JIEF Journal of Islamic Economics and Finance İslam Ekonomisi ve Finansı Dergisi

ISSN 2149-3820 e-ISSN 2651-5342 2022 8(2)

journal homepage: http://dergipark.gov.tr/jief

YOKSULLUĞUN YENİDEN TANIMLANMASI İÇİN DÖRT BOYUTLU İSLAMİ BİR ÇERÇEVEYE DOĞRU

Nurgül Sevinç[a]
İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, Türkiye

Mehmet Bulut[b]
İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, Türkiye

MAKALE BİLGİSİ

Makale Geçmişi:

Başvuru: 18 Nisan 2022
Kabul: 29 Aralık 2022

Makale Türü:
Araştırma Makalesi

JEL Sınıflandırma:
I32
Z12

Anahtar Kavramlar:
Çok boyutlu yoksulluk, İslami bakış açısı, yeniden tanımlama

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, İslami geleneğe dayalı olarak yoksulluğu yeniden tanımlamak için dört boyutlu bir model önermektedir. Mevcut literatür, yoksulluk ve onun çok boyutluluğu üzerine bütüncül bir tartışmada yetersizdir. Çalışma, mevcut literatürü analiz etmek için nitel araştırma yönteminin bir parçası olarak tümevarım ve tümdengelim yöntemini kullanır. İslam'ın birincil kaynaklarından ve Müslüman alimlerin yoksulluk ve diğer ilgili alanlar hakkındaki çalışmalarından yararlanır. Çalışma, ayrıca, sosyal politika, ekonomi, sosyoloji, psikoloji, psikiyatri, sağlık ve diğer alanlardaki geleneksel yoksulluk literatürünü de gözden geçirdi. Çalışma, politika oluşturma ve araştırma yönlerini etkileyebilir ve yoksulluğun azaltılmasıyla ilgili kritik önlemlere ve stratejilere ışık tutabilir. Çalışmanın yeniliği, yoksulluğu yeniden tanımlamak ve gelecekteki araştırmalar için yeni ama kapsamlı bir yön belirlemek için özgün bir İslami model geliştirmekte yatıyor.

https://doi.org.tr/10.54863/jief.1105306

[a]**Sorumlu Yazar:** Doktora Öğrencisi, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, E-posta: nurgul.sevinc@izu.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9587-7021

[b] Profesör, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, E-posta: mehmet.bulut@izu.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5903-4721

Kaynak göster: Sevinç, N. ve Bulut, M. (2022). Yoksulluğun Yeniden Tanımlanması için Dört Boyutlu İslami bir Çerçeveye Doğru. *İslam Ekonomisi ve Finansı* Dergisi, 8(2), 159-184, https://doi.org.tr/10.54863/jief.1105306.

JIEF Journal of Islamic Economics and Finance
İslam Ekonomisi ve Finansı Dergisi

ISSN 2149-3820 e-ISSN 2651-5342 2022 8(2)

journal homepage: http://dergipark.gov.tr/jief

TOWARDS A FOUR-DIMENSION ISLAMIC FRAMEWORK FOR REDEFINING POVERTY

Nurgül Sevinç [a]
Istanbul Saabahattin Zaim University, Türkiye

Mehmet Bulut [b]
Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Türrkiye

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 18 Apr 2022
Accepted: 29 Dec 2022

Article Type:
Reseach Article

JEL Classification:
I32
Z12

Keywords:
Multidimensional poverty, Islamic perspective, redefinition

ABSTRACT

This study proposes a four-dimension model to redefine poverty based on the Islamic tradition. The extant literature is deficient in holistic discussion on poverty and its multidimensionality. The study employs inductive and deductive reasoning as a part of the qualitative research method to analyze the existing literature. It draws on the primary sources of Islam and works of Muslim scholars on poverty and other related aspects. It has also reviewed the conventional literature on poverty from social policy, economics, sociology, psychology, psychiatry, and health, among others. The study can influence policymaking and research directions and shed light on critical measures and strategies related to poverty alleviation. The study's novelty lies in developing an original Islamic model for redefining poverty and setting a new yet comprehensive direction for future research.

https://doi.org.tr/10.54863/jief.1105306

[a]**Corresponding Author:** Ph.D. Candidate, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, E-mail: nurgul.sevinc@izu.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9587-7021

[b] Professor, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, E-mail: mehmet.bulut@izu.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5903-4721

To cite this article: Sevinç, N. and Bulut, M. (2022). Towards a Four-Dimension Islamic Framework for Redefining Poverty. *Journal of Islamic Economics and Finance, 8(2),* 159-184, https://doi.org.tr/10.54863/jief.1105306

INTRODUCTION

Concerns for human poverty are as old as the history of man himself. The Qur'an relates the story of how Allah cautioned Prophet Adam against Satan (20:117-119). Prophet Adam and Eve allowed Satan to drive them out of heaven and faced hardship, unlike in heaven where they would never go hungry, unclothed, or suffer from thirst or sun heat. Thus, they would encounter poverty on earth should they be expelled from heaven. Prophet Adam and Eve were expelled from heaven, and their children faced increasing hardships and poverty. Today, about 1.3 billion people (21.7% of people in the world) in more than 100 countries endure multidimensional poverty, as stated in the 2021 Global Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI).

In 2000, global attention to poverty took a new turn through forgoing international collaboration culminating in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). During the MDGs Summit, participating countries agreed to attain eight global development goals by 2015, which were hardly reached. The failure of MDGs to achieve their desired targets resulted in the birth of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for 2030. The first of those SDGs states "no poverty," while the second is "zero hunger" (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2020). Giving priority to poverty and ranking it as the first goal indicate the extent to which it has become a serious global threat. The UNDP Human Development Report (2020) confirms that poverty remains a global concern. The World Health Organization and the World Bank stated that more than half a billion people crashed into extreme poverty even before the pandemic because they paid for health services, and the situation seems to be worse with the pandemic (The World Bank, 2021).

For simplicity, one may describe the literature on poverty as twofold: conventional and religious. Approaches to the study of poverty are influenced by these kinds of literature's worldviews and philosophical assumptions. Conventional studies include published reports from international institutions such as UNDP, UNHCR, and the World Bank, papers, books, book chapters, and a significant number of academic theses and dissertations, reflecting a broad range of schools, philosophies, and disciplines. The religious sources include primary sources of Islam like the Qur'an, Sunnah, and a wide array of scholarly works and treatises.

