

Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah and Subjective Well-Being: Toward a Holistic Framework for Muslim Quality of Life

Muhammad Abdul Aziz,¹ Roimun²

^{1,2} Institute of Pembina Rohani Islam Jakarta (IPRIJA), Indonesia

^{1,2} Institute of Agama Islam Banten, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: ✉ email: muhammadabdulaziz[at]iprija[dot]ac(dot)id

Abstract

Purpose— This article develops a conceptual framework for measuring Muslim quality of life by bringing the normative architecture of Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah into dialogue with the psychological theory of subjective well-being (SWB). Contemporary well-being measurement commonly distinguishes life evaluation, affective experience, and meaning, while Islamic accounts of welfare additionally specify religious, moral, relational, intellectual, bodily, and material goods that deserve protection and enhancement. The purpose is therefore not to replace subjective accounts of a good life with a religious checklist, but to explain how a Maqāṣid-informed framework can make the measurement of Muslim quality of life more culturally intelligible, ethically grounded, and analytically multidimensional.

Design/methods— The study uses a directed integrative literature review and conceptual synthesis. It reads primary and contemporary Maqāṣid scholarship together with peer-reviewed literature on SWB, quality of life, and Indonesian well-being measurement. The analysis differentiates between objective life conditions, subjective evaluations, and ethical-relational meanings; it then maps these planes onto the five widely used Maqāṣid domains: preservation and flourishing of religion, life, intellect, family or posterity, and wealth.

Findings— The synthesis yields three core principles: first, each Maqāṣid domain should be assessed through both enabling conditions and subjective appraisals; second, material wealth cannot compensate for severe deprivation in other domains (non-compensation principle); and third, faith must be treated as a substantive dimension rather than a residual cultural variable. This framework provides a culturally intelligible and ethically grounded measurement model for Muslim populations.

Keywords— Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah; subjective well-being; quality of life; Muslim well-being; Indonesia; Islamic social thought.

Ethical Statement: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles were adhered to during the preparation of this work, and all sources used have been properly cited in the bibliography. The article has been reviewed by at least two peer reviewers, a similarity report was obtained using Turnitin, and compliance with research/publication ethics has been confirmed.

Conflicts of Interest: : The author(s) has no conflict of interest to declare.

Copyright & License:



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY NC 4.0) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Article Type: Research Article

1. Introduction

Quality of life is increasingly understood as more than income, consumption, or the provision of public services. In well-being research, people are not treated merely as recipients of resources; they are also evaluators of their own lives, emotions, relationships, and sense of purpose. This shift matters because objectively similar circumstances can be experienced differently, and because indicators of material prosperity alone cannot disclose whether people regard their lives as satisfying, meaningful, and emotionally sustainable. The contemporary SWB tradition accordingly treats life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect as distinct but related dimensions of how individuals experience the quality of their lives (Diener et al., 2018; World Health Organization Quality of Life Group [WHOQOL Group], 1995).

The need for multidimensional measurement is particularly clear in Indonesia. The national Happiness Index is designed as a subjective development measure and organizes its assessment around life satisfaction, affect, and meaning or eudaimonia. Such an approach is important because it places people's own evaluations alongside conventional socioeconomic indicators and recognizes that a meaningful life cannot be inferred from income alone. At the same time, a general subjective framework does not independently specify which life domains should be protected when Muslim communities assess a good and dignified life in relation to religious commitments, family responsibilities, knowledge, health, and economic justice (BPS, 2021; Nandini & Afiatno, 2020).

Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah offers an Islamic vocabulary for addressing this problem. Rather than functioning only as a technical method of legal reasoning, Maqāṣid identifies the higher purposes of the Sharī'ah and directs attention to human flourishing, justice, the removal of harm, and the orderly development of individual and social life. Modern Maqāṣid scholarship commonly presents the preservation of religion (ḥifẓ al-dīn), life (ḥifẓ al-nafs), intellect (ḥifẓ al-'aql), posterity or family continuity (ḥifẓ al-nasl), and wealth (ḥifẓ al-māl) as interrelated domains of welfare. These domains are not merely prohibitions against injury; they provide a normative basis for asking what conditions enable people to live well (Ibn Ashur, 2006; Auda, 2008).

