah*, the index is measured using questions like years of school, literacy rate, alcohol consumption, and drug sales in the streets. Tunisia, Nigeria, and Pakistan are the nations with the most intellectual deprivation, whereas Jordan, Iran, and Tajikistan are the countries with the least intellectual deprivation. The values of the index of intellect are quite justified on the basis of literacy rates of most deprived and least deprived countries in the list¹⁵.

The Posterity index is used to look at the situation of offspring and future generations in these countries. Questions regarding the position of women in society, mutual connection, and trusting individuals as neighbors are among the indicators used to calculate the index score. Similarly, some questions about dominant moral norms such as sex before marriage, homosexuality, and prostitution are also included. The two dimensions of faith and posterity embraced the aspect in which Muslims must outperform everyone else. This is what the measured value of indices revealed. However, among the Muslim nations, Malaysia, Kazakhstan, and Lebanon were determined to be the most deficient in the Posterity. On the other hand, Bangladesh, Egypt, and Jordan are better in terms of Posterity. The strong social and familial values in Bangladesh, Egypt, and Jordan are the main reasons for their relative superiority. The societies in these countries are conservative and feel proud of their Islamic culture and history. We can observe a link between faith and posterity index values for the countries in our sample. Countries that are more religious are also good in Posterity, and vice versa. Only two nations, Malaysia and Nigeria, are found to be in breach of this pattern due to obvious reasons of splitted population of these countries between Muslim and other beliefs.

Next, we calculated the *hifz al-māl* index, which measures the economic performance of our sample countries. The value of the index indicates the people's income and standard of living. The value of this index was calculated using a variety of questions, including work conditions, humanitarian organisation function, and amount of corruption. In terms of economic well-being, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan are the least deprived countries. Nigeria, Iraq, and Egypt, meanwhile are the poorest countries. This is perhaps because Nigeria and Iraq have been victims of wars and violence, which have had a negative impact on their economy. At the same time, Egypt's economy has been negatively affected by the country's political unrest and uncertainty. Egypt's history of military dictatorship and internal strife has left the country's economy in a state of perpetual instability. Next we calculate the *maqāsid al-Sharī'ah* based headcount of Poverty (MSH), Average Poverty (MSA) and Multidimensional Poverty Index (MSPI). Results are summarized in Table 3.

There is a difference of interpretation of each value of MSH, MSA and MSPI for any country. For example, the head count value of 67.91% for Nigeria shows an incidence of poverty which means 67.91% of sample population is deprived in more than two dimensions of MS. Whereas the intensity or depth of poverty is measured by the value of average deprivation which is 42.67% for Nigeria. It means the average poor person is deprived in 42.67% of dimensions. Similarly the multidimensional Poverty (MSPI) which is obtained by multiplying MSH with MSA, means that head count is adjusted for intensity of poverty.

¹⁵Tunisia with 79.04%, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/575173/literacy-rate-in-tunisia/> and Tajikistan with 99.80% <https://knoema.com/atlas/Tajikistan/topics/Education/Literacy/Adult-literacy-rate>

TABLE 3

The Composite index of *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* based Poverty (MSH) Average Poverty (MSA) and Multidimensional Poverty Index (MSPI)

Country	MSH	MSA	MSPI
Nigeria	0.68	0.43	0.29
Tunisia	0.6	0.43	0.26
Pakistan	0.52	0.4	0.21
Kazakhstan	0.51	0.42	0.21
Malaysia	0.5	0.43	0.21
Iraq	0.49	0.4	0.2
Lebanon	0.42	0.41	0.17
Turkey	0.37	0.43	0.16
Bangladesh	0.33	0.39	0.13
Egypt	0.32	0.4	0.13
Indonesia	0.29	0.39	0.11
Kyrgyzstan	0.26	0.4	0.1
Iran	0.21	0.4	0.09
Jordan	0.18	0.39	0.07
Tajikistan	0.16	0.38	0.06

The value of MSPI is also important in the context of adjusted head count. The low value of MSPI for almost all countries in the list shows that although the head count is high, the intensity of poverty is not very high. Our results are consistent with [Ali et al. \(2018\)](#) with many countries at almost same ranking level with the exception of few countries which may be because of the time laps of five years.

Based on MSPI score, the countries are ranked in Table 4. In our ranking of 15 Muslim nations, Nigeria is placed first, with the most deprivation, while Tajikistan is ranked 15th, with the least deprivation in the five dimensions of *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*. Individual nations' rankings are described in this table based on their achievements in five MS dimensions. Nigeria, for example, is the poorest country in MSPI and perform poorly in almost all dimensions except faith. Tajikistan is the country with the lowest MSPI score. When we examine its performance in five MS dimensions, we find that it excels in three of them: life, intellect, and wealth, with the exception of faith and posterity. Because of the country's history, it is the most disadvantaged in terms of faith and posterity.