This study draws on relevant conventional and Islamic literature, focusing on poverty definitions and measurements. There currently exist several conventional approaches to defining and measuring poverty. For example, the study of Rowntree (1901) is perhaps the first to focus on the monetary approach to poverty. For Kanbur and Squire (1999, 49), the basic approach to measuring poverty, and the increase and decrease in income/consumption (GDP) used by Rowntree (1901) almost 100 years ago, is still very much a characteristic feature of poverty measurement today. On the other hand, Sen (1985) places "capability" at the center of the definition and measurement of poverty. Such a capability approach emphasizes the "deprivation of basic capabilities" as opposed to the "lowness of incomes" (Rank, 2016, 877). Also, the social exclusion approach (Townsend, 1979) refers to the lack of opportunity to participate in the normal relationships and activities available to most people in a society. Lastly, the participatory approach to poverty (Chambers, 1994) centers on the views of the people living in poverty. In addition, there are other recent critical studies on poverty measurement. This, for instance, includes the Human Development Index (HDI) (UNDP, 1990), Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) (UNDP, 2010), and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), both mooted by the United Nations in 2000 and 2015, respectively.

Nevertheless, a cursory look at those approaches points to some deficiencies. For example, while the monetary approach focuses chiefly on the economic dimension of poverty and advances a one-dimensional measurement, the measure of HDI associated with the capability approach and HPI and MPI are multidimensional; however, they neglect the psychological, social, and spiritual dimensions. This explains, to a certain degree, the failure of some conventional approaches to address core dimensions such as morality, ethicality, or spirituality.

On the other hand, the Islamic literature on poverty is twofold. First, studies drawing on the past Muslim jurists and ethicists who approached poverty primarily on the rulings of the Shariah, legal rights, moral and ethical obligations, and spirituality, especially those related to income and wealth transfers from charitable institutions such as *zakah* (compulsory charity), *waqf,* and *sadaqah* (non-compulsory charity). Prominent among those today are al-Qaradawi (1975) and Kahf (2014). Many of those works fall in the field of Islamic economics, such as Zaman (2018) and Ahmed (2004); Islamic finance, such as

Haneef et al. (2015), Raimi et al. (2014), and Ashraf et al. (2013). The literature of contemporary Islamic economics and finance appears to be unable to treat poverty as a core subject. Instead, it considered poverty as a basis for a counterargument against the failure of the capitalist economic system. Farooq (2008) is appalled that poverty is not a central theme in these two categories of Islamic literature. The following may even be worse, the "prevailing patterns of Islamic finance are markedly delinked from any broader developmental goals" (Farooq, 2008, 36).

Those significant works on poverty definition and measurement are expected to help policymakers develop the right goals and strategies for poverty alleviation. Yet poverty continues to represent an existential threat, and this threat is only anticipated to rise. This raises a few pertinent research questions. To what extent has poverty been comprehensively defined? And to what extent have the measurements proposed for poverty alleviation effectively addressed poverty? The literature has largely been silent on these issues.

The present study attempts to fill these gaps and advances a four-dimension Islamic framework for poverty redefinition. Section two explains the method of the study. Section three reviews the major conventional approaches to poverty. Section four discusses the Islamic concept of poverty and examines to what extent the literature on basic needs can be used to develop a new definition of poverty. Section five proposes the four-dimension Islamic framework for redefining poverty, using the biopsychosocial-spiritual model from the health literature and other sources. Finally, it concludes.

METHOD

This research used inductive and deductive reasoning as a part of the qualitative research method to review the conventional works on approaches to poverty from different disciplines such as social policy, economics, sociology, psychology, psychiatry, and health. Specifically, the decision of major approaches among various approaches to poverty was made following Laderchi et al. (2003). Using the same method, it further investigated the primary sources of Islam and works of Muslim scholars, in addition to the selected literature on basic needs concerning definitions and dimensions of poverty. To review the literature on poverty, the study mainly used online sources such as related reports of UNDP, the World Bank, World Health Organization, papers, books, book

chapters, academic theses and dissertations, and encyclopedias from Islamic and non-Islamic perspectives.

REVIEW OF MAJOR CONVENTIONAL APPROACHES TO POVERTY

The approach used for examining poverty is critical. The definition of or approach to poverty determines how poverty should be measured and categorized and how relevant poverty eradication strategies should be devised. This is especially true when the definitions/approaches and appropriate measurements and policies are consistent. Unfortunately, the literature lacks consistency (Laderchi et al., 2003, 244). Although the multidimensionality of poverty has been broadly acknowledged, the one-dimensional approach has predominantly been used, especially in the showcase of poverty statistics. This inconsistency may lead to inaccurate results regarding detecting the exact population of the people living in poverty and further hinder the proper implementation of strategies to encounter poverty.

This section provides an overview of some conventional poverty approaches, focusing on those 'monetary,' 'capability, 'social exclusion,' and 'participatory.' The decision of major approaches among various approaches, despite being very arguable and exposed to many criticisms in the literature, is selected following Laderchi et al. (2003). Kanbur and Squire explain the evolution of the literature on poverty, perhaps knowing less about the Islamic approach, if not ignoring it altogether:

> The definition of poverty has broadened over the last quarter of a century, and as it has broadened, so the relevant set of policies has expanded. Beginning with a focus on command over market-purchased goods (income), the definition of poverty has expanded to embrace other dimensions of living standards, such as longevity, literacy, and healthiness. And, as we learn more about and from the poor, the concept has developed further to reflect a concern with vulnerability and risk and with powerlessness and lack of voice. Our review of the evolution of thinking about poverty leads us to two broad conclusions (1999, 1-2).

For them, broad definitions enhance our understanding of the people living in poverty and poverty itself and alter the strategies/policies used for poverty

alleviation. Despite their good definition, it appears to be still deficient. For example, in the case of faith groups, spirituality is a crucial factor that helps illustrate much of the multidimensional nature of poverty.

It would be interesting to introduce the concepts often used in places where poverty is used before the review. Those, for instance, include "quality of life, welfare, well-living, living standards, utility, life satisfaction, prosperity, needs fulfillment, development, empowerment, capability expansion, human development, human poverty, land, and, more recently happiness" (McGillivray and Clarke, 2006, 3). Although those carry some differences, especially regarding definitions, they are still like the concept of poverty. We choose to use some of these words in this study interchangeably.

Table I: Evolution of the dominant concept and measurement of well-being, 1900–2010

Year	Dominant concept of well-being	Measurement of well-being
The 1900s	Economic well-being	GDP growth
The 1950s	Economic well-being	GDP growth
The 1960s	Economic well-being	GDP per capita growth
The 1970s	Basic needs	GDP per capita growth + basic goods
The 1980s	Economic well-being	GDP per capita but the rise of non-monetary factors
The 1990s	Human development/capabilities	Human development and sustainability
The 2000s	Universal rights, livelihoods, freedom	MDGs and "new" areas: risk and empowerment
The 2010s	Multidimensional poverty	Multidimensional poverty indexes

Source: In addition to Table 3.1 in Sumner (2006, 56), we added "dominant concept of well-being" and "measurement of well-being" for the 1900s and 2010s.