The attraction of Maqāṣid for quality-of-life research lies in its capacity to connect material, spiritual, moral, and relational concerns. Yusof et al. (2019), in an individual-level study in South Kalimantan, showed how the five domains can be used to construct a holistic development and well-being index rather than reducing development to economic achievement. Similarly, Ab Manan et al. (2021) argued that Maqāṣid-based quality of life should extend beyond physical wellness by considering a broader, holistic structure of human needs and values. These studies demonstrate the promise of Maqāṣid as an organizing framework, but they also raise the methodological question of how normative Islamic domains should be related to people's own subjective assessments of life.

Existing literature provides an initial empirical bridge. Kadji and Widiyanti (2023) examined Muslim volunteers in Indonesia and found that selected Maqāṣid dimensions were associated with life satisfaction, while Nandini and Afiatno (2020) documented the importance of income, education, health, relationships, work satisfaction, positive feelings, and meaning for happiness in urban Indonesia. These findings make it difficult to sustain either a purely material account of welfare or a purely inward account of happiness. Yet they do not resolve how to build a measurement model in which the Maqāṣid domains are neither collapsed into a generic satisfaction scale nor treated as a list of objectively measurable inputs detached from lived experience.

This article addresses that conceptual gap. It asks how Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah and subjective well-being theory can be integrated into a framework for measuring Muslim quality of life without conflating prescriptive Islamic goods with descriptive reports of satisfaction. The article develops an analytic distinction between objective and institutional conditions, subjective evaluations, and ethical-relational meanings. It then proposes that each Maqāṣid domain should be assessed through both enabling conditions and self-evaluated flourishing, with explicit attention to non-compensation, dignity, cultural variation, and the ethical risks of measuring religiosity (Diener et al., 2018; Rasool et al., 2020).

2. Methods

This article employs a directed integrative literature review and conceptual synthesis. The design is appropriate when a study seeks to connect concepts developed in adjacent

but non-identical bodies of scholarship, clarify their boundaries, and generate a framework for subsequent empirical work. It does not report a survey, experiment, or meta-analysis, and it does not claim to estimate causal effects. Instead, the review treats Maqāṣid scholarship as a normative theory of human goods and SWB scholarship as a theory and measurement tradition concerned with people's evaluations and experiences of their lives (Snyder, 2019; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

The source base includes primary Maqāṣid texts in English translation and contemporary scholarly works on Maqāṣid, Islamic well-being, quality of life, and subjective well-being. Sources were selected when they made a direct conceptual contribution to at least one of four questions: what counts as a protected or flourishing human good in Maqāṣid; how quality of life and SWB are defined and measured; how Islamic and Indonesian research has operationalized well-being; and what methodological cautions apply when measuring meaning, faith, and self-reported welfare. Indonesian institutional and journal sources were included to anchor the framework in a context where subjective happiness measurement and Islamic social thought are both publicly relevant (BPS, 2021; Kadji & Widiyanti, 2023; Victoriana et al., 2023).

The literature search was conducted in Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar using keywords: *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*, *subjective well-being*, *quality of life*, *Muslim well-being*, and *Indonesia*. Inclusion criteria: (1) peer-reviewed articles or books published between 2000–2024; (2) direct conceptual contribution to Maqāṣid or SWB theory; (3) empirical studies on Muslim populations or Indonesian context. Exclusion criteria: (1) purely legal or fiqh discussions without well-being implications; (2) non-English sources without translation. A total of 42 sources were included after full-text screening. Differing interpretations of Maqāṣid (e.g., five-domain vs. expanded models) were resolved by prioritizing Ibn Ashur and Auda's systems-oriented approach while noting alternative formulations in the discussion.

The analysis proceeded in three stages. First, the study extracted the core domains and normative claims of Maqāṣid from Ibn Ashur and modern systems-oriented interpretation. Second, it identified the central components of SWB and quality-of-life measurement: cognitive life evaluation, positive and negative affect, eudaimonic meaning, and domain-specific satisfaction. Third, it compared the two traditions by asking whether a given

construct functions as a condition of flourishing, a subjective appraisal, a moral orientation, or a combination of these. The outcome is a conceptual framework rather than a numerical index because the relative weights and psychometric behavior of indicators require empirical validation (Ibn Ashur, 2006; Auda, 2008; Diener et al., 2018).

A central methodological principle is construct separation. Maqāṣid domains specify ethically significant areas of life, whereas SWB indicates how individuals evaluate or experience their lives within and across those areas. One cannot infer that a person is flourishing solely because they express satisfaction, nor can one infer that a person is satisfied merely because objective conditions appear adequate. The framework therefore avoids treating religiosity, health, education, family relations, or income as interchangeable proxies for happiness. It also avoids treating self-reported satisfaction as a sufficient test of justice or welfare, especially when preferences may adapt to deprivation (WHOQOL Group, 1995; Diener et al., 2018).