The policy scores of dimensions are obtained by simply subtracting the actual rank of a country from the possible highest rank in the given dimensions, which are given in parenthesis. For example, for intellect dimension the rank of Iran is 14, therefore the policy score of Iran for Intellect is 1. The low policy score in a dimension means low policy emphasis is required and vice versa. The policy score is the reciprocal of ranking of countries. When a country is ranked high in a dimension, it means the country is the least deprived in that dimension and the policy score calculated on the basis of the given formula will be low. Low policy score will mean low policy emphasis is required for that dimension.

TABLE 4
MSPI and Dimension-wise ranking and Corresponding Policy Scores

Country	MSPI Rank	Deprivation Ranking in each MS Dimension				
	Most Poor	Faith	Life	Intellect	Posterity	Wealth
Nigeria	1	15 (0)	1 (14)	2 (13)	4 (11)	1 (14)
Tunisia	2	6 (9)	4 (11)	1 (14)	8 (7)	5 (10)
Pakistan	3	13 (2)	3 (12)	3 (12)	7 (8)	4 (11)
Kazakhstan	4	1 (14)	7 (8)	10 (5)	2 (13)	13 (2)
Malaysia	5	7 (8)	2 (13)	6 (9)	1 (14)	10 (5)
Iraq	6	9 (6)	8 (7)	5 (10)	9 (6)	2 (13)
Lebanon	7	4 (11)	10 (5)	9 (6)	3 (12)	7 (8)
Turkey	8	5 (10)	5 (10)	12 (3)	6 (9)	12 (3)
Bangladesh	9	11 (4)	9 (6)	4 (11)	13 (2)	9 (6)
Egypt	10	14 (1)	13 (2)	7 (8)	14 (1)	3 (12)
Indonesia	11	12 (3)	6 (9)	8 (7)	11 (4)	8 (7)
Kyrgyzstan	12	3 (12)	12 (3)	11 (4)	10 (5)	14 (1)
Iran	13	8 (7)	11 (4)	14 (1)	12 (3)	11 (4)
Jordan	14	10 (5)	14 (1)	13 (2)	15 (0)	6 (9)
Tajikistan	15	2 (13)	15 (0)	15 (1)	5 (10)	15 (0)
	Least Poor					

Note: The numbers in parenthesis are country policy scores based on their deprivation ranking in the given MS dimensions.

Conclusion and Policy Implications

Conclusion

In the context of the objectives of this study, we have constructed five indices of five MS dimensions for fifteen predominantly Muslim countries present in the final round of WVS-7. The purpose of calculating individual indices is to measure the deprivation from the perspective of five dimensions of MS in the sample Muslim countries. Although the composite index of five dimensions seems sufficient in ranking countries on the basis of overall value of MSH, however from policy perspectives it is important to study the situation of countries in terms of their performance from the perspective of each individual dimension. It will help countries to direct policy focus and resources to overcome the weaknesses of individual dimensions. We have countries in the list which are perform strongly in one or more dimensions but at the same time are very weak in other dimensions.

Apart from the head count of MS deprivation in the form of MSH, we have also calculated the values of average poverty/deprivation (MSA) and the MS based multidimensional poverty (MSPI). The value of MSPI is calculated by multiplying the values of MSH and MSA. The purpose of calculating the values of MSPI is to get the value of poverty adjusted for intensity or breadth of poverty. As a result, the values of MSPI can be called as the adjusted head count of deprivation.

We analyze the relative situation of deprivation in five dimensions of MS for all countries along with their MSH ranking. This will help in analyzing the relative performance of the

poorest and least poor countries in the five dimensions of MS. For example, Nigeria being the most deprived in MSH, is also unable to perform in four dimensions of MS. In contrast, the least MSH-deprived country of Tajikistan has relatively lower deprivation in four of the five dimensions except wealth.

In other words, countries can reduce their deprivation by working on such problematic dimensions. For example, the most deprived nation in the list is Nigeria, performing worst in the wealth and intellect dimensions. Similarly, the weak dimensions of each country can be identified on the basis of contribution of dimensions towards overall deprivation.

Policy Implications

On the basis of results of this study, we observe that a majority of the Muslim countries are weak in the dimensions of *hifz ul-nafs* (Peace and Security), *hifz ul-'Aql* (Intellect and Learning) and *hifz al-māl* (Wealth). Similarly, almost all the countries perform well for the remaining two dimensions of *hifz ul-din* (faith and religiosity) and *hifz ul-nasl* (Posterity). In order for these countries to perform well for the safety and financial wellbeing of their people, OIC member countries are recommended to ensure law and order, justice and meritocracy in their countries. There is a positive correlation with the situation of law and order and crime rates (Hasyim et al., 2019). Moreover, there should be an efficient judiciary, strong policing and other security institutions to deal with the threats to the lives and resources of people.

In terms of intellect, the average years of schooling, quality of education and government spending on education in OIC member countries are quite low as compared to many other countries of the world. There is a need to reset the priorities of governments to divert policy focus and resources towards education and learning. In nowadays' world, the economies and defense of the countries are dependent on their performance in the fields of science and technology. The solution to all individual and societal problems must be found in the divine Islamic teachings that are adhered to and put into practice at all levels.