The evolution of poverty literature since the 1900s is summarized in Table I above. It shows that up until the 1970s, GDP growth and GDP per capita growth were the common poverty measurements. In the 1990s, although monetary measures were in use, their popularity was gradually overtaken by non-monetary and composite measurements such as the Human Development

Index (HDI), Human Poverty Index (HPI), and Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI).

Considering more than a hundred years of developing conventional literature on poverty, we note a breakpoint where the definition of poverty has begun to embrace non-monetary concepts and terms other than monetary ones. Particularly before the capability approach became remarkable and visible, the monetary approach has been the more dominantly traditional approach since the 1900s.

As the pioneer of the monetary approach, Rowntree (1901, 86) studied poverty based on wage-earning classes of York with Boot and proposed primary and secondary definitions of poverty. He defined primary poverty as the state of "families whose total earnings are insufficient to obtain the minimum necessaries for the maintenance of merely physical efficiency." His definition of secondary poverty concerns the circumstance of "families whose total earnings would be sufficient for the maintenance of merely physical efficiency were it not that some portion of them is absorbed by other expenditure, either useful or wasteful" (Rowntree, 1901, 86-87). While earnings are the keyword in the former, expenditure is central to the definition in the latter. Using this approach, in 1990, the World Bank introduced and institutionalized the "dollar-a-day international poverty line" concept and continued to review it (Jolliffe and Prydz, 2016).

However, this approach has significant problems both in definition and measurement. First, despite "household" has been the unit of analysis in those definitions, "individual" has been the unit of analysis in the World Bank's poverty measurement. This is a conflict regarding the definition and measurement of poverty. Moreover, using the individual as a unit of analysis does not reflect reality, as it is prevalent that individuals live in households. Second, the attempt to explain poverty through income or consumption is insufficient, as poverty is a more complex and multidimensional phenomenon accepted by most studies, such as Sumner (2006). Third, poverty lines are too low that they do not allow for a life of dignity. To exemplify, the World Bank set the poverty line -capturing people's minimum nutritional, clothing, and shelter needs- for Türkiye as an upper-middle-income country at $5.50 a day. Using this dollar figure, it is unclear whether a Türkiye citizen in good health would meet their daily nutritional needs, especially when FAO and WHO set

2100 kcal as the minimum individual intake. While this threshold is low, it is hard to imagine how the international poverty line of $1.90 can be "*minimum*." Lastly, this approach inherently assumes utility maximization, which seeks to reduce humans to running after their desires without control, which conflicts with the living style of a homoethicus/homoIslamicus individual.

In the 1980s, however, the monetary poverty debate shifted to non-monetary poverty thanks to the efforts of Amartya Sen and Mahbub ul Haq. Before them, despite its several flaws, the monetary approach was dominant in theory and practice. Sen and Haq sought to "bridge the gap between economic growth and people's well-being" through the Human Development Report (HDR) of UNDP when they introduced the concept of "human development" in 1990 (Haq, 2008, 330). These HDRs were based on the capability approach pioneered by Sen. He defines poverty as a deprivation of "minimally acceptable levels of certain capabilities" and further argues that this approach is not restricted to basic capabilities only (Sen, 1993, 41). For him, capability refers to "the alternative combinations of functionings the person can achieve, and from which he or she can choose one collection." "Functionings" represent "parts of the state of a person, in particular the various things he or she manages to do or be in leading a life." These "doings and beings" are evaluated within the context of achieving "valuable" functionings. While some functionings -such as having good health- are primitive, others - acquiring self-respect- are more complex (Sen, 1993, 31). The subject of this approach is "the identification of value-objects," which see "the evaluative space in terms of functionings and capabilities to function" (Sen, 1993, 32). Low income was not the most critical issue for this approach, both in definition and measurement, such as HDI, HPI, and MPI of UNDP.

While this approach is worthy of considering money as means instead of an end, one of the significant weaknesses, its application for poverty measurement has been incomplete. Specifically, in Global MPI, the dimensions are health, education, and living standards. The indicators are nutrition, child mortality, years of schooling, school attendance, cooking fuel, sanitation, drinking water, electricity, housing, and assets (OPHI, n.d.). The index does not capture some significant concepts, such as spirituality, although it represents "a universal human characteristic" (Cobb et al., 2012, 179). It is doubtful, providing that Sen highlighted these dimensions and indicators when underlining "valuable functionings." These present dimensions and indicators are valuable; however,

they are not sufficient as other non-monetary concepts, such as doing good to others could have been considered as well. "Investments in extending basic capabilities/basic needs via monetary incomes and public services" (Laderchi et al., 2003, 264) represent some of the basic requirements of policymakers. The focus on the extension of basic capabilities alone is inadequate. Those can help decrease poverty; however, their impact may not affect entire populations, especially those unable to extend their capabilities, such as people with special needs, sick, elderly, and so forth, representing parts of all communities and societies.

The perspective considering non-monetary aspects of poverty started with the capability approach and continued with the social exclusion and participatory approach. At the end of the 1990s, the social exclusion approach gained recognition and prevalence. It carried various definitions. Townsend argued that people are deprived when they are excluded from ordinary living patterns, customs, and activities (1979, 31). In Smith's description of poverty, the traditions of the surrounding society are central. Accordingly, although a linen shirt is not necessary for life, in the greater part of Europe, "a creditable day-laborer would be ashamed to appear in public without a linen shirt" (Smith, 1776, 634). He also has a non-monetary view of poverty, focusing on how a person is socially perceived. To Atkinson (1998), this approach has three main characteristics: "relativity (i.e., the exclusion is relative to a particular society); agency (i.e., they are excluded as a result of the action of an agent or agents)" and "dynamics (meaning that prospects are relevant as well as current circumstances)" (cited in Laderchi et al., 2003, 258).

Social exclusion describes one type of poverty that shows people's financial conditions compared to society's average: relative poverty. However, it does not provide a definition independent of others' living styles. As a policy recommendation, it fosters "processes of inclusion, inclusion in markets and social process, with particular emphasis on the formal labor market" (Laderchi et al., 2003, 264) to reduce poverty. Nevertheless, while they might help alleviate the social exclusion approach to poverty, they fail to advance a holistic cure.