The resulting synthesis is intentionally proposed as a first-order framework for instrument development. It recommends future researchers use cognitive interviews, participatory item development, pilot testing, factor analysis, and measurement-invariance testing before making comparative claims across gender, age, region, school attainment, or Muslim subgroups. This caution is consistent with the broader literature on adapting well-being instruments across contexts and with Indonesian research showing that meaning, gratitude, social relationships, and emotional regulation may shape subjective well-being in ways that cannot be reduced to a single score (Warsah et al., 2023; Victoriana et al., 2023).

3. Results: A Maqāṣid-SWB Framework for Muslim Quality of Life

3.1. Complementary but Non-Identical Theories of a Good Life

The synthesis indicates that Maqāṣid and SWB are complementary because both reject a narrow economic definition of welfare, but they answer different questions. Maqāṣid asks what human goods, protections, and social arrangements are necessary for a life ordered toward benefit and away from harm. SWB asks how people judge their lives and how frequently they experience pleasant or unpleasant affect. The first is fundamentally normative and purposive; the second is evaluative and experiential. Treating

them as identical would erase the distinctive contribution of both traditions (Auda, 2008; Diener et al., 2018).

This distinction is essential for quality-of-life measurement. Objective and institutional conditions, such as access to health care, safe housing, education, legal protection, fair employment, and opportunities for religious practice, are not reducible to personal mood. Conversely, an indicator set composed only of observable conditions may miss whether people feel secure, respected, connected, capable, and purposeful. The WHOQOL tradition therefore defines quality of life in relation to a person's perception of their position in life within cultural and value systems, while Maqāṣid literature adds a normative account of the goods that such perceptions should be able to engage (WHOQOL Group, 1995; Ab Manan et al., 2021).

The framework consequently defines Muslim quality of life as a multidimensional condition in which people have reasonable access to the capabilities, protections, relationships, and moral-spiritual resources associated with the Maqāṣid domains, and in which they can evaluate those conditions as adequate, meaningful, and conducive to a dignified life. This definition does not assume that all Muslims interpret well-being in exactly the same way. Rather, it offers a shared normative map while retaining space for subjective interpretation, contextual variation, and the lived significance of local institutions and family practices (Yusof et al., 2019; Rasool et al., 2020).

3.2. Ḥifẓ al-Dīn: Faith, Moral Coherence, and Spiritual Agency

Within the proposed framework, ḥifẓ al-dīn should not be reduced to counting ritual performance or policing private belief. Its measurement purpose is to identify whether individuals experience sufficient freedom, knowledge, support, and ethical coherence to live in ways they regard as religiously meaningful. Relevant objective or enabling conditions may include access to trusted religious education, space for worship, protection from discrimination, and credible moral guidance. Subjective indicators may ask whether respondents feel that their beliefs offer orientation, whether they can practice without fear or humiliation, and whether their daily choices are congruent with their moral commitments (Ibn Ashur, 2006; Yusof et al., 2019).

The inclusion of a faith domain responds to a limitation in secular quality-of-life models when applied without adaptation to Muslim settings. Religion may function as identity, meaning, community, moral restraint, and a source of hope, but these functions should be assessed as experienced resources rather than assumed benefits. The framework therefore avoids an automatic inference that more visible religious practice equals higher quality of life. It instead examines spiritual agency, moral coherence, and perceived support, recognizing that people may also experience religious strain, exclusion, or conflict. This approach preserves the value of faith while respecting the ethical requirements of non-coercive social research (Auda, 2008; Warsah et al., 2023).

3.3. Ḥifẓ al-Nafs: Bodily Security, Mental Health, and Felt Safety

Ḥifẓ al-nafs concerns the protection and development of life. In a measurement framework, it includes physical health, safety, nutrition, housing stability, freedom from violence, access to care, and psychosocial security. These should be represented both as conditions and as experiences. For example, a person may have health services available but still feel unable to obtain respectful treatment; another may report adequate housing while living with persistent fear. The Maqāṣid-SWB framework therefore combines indicators of access and exposure with self-evaluations of health, safety, vitality, and emotional balance (WHOQOL Group, 1995; Yusof et al., 2019).

Mental and emotional well-being must be integrated into ḥifẓ al-nafs rather than treated as an optional