References

- Ahmed, A. R. Y. (2011). An introduction to an islamic theory of economic development. In *8th International Conference on Islamic Economics and Finance*. Center for Islamic Economics and Finance, Qatar Faculty of Islamic Studies, Qatar Foundation, Qatar.
- Aldrich, D. P., & Meyer, M. A. (2015). Social capital and community resilience. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(2), 254–269. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764214550299>.
- Al-Ghazali, A. H. (1901). *Al-mustasfa min 'ilm al-usul*. Al-Matbaah al-Amiriyyah.
- Ali, S. S., Hasan, H., et al. (2018). Measuring deprivation from *maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* dimensions in oic countries: ranking and policy focus. *Journal of King Abdulaziz University: Islamic Economics*, 31(1), 3–26.

- Alkire, S., & Foster, J. (2011). Counting and multidimensional poverty measurement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 95(7-8), 476–487. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.11.006>.
- Amin, R. M., Yusof, S. A., Haneef, M. A., Muhammad, M. O., & Oziev, G. (2015). The integrated development index (i-dex): A new comprehensive approach to measuring human development. *Islamic economics: Theory, Policy and Social Justice*, 2, 159–172.
- Amir Ud Din, R. (2014). *Maqāṣid al-Sharī‘ah*: Are we measuring the immeasurable. *Islamic Economic Studies*, 22(2), 1–31. doi: <https://doi.org/10.12816/0008093>.
- Anto, M. (2011). Introducing an Islamic human development index (i-hdi) to measure development in OIC countries. *Islamic Economic Studies*, 130(542), 1–54.
- Bari, F. (2011). Economic growth to human development: Journey with dr. mahbub ul haq. *Lahore Journal of Policy Studies*, 4(1), 72–97.
- Chakravarty, S. R. (2003). A generalized human development index. *Review of Development Economics*, 7(1), 99–114.
- Chapra, M. U., Khan, S., & Al Shaikh-Ali, A. (2008). *The Islamic vision of development in the light of maqāṣid al-sharī‘ah* (Vol. 15). IIIT.
- Dar, H. A. (2004). On making human development more humane. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 31(11/12), 1071–1088.
- Easterlin, R. A., & O’Connor, K. (2020). The easterlin paradox. Available at SSRN 3743147.
- Frank, R. H. (2012). The easterlin paradox revisited. *Emotion*, 12(6), 1188–1191. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029969>.
- Guru, B. K., & Yadav, I. S. (2019). Financial development and economic growth: panel evidence from brics. *Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Science*, 24(47), 113–126. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEFAS-12-2017-0125>.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2020). Education, knowledge capital, and economic growth. *The economics of education*, 171–182. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815391-8.00014-8>.
- Haq, K. (2018). *Economic growth with social justice: Collected writings of mahbub ul haq*. Oxford University Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199474684.001.0001>.
- Harrison, R. (2005). *Learning and development*. CIPD publishing.
- Hasan, Z. (1995). Review of mu chapra’s ‘Islam and economic development’. *IIUM Journal of Islamic Economics*, 4(1), 61–70.
- Hasyim, S., Zuhilmi, M., & Amri, K. (2019). Is there a causality relationship between law enforcement, crime rates, and economic growth? an empirical evidence from western indonesia. *Regional Science Inquiry*, 11(3), 95–109.

- Ibn-Ashur, M. (1945). *Treatise on maqāṣid al-Sharī‘ah mohamed el-misawi*. International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Kim, Y. E., Loayza, N., & Meza Cuadra Balcazar, C. M. (2016). *Productivity as the key to economic growth and development* (No. 108092). World Bank Research and Policy Briefs.
- Polat, Ö., & Uslu, E. E. (2013). The impact of terrorism on economy in turkey. *Journal of Economic & Social Research*, 15(1), 73–96.
- Rahim, S. (2013). Distributive justice: a perspective from islamic economics literature. *Journal of Emerging Economies and Islamic Research*, 1(3), 77–99. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24191/jeeir.v1i3.9131>.
- Rehman, S. S., & Askari, H. (2010). How islamic are islamic countries? *Global Economy Journal*, 10(2), 1–37. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2202/1524-5861.1614>.
- Schuller, T. (2001). The complementary roles of human and social capital. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, 2(1), 18–24.
- Sen, A. (1985). *Commodities and capabilities*. Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). *On ethics and economics*. Blackwell.
- Syed Ali, S., & Hasan, H. (2018). Towards a *Maqāṣid al-Sharī‘ah* based development index. *Journal of Islamic Business and Management*, 8(1), 20–36.
- Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2012). Economic development. *Pearson, Addison Wesley: New York-USA*. Accessed on, 30(10), 2015.
- Whiteley, P. F. (2000). Economic growth and social capital. *Political studies*, 48(3), 443–466. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00269>.
- Zaman, A. (2013). Is development accumulation of wealth? islamic views. *Afro Eurasian Studies*, 2(1-2), 144–203.
- Zaman, A. (2018). An islamic approach to inequality and poverty. *Journal of King Abdulaziz University: Islamic Economics*, 31(1), 69–92. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4197/islec.31-1.4>.
- Zaman, A. (2019). Islam’s gift: An economy of spiritual development. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 78(2), 443–491. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajes.12272>.