Chambers (1994) is the one who pioneered the participatory approach to poverty. He described participatory as "an empowering process which enables local people to do their analysis, to take command, to gain confidence, and to make their own decisions" (1994, 2). Chambers criticized the traditional

paradigm and recommended a shift in the focus on the people living in poverty. For that, he suggested the following practices: 1) 'enabling' and 'they can do it,' i.e., if outsiders encourage local people to do activities such as planning and implementing, they usually do; 2) "lateral spread by peers," i.e., provision of technologies and methods by peers (1994, 10-12). Towards the end of the 1990s, the strength of the participatory approach was shown in its focus on the concepts of risk, vulnerability, chronic/transitory poverty, empowerment, and participation as a result of the extensive study known as 'Voices of the Poor' (VOP) carried out on 60,000 people from 47 countries. Most analyses of this study were presented at World Development Report (WDR) (Sumner, 2006, 60).

Participatory assessments have both strengths and weaknesses. They tend to be "much more open-ended, interactive and qualitative, allowing people to describe what constitutes poverty in whatever dimension they choose" (Kanbur and Squire, 1999, 32). On the other hand, the subjectively evaluative space can be problematic as people living in poverty conduct the poverty analysis. While empowerment of the poor is the required policy, it can be a partial solution to alleviate poverty.

THE ISLAMIC APPROACH TO POVERTY

The Islamic concept of poverty

Poverty is one of the top issues in the Qur'an, the tradition of Prophet Muhammad (pbuh), and early Islamic texts (Peerzade, 1997). However, besides some studies, particularly approaches to poverty have seen meager interest in contemporary Islamic works. In the following, we discuss the Islamic approach to poverty according to Islamic sources.

The Qur'an mentions the term poverty and its derivatives on twelve occasions. Except for two, poverty refers to the endurance of financial difficulties and the inability to meet needs. For instance, in the Qur'an (28:24), Prophet Moses describes himself as poor when leaving his country, facing hunger and thirst. Also, the Qur'an (59:8) describes as poor those early Muslims who migrated from Mecca to Madinah for fear of persecution (Eskicioglu, 1995). However, poor (*faqir*) and pauper -corresponding to *miskin* in Sabra (2000)- represent two separate categories in the Qur'an (9:60), where those who are eligible to take *zakah* are described. This distinction on the *zakah* eligibility sparked an interesting debate on the definitions of the terms. Besides *zakah*, the definition

and measurement of poverty have gained importance, especially concerning the determination of essential issues such as *zakah al-fitr* (alms given at the end of Ramadan), *nafaqah* (livelihood), and *waqf* (Eskicioglu, 1995).

Some Muslim scholars argue that those terms represent the same group. On the other hand, most scholars consider that the state of weakness is the common aspect of being *faqir* and *miskin*, but the degree or quality is a different aspect of them. For most of the *fiqh* (Islamic law) schools, the salient feature of these terms is the degree of weakness and need; however, there is a debate regarding who is needier (Kallek, 2005). According to the Hanafi and Maliki schools, the *miskin* person has no property (*mal*) and demonstrates the need, while the *faqir* is short of sufficient *mal* and tries to earn their livelihood. The Shafi'is and Hanbalis argued that compared to the *miskin*, the *faqir* is greater in need and deprivation (Eskicioglu, 1995).

The definition of the poor is debated among jurists, especially concerning the rights and obligations of parties considering *zakah*. The Hanafis' position is somewhat different from others. They define the poor as those whose property and income fall below the level of *nisab*, a measure of wealth based on the obligation of *zakah*. However, most Muslim jurists look into the income and expenditure balance and further argue that a person is described as poor when he cannot afford his expenditures through his property and income, even when his wealth reaches the *nisab* level (Eskicioglu, 1995).

On two different occasions, the Qur'an advances a non-materialistic perspective of poverty; It states that Allah is The Rich (*al-Ghaniy*) and people are the poor (35:15, 47:38). Based on this, it was established that humans need their Creator as they are not self-sufficient. The meaning of the word *faqir* has also gained particular importance in the circles of Sufism, becoming one of the essential concepts of Sufism literature (Eskicioglu, 1995). In this context, al-Ghazali views poverty as "the absence of what is needed." Similarly, Sabra noted, "for many medieval Muslims, scholars, soldiers, and commoners, poverty was an indication of extreme piety, even a sign of being chosen by God." He also added that "many Sufis called themselves paupers (*fuqara'*), indicating both their rejection of material goods and their recognition of their need for God" (Sabra, 2000, 17). According to al-Ghazali, poverty is "the absence of what is needed." In addition;

> All beings other than God are poor (or needy, *faqir*) since they all depend on Him for the continuation of their

> existence. God, on the other hand, is 'the Absolutely Wealthy One' (*al-ghani al-muṭlaq*) since He does not depend on any other being for his existence. Although the state of human beings can be described as 'absolute poverty', since they rely on God for their continued existence, al-Ghazali prefers to speak of relative poverty, that is, the lack of sufficient property to obtain all of one's needs. Since man's needs are potentially limitless, different levels of need correspond to different levels of poverty (cited in Sabra, 2000, 20).

The Sufis have understood and practiced poverty in different forms and shapes. Among them, there have also been extreme groups who choose poverty voluntarily. Prophet Muhammad (pbuh) cautioned against such practices. The following hadith emphasizes the avoidance of begging and asking:

> The poor man (*miskin*) is not the one who goes round to the people and is dismissed with one or two morsels and one or two dates. They (the Prophet's Companions) said: Messenger of Allah, then who is *miskin*? He said: He who does not get enough to satisfy him, and he is not considered so (as to elicit the attention of the benevolent people), so that charity may be given to him, and he does not beg anything from people (Translation of Sahih Muslim, 5: 2261). However, when a person is caught in severe poverty, he then is allowed to beg (Translation of Sahih Muslim, 5: 2271).

The hadith also highlights the spiritual dimension of poverty in the following Prophetic report: "Richness does not lie in the abundance of worldly goods, but richness is the richness of heart itself" (cited in Kasri, 2014, 20). This implies the quality of self-contentment with what one already has and that what matters most is the heart satisfaction possible with Allah's remembrance (Qur'an, 13:28).

The Sufis have their understanding and taxonomy of poverty. For them, poverty is twofold; absolute and relative. Bonner's categorization (1996) consists of radical and conservative poverty. The Madinah radical view focuses on rights and associates poverty with entitlement. Wealthy individuals provide charity to those deserving of it. When poor people become rich, they would participate in

the chain of giving and become donors leading to a circulation of sustainable giving. For example, wealthy individuals, including warriors and officials in charge of alms collection, are entitled to alms (Bonner, 1996, 339-341). On the contrary, the Iraqi conservative view underlines the "surplus" dimension of poverty. According to them, to receive alms, one must be in a state of need; no charity for the rich is described. Those who are "able-bodied" are not allowed to receive alms. According to this view, the poverty line is set at an income of fifty *dirhams* (Bonner, 1996, 341-343). The Islamic sources define poverty by combining both worldly and spiritual dimensions. While materialism covers the needs of the body, the spiritual relates to the soul's needs. The following section focuses on those needs in detail.

Selected literature of the basic needs: Towards an Islamic perspective

As one of the significant contributors to basic needs literature, Doyal and Gough (1991) asserted that all humans equally need basic needs and desire their fulfillment. Humans are harmed when those needs are unmet, which generates an injustice. They also differentiated between needs and wants, stating that needs prioritize wants and suggested two basic needs: physical health and autonomy. To explain physical health, they referred to the biomedical model of medicine. This model is "an approach to conceptualizing disease that has dominated thinking about physical and mental disorders for much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries" where "disease is presumed to be fully attributable to physiological or biochemical deviations from the norm" (Strickland and Patrick, 2015, 385). Autonomy includes individuals' understanding/perception level and psychological capacity to make decisions and act upon those decisions where stress is placed on social activities. The concept of intermediate needs includes specific need satisfiers set to meet those two types of basic needs. Some intermediate needs embrace a non-hazardous work environment, safe birth control and child-bearing, and appropriate education. While basic needs are perpetually universal, specific satisfiers are frequently relative. The term satisfiers generally refer to the goods and services provided by various systems of society (Doyal and Gough, 1991).

Corning (1983) developed the Survival Indicators approach based on the concern for humans' biological survival and reproduction (adaptation). This approach views basic needs as "requisite for the continued functioning of an organism in a given environmental context." That means "denial of the posited need would significantly reduce the organism's ability to carry on productive

activities and/or reduce the probability of its continued survival and successful reproduction" (Corning, 2000, 60-61). For Corning (2000, 61), "'human nature,' and the very nature of the human survival enterprise, entails cognitive and psychological needs and a need for social relationships of various kinds." He added that "these are not ends in themselves. Most of us are dependent upon a 'collective survival enterprise' of some sort; our needs are satisfied through socially-organized activities." Maslow's well-known hierarchy of needs highlights five categories of physiological needs, food, water, shelter, sleep, and intercourse, which constitute the fundamental base of his pyramid. Other types include, in ascending order, safety, belongingness and love, esteem, and self-actualization or growth needs (1954, 80).

The major criticism of the basic needs approach is that the number of needs is not precise (Baliamoune-Lutz, 2006, 121). Although some studies, such as that of Scanlon (1993), call for a "substantive list" of essential elements for life, producing such a list may not be possible as it may not even apply to different individuals and cultures (Alkire, 2002). Campbell et al. (1976, 9) argued that "individual needs differ greatly from one person to another and that what satisfies one will be totally unsatisfactory to the other." The study further adds that "the same individual may find the same circumstances thoroughly unsatisfactory at one stage of his life but quite acceptable at a later stage." Even though it is possible to generate a list of universal basic needs such as food, water, and air, this list will not sufficiently cover all basic needs because of the reasons above.

A thorough examination of the literature on basic needs suggests that essential needs have diverse biological, psychological, social, or spiritual dimensions. Earlier, we highlighted the debate surrounding the first three dimensions. However, despite the crucial position of spirituality, it remains poorly studied among the basic needs literature. One of the very few studies on spirituality as a need is that of Van Dierendonck (2012), which considers it a separate dimension from the dimension of psychology. Nevertheless, in the literature on welfare, well-being, and health, spirituality has been announced as a significant dimension of quality of life (World Health Organization, 1995).

While the meaning and border of spirituality vary among studies, spirituality is viewed as "a universal human characteristic, stripped of any particularities of content, class, culture, and religion" (Cobb et al., 2012, 179). Sulmasy (2002, 25) views spirituality as "an individual's or a group's relationship with the transcendent," while religion implies "a set of beliefs, practices, and language

that characterizes a community that is searching for transcendent meaning in a particular way, generally based on belief in a deity." The argument is that most people reflect spirituality through religious activities; others perform different branches of art, such as music, to show their spirituality. Cobb et al. (2012, 182) add that "social inclusion and justice" are within the scope of broader spirituality. In Lartey (2012), the framework for spirituality is even broader, and hence "spirituality involves relationships: With places and things (spatial), with self (intrapersonal), with others (inter-personal), among people (corporate) and with transcendence (God, something there)" (cited in Cobb et al., 2012, 181). Thus, spirituality rather corresponds to the "transcendent." This concept does not necessarily refer to God and is accepted as a broader term than religious practice.

FOUR-DIMENSION ISLAMIC FRAMEWORK FOR REDEFINING POVERTY

In this section, we would like to discuss how the Islamic approach to basic needs and health can enrich our understanding of poverty by adapting the biopsychosocial-spiritual model of psychiatry.

As brief information about this model, an early version of it, called the bio-psychosocial model, was developed by George Engel in 1977. The borders of the dominant biomedical approach to the disease have been extended. Moreover, "in contrast with the biomedical model, which is a theory-driven model constructed around a scientific understanding of human biology, the biopsychosocial model is a practice model of particular relevance to clinicians." In addition, "it deals not only with the science of disease but also with the issues that present in clinical relationships" (Cobb et al., 2012, 179). Later, the missing element of "spirituality" has been added and thus the model has been upgraded in such a way to embrace the metaphysical grounding (King, 2000; McKee and Chappel, 1992; Sulmasy, 2002).

Considering the complexity and wholeness of human beings (Rojas, 2006, 183), integrating the biopsychosocial-spiritual model into the basic needs and poverty literature is best suited, primarily when the literature has not been used biopsychosocial-spiritual model. Although a study on gender and poverty emphasizing "the impact of AIDS and poverty on the functioning of female orphans" uses the biopsychosocial-cultural model (Suraj-Narayan, 2009), it still excludes the dimension of "spirituality."

The Quality of Life (QOL) project of the World Health Organization (WHO), a subjective assessment of respondents' quality of life, carries similarities with the biopsychosocial-spiritual model. While WHOQOL-100 (1991) measures the perceived quality of life according to six different domains: physical, psychological, level of independence, social relationships, environment, spirituality/religion/personal beliefs, a brief version of this project, called WHOQOL-BREF (1996), has only four factors: physical, psychological, social relationships and environment (World Health Organization, 1998). In the latter, the physical factor is considered with the independence facet, while the psychological aspect comprises spirituality (Australian WHOQOL Field Study Centre, 2000). However, our proposed model is different from WHOQOL-BREF on the following elements: 1) it evaluates deprivation considering the diverse needs of humans instead of mere assessment of the subjective quality of life; 2) the domain of spirituality is separated while the domain of environment does not exist in our model. Environmental facets can be embedded in other dimensions, such as the physical, related to safety or security.

More recently, a few studies combine material and non-material aspects of poverty, mainly psychological and spiritual aspects. Siracusano et al. (2021) study poverty from a psychological viewpoint and develop the concept of "vital poverty" concerning "a form of impoverishment that is not only economic or material but rather relational, value, affective." On the other hand, Helminiak (2020) studies spiritual poverty and elucidates "the link between spirituality and poverty as a matter of personal integration and suggests interventions to address the corrosive epidemic sickness of the postmodern world, so different from traditional societies in which religion and culture intertwined and functioned effectively." Derdziuk (2015) focuses on both psychological and spiritual aspects of poverty, accordingly, "attitudes to poverty point to a wide range of human behaviors towards possessions and in effect, reveal an individual's sense of value." In addition, Deneulin and Mitchell (2019) introduce the concept of integrated human development that "integrates the material and spiritual dimensions of life, recognizes the interdependence between humans and their environment or territory and demands change at both the individual and collective levels." However, none of these articles formulate poverty using four dimensions - biological, psychological, social, and spiritual- and propose a measurement depending on these dimensions.

In the biopsychosocial-spiritual model in psychiatry, all four dimensions construct a whole and interact with each other so that they cannot be disaggregated. Speaking of this integrity, Sulmasy (2002, 27) argues that "when life-threatening illness strikes, it strikes each person in his or her totality." He argued that biological, psychological, or social but equally spiritual constitutes the person as a whole.

According to the model, this totality/wholeness requires a person to fulfill their needs in these aspects. Since biological (physical) needs are hierarchically found at the bottom, and the remaining psychological, social, and spiritual (non-physical) needs are at the top, the non-physical needs can be fulfilled following the physical needs. There is also an interactive play between biological, psychological, social, and spiritual needs.

Considering the above, the operational definition of poverty goes as follows; *human poverty is the state of deprivation regarding fulfilling four essential needs: biological, psychological, social, and spiritual, both at individual and societal levels to sustain human dignity*. Each of those dimensions is indispensable to the definition of poverty, whereas the essential needs listed under those dimensions are subject to change. Through this poverty model, we argue that although the physical needs prioritize fulfillment compared to the non-physical needs, this should not imply that non-physical conditions are of less importance or priority, especially when dimensions interact with each other and they all construct a whole. When one of those dimensions is not satisfied, it causes deprivation and affects the rest.

As we stated, a particular list of basic needs may not be possible. A list considering those four dimensions -but not final- can be as follows: for biological needs, physical health, nutrition, clothing, housing, access to sanitation, and employment/self-employment. Psychological needs, psychological health/mental peace, access to information, and worldly and religious education. Social needs, social relations (family, friends, etc.), and social activities. Spiritual needs; faith, worship, good deeds, and having values (justice, honesty, etc.).

Those needs have both individual and social aspects. As far as the dimension of individuality is concerned, "the person is unique, independent, and self-determining." In contrast, in sociality, "the person is like others, dependent and conditioned by the environment" (O'Boyle, 1990, 5). At an individual level, each person must earn their living; and sustain their spouse, children, and parents in need. When financially able, it is recommended to spend on relatives and

others in need (Shaybani and Sarakhsi, 1980/1993). Nonetheless, one may be unable to earn his living for various reasons, such as the case of handicaps and old age. In cases of deprivation, especially in material terms, able persons starting from those in the close circle of deprived persons would be responsible for eliminating it. Consequently, as well as the self-sufficiency of able persons, fulfilling the needs of unable members of society is also ensured.

In addition to the individual and social aspects in the above definition, the dignity issue is also underlined. As the primary source of Islamic law, the Qur'an emphasizes the dignity and honor of human beings (95:4, 17:70). Dignity is "a foundation, an intrinsically valuable status of human beings by virtue of their humanity" (Pless et al., 2017, 225-226). It requires the "treatment of others as human beings instead of seeing them as objects" (Pless et al., 2017, 225). In our context of the discussion, and regarding dignity, all need to enjoy the standard of life assuring dignity and should be able to meet fundamental biological, psychological, social, and spiritual needs. At this point, it must be stated that in the literature on poverty, a division of developed and developing countries (a categorization depending on the income levels of countries) exists in describing the needs of humans and deciding the policies/strategies to alleviate poverty. Although countries' income levels have a role in these two issues, this role is too much at present, causing a situation in which dignity falls behind the income levels.

Poverty, as a concept, has not been focused on much, especially in Islamic societies, since poverty has not been a serious threat as it is today in these societies. Because previously Islamic system has been implemented with all its elements and poverty has not been a long-lasting problem, instead could be dealt with mainly on a regional scale and through social finance instruments such as *qard al-hasan* (debt without interest), *zakah*, *sadaqah,* etc. Therefore, rather *sa'adah* (happiness in this world and the hereafter) and similar concepts such as *falah*, happiness, prosperity, success, blessedness and beatitude, good life, and holistic well-being (Kader, 2021, 103) have reflected the Islamic perspective within the context of development.

Considering the term *sa'adah*, the focus is on "living virtuously," essential to living well. It can be linked to the concept of *Maqasid al-Shariah* (Objectives of Shariah). According to Muslim scholars such as al-Ghazali, and al-Shatibi, Shariah aims to preserve and promote five essential elements: faith (*din*), self

(*nafs*), intellect ('*aql*), posterity (*nasl*), and wealth (*mal*). Whereas protecting these five essentials is an interest, the things that cause their absence are harmful (Kader, 2021, 108). While these five essentials are within *daruriyat* (necessity), there are two more levels of al-Maqasid that are, in ascending order, *hajiyat* (complement) and *tahsiniyat* (embellishment). While daruriyat has been explained within the scope of this study, *hajiyat* "provides avenues for the growth of the five elements," and *tahsiniyat* "represents the stage for their sustainability" (Ghazal and Zulkhibri, 2019, 290).

Ibn Ashur drew attention to the relationship between *fitrah* and *Maqasid*. He pointed out that *fitrah* is the order that Allah observes in His creations and emphasized that the general purpose of Islamic law is to protect human nature and correct its deteriorated aspects. Islam is a religion of *fitrah*, which means this religion is in harmony with the innate characteristics of man. Therefore, the provisions brought by Islam meet the needs necessary for creating a human civilization (Boynukalin, 2003).

CONCLUSION

This study reviewed the current major approaches to poverty while attempting to prove their shortage and deficiency and their non-comprehensiveness in understanding poverty. The biological, psychological, social, and spiritual needs are somewhat fragmented. Also, while the debate of physical needs is more prevalent in discussing basic human needs, spirituality is rarely highlighted. The research has also examined poverty according to the sources of Islam, emphasizing both the material and spiritual view of poverty definition. As an exceptional model in health, the biopsychosocial-spiritual model combines these four needs. We adapt this model to the literature of poverty and basic needs from an Islamic viewpoint to propose a definition of poverty as a state of deprivation to fulfill four dimensions of essential requirements, whether biological, psychological, social, and spiritual, both at the individual and societal level to sustain the dignity of human. This framework may suggest a more comprehensive measurement of poverty from an Islamic view as further research. This measurement may identify the different categories of people as poor. Furthermore, in line with the definition and measurement, policy recommendations may embrace non-material solutions -in addition to material ones- such as brotherhood, cooperation, altruism, etc.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, H., 2004. Role of Zakāh and Awqaf in Poverty Alleviation. Jeddah: Islamic Development Bank Group Islamic Research & Training Institute.

Alkire, S., 2002. Valuing Freedoms: Sen's Capability Approach and Poverty Reduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Al-Qaradawi, Y., 1975. Fakirlik Problemi ve İslam [The Problem of Poverty and Islam]. Ankara: Nur Publications.

Ashraf, A., Hassan, M. K., Hunt-Ahmed, K., 2013. An integrated Islamic poverty alleviation model. In: Hunt-Ahmed, K. (Ed.). Contemporary Islamic Finance: Innovations, Applications, and Best Practices. John Wiley & Sons, 223-243. [Online]. Available at: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9781118653814 (Accessed: 20 Jan 2021)

Australian WHOQOL Field Study Centre, 2000. Australian WHOQOL-100, WHOQOL-BREF and CA-WHOQOL Instruments User's Manual and Interpretation Guide. [Online]. Available at: https://www.who.int/tools/whoqol/whoqol-100 (Accessed: 20 Jan 2021)

Baliamoune-Lutz, M. N., 2006. On the measurement of human well-being: fuzzy-set theory and Sen's capability approach. In: Mcgillivray, M., Clarke, M. (Eds.). Understanding Human Well-Being. Tokyo: UNU Press, 119-138.

Bonner, M., 1996. Definitions of poverty and the rise of the Muslim urban poor. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 6(3), 335-344. [Online]. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/25183240 (Accessed: 2 Feb 2020)

Boynukalin, E., 2003. Makasidu's-Seria [Maqasid al-Shariah]. In: The Encyclopedia of Islam. [Online]. Available at: https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/makasidus-seria (Accessed: 2 Feb 2022)

Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Rodgers, W. L., 1976. The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluations, and Satisfactions. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Chambers, R., 1994. Paradigm shifts and the practice of participatory research and development. Institute of Development Studies Working Paper 2. Brighton: IDS. [Online]. Available at: https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/bitstream/handle/20.500.12413/3712/WP2.pdf?seq (Accessed:31 May 2020)

Cobb, M., Puchalski, C., Rumbold, B., 2012. (Eds.). Oxford Textbook of Spirituality in Healthcare. New York: Oxford University Press.

Corning, P. A., 2000. Biological adaptation in human societies: a 'Basic Needs' approach. Journal of Bioeconomics 2(1), 41-86.

Demir Seker, S., 2011. The Dynamics of Poverty in Turkey. Doctoral Thesis. The Middle East Technical University. [Online]. Available at:

https://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12613400/index.pdf (Accessed: 31 Mar 2020)

Deneulin, S., Mitchell, A., 2019. Corrigendum: Spirituality and impact evaluation design: The case of an addiction recovery faith-based organisation in Argentina. HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies, 75(4). [Online]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v75i4.5482 (Accessed: 9 Nov 2021)

Derdziuk, A., 2015. Attitudes towards poverty. The Person and the Challenges 5(1), 155-175. [Online]. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15633/pch.932 (Accessed: 7 Nov 2021)

Doyal, L., Gough, I., 1991. A Theory of Human Need. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.

Eskicioglu, O., 1995. Fakir [The Poor]. In: The Encyclopedia of Islam. [Online]. Available at: https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/fakir (Accessed: 22 Dec 2020)

Farooq, M. O., 2008. The challenge of poverty and the poverty of Islamic economics. Journal of Islamic Economics, Banking and Finance 4(2), 35-58. [Online]. Available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1403989 (Accessed: 6 Feb 2020)

Ghazal, R., Zulkhibri, M., 2019. Islamic Inclusive Growth Index (i-IGI): Measurement and determinants. 285-310. In: Ali, S. S. (Ed.). Towards a Maqasid al-Shariah Index of Socio-Economic Development Theory and Application.

Haneef, M. A., Pramanik, A. H., Mohammed, M. O., Amin, M. F. B., Muhammad, A. D., 2015. Integration of waqf-Islamic microfinance model for poverty reduction: the case of Bangladesh. International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management. [Online]. Available at: https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IMEFM-03-2014-0029 (Accessed: 20 Jan 2020)

Haq, K., 2008. Amartya Sen and Mahbub ul Haq: a friendship that continues beyond life. Journal of Human Development 9(3), 329-330. DOI: 10.1080/14649880802236524.

Helminiak, D. A., 2020. Material and spiritual poverty: A postmodern psychological perspective on a perennial problem. Journal of religion and health, 59(3), 1458-1480. [Online]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-019-00873-z (Accessed: 6 Nov 2021)

Jolliffe, D., Prydz, E. B., 2016. Estimating International Poverty Lines from Comparable National Thresholds. The World Bank. [Online]. Available at: https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/24148/Estimating0int00national0thresholds.pdf?sequence=1 (Accessed: 1 Apr 2021)

Kader, H., 2021. Human well-being, morality and the economy: an Islamic perspective. Islamic Economic Studies 28(2), 102-123. [Online]. DOI 10.1108/IES-07-2020-0026 (Accessed: 28 Dec 2021)

Kahf, M., 2014. Notes on Islamic Economics: Charitable Sector. Irvine: Monzer Kahf.

Kallek, C., 2005. Miskīn [The Pauper]. In: The Encyclopedia of Islam. [Online]. Available at: https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/miskin (Accessed: 22 Dec 2020)

Kanbur, R., Squire, L., 1999. The evolution of thinking about poverty: exploring the interactions. In: M. Meier, G., Stiglitz, J. E. (Eds.). Frontiers of Development Economics-The Future Perspective. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 183-226.

Kasri, R. A., 2014. The Role of Zakah in Poverty Alleviation: Evidence from Indonesia. Doctoral Thesis. Durham University. [Online]. Available at: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/10922/ (Accessed: 28 Oct 2019)

King, D. E., 2000. Faith, Spirituality and Medicine: Toward the Making of a Healing Practitioner. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Pastoral Press.

Laderchi, C. R., Saith, R., Stewart, F., 2003. Does it matter that we do not agree on the definition of poverty? A comparison of four approaches. Oxford Development Studies 31(3), 243-274. [Online]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/1360081032000111698 (Accessed: 15 Apr 2020)

Maslow, A. H., 1954. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper & Row.

McGillivray, M., Clarke, M., 2006. Human well-being concepts and measures. In: Mcgillivray, M., Clarke, M. (Eds.). Understanding Human Well-being. Tokyo: UNU Press, 3-15.

McKee, D. D., Chappel, J. N., 1992. Spirituality and medical practice. Journal of Family Practice 35(2), 201-205.

O'Boyle, E. J., 1990. Poverty: a concept that is both absolute and relative because human beings are at once individual and social. Review of Social Economy, 48(1), 2-17. [Online]. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/29769481 (Accessed: 5 Jun 2021)

OPHI, n.d. Global Multidimensional Poverty Index. [Online]. Available at: https://ophi.org.uk/multidimensional-poverty-index/#:~:text=The%20global%20Multidimensional%20Poverty%20Index,that%20a%20person%20faces%20simultaneously (Accessed: 7 Apr 2021)

Peerzade, S. A., 1997. The definition and measurement of poverty: an integrated Islamic approach. The Pakistan Development Review 36(1), 87-97. [Online]. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/41260020 (Accessed: 31 Jul 2020)

Pless, N. M., Maak, T., Harris, H., 2017. Art, ethics and the promotion of human dignity. Journal of Business Ethics, 144(2), 223-232. [Online]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3467-9 (Accessed: 9 Jun 2021)

Raimi, L., Patel, A., Adelopo, I., 2014. Corporate social responsibility, waqf system and zakah system as faith-based model for poverty reduction. World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development.

Rank, M. R., 2016. Toward a new paradigm for understanding poverty. In: Brady, D., Burton, L. M. (Eds.). The Oxford Handbook of the Social Science of Poverty. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 866-883.

Rojas, M., 2006. Well-Being and the complexity of poverty: a subjective well-being approach. In: Mcgillivray, M., Clarke, M. (Eds.). Understanding Human Well-being. Tokyo: UNU Press, 182-206.

Rowntree, B. S., 1901. Poverty: A Study of Town Life. London: Macmillan.

Sabra, A., 2000. Poverty and Charity in Medieval Islam: Mamluk Egypt, 1250-1517. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Sen, A., 1985. Commodities and Capabilities. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Sen, A., 1993. Capability and well-being. In: Nussbaum, M., Sen, A. (Eds.). The Quality of Life. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 270-293.

Shaybani, I. M., Sarakhsi, S., 1993. Kitabu'l-Kesb [The Book of Earnings], (M. Baktır, Trans.). Istanbul: Seha Publications. (Original work was published in 1980).

Siracusano, A., D'Argenio, A., Ribolsi, M., 2021. The application of new social determinants in forensic psychiatric practice: The vital poverty. Journal of Psychopathology 27, 60-63. [Online]. DOI: 10.36148/2284-0249-421 (Accessed: 7 Nov 2021)

Smith, A., 1776. The Wealth of Nations. Renascence Editions.

Strickland, C. M., Patrick, C. J., 2015. Biomedical model. In: Cautin, R. L., Lilienfeld, S. O. (Eds.). The Encyclopedia of Clinical Psychology. John Wiley & Sons. 1-3. [Online]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118625392.wbecp476 (Accessed: 28 Jun 2020)

Sulmasy, D. P., 2002. A biopsychosocial-spiritual model for the care of patients at the end of life. The Gerontologist 42(3), 24-33. [Online]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/42.suppl_3.24 (Accessed: 23 Jun 2020)

Sumner, A., 2006. Economic well-being and non-economic well-being. In: Mcgillivray, M., Clarke, M. (Eds.). Understanding Human Well-being. Tokyo: UNU Press, 54-73.

Suraj-Narayan, G., 2009. Gender and poverty: twin oppressors of girlhood orphaned by AIDS. Agenda 23(79), 6-12. [Online]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2009.9676218 (Accessed: 23 Jun 2020)

The World Bank, 2021. More than half a billion people pushed or pushed further into extreme poverty due to health care costs. [Online]. Available at: https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2021/12/12/more-than-half-a-billion-people-pushed-into-extreme-poverty-due-to-health-care-costs (Accessed: 2 Feb 2022)

Townsend, P., 1979. Poverty in the United Kingdom. London: Penguin.

Translation of Sahih Muslim, Book 5. Kitab al-Zakah the Book of Zakah. [Online]. Available at: https://www.iium.edu.my/deed/hadith/muslim/005_smt.html (Accessed: 26 Dec 2020)

UNDP, 1990. Human Development Report 1990: Concept and Measurement of Human Development. [Online]. Available at: http://www.hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1990 (Accessed: 14 Jan 2021)

UNDP, 2010. Human Development Report 2010: The Real Wealth of Nations – Pathways to Human Development. [Online]. Available at: http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-2010 (Accessed: 25 Jan 2021)

UNDP, 2020. Human Development Report. The 2020 Global Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI). [Online]. Available at: http://hdr.undp.org/en/2020-MPI (Accessed: 15 Dec 2020)

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2020. The 17 Goals. [Online]. Available at: https://sdgs.un.org/goals (Accessed: 15 Dec 2020)

Van Dierendonck, D., 2012. Spirituality as an essential determinant for the good life, its importance relative to self-determinant psychological needs. Journal of Happiness Studies 13(4), 685-700. DOI 10.1007/s10902-011-9286-2.

World Health Organization, 1995. Field Trial WHOQOL-100 February 1995: The 100 Questions with Response Scales, 2012 Revision. [Online]. Available at: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-HIS-HSI-Rev-2012 (Accessed: 7 Jan 2021)

World Health Organization, 1998. WHOQOL User Manual.

Zaman, A., 2018. An Islamic approach to inequality and poverty. Journal of King Abdulaziz University.

AUTHORS' PERCENTAGE-BASED CONTRIBUTION

The contributions of each author to the study by percentages are as follows:

The percentage-based contributions of the 1st author and 2nd author are 75%, and 25%, respectively.

1st Author: Conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, resources, writing-original draft, writing-review & editing, and visualization.

2nd Author: Conceptualization, resources, writing-review & editing, and supervision.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTING INTERESTS

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ETHICAL APPROVAL OF THE STUDY

All rules within the scope of "Instruction on Research and Publication Ethics for the Higher Education Institutions" were observed throughout the study. No actions mentioned in the Instruction's second chapter titled "Actions Against to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics" were taken in the study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to Prof. Mustafa Omar Mohammed and Dr. Ruslan Nagayev for their invaluable feedback and constructive comments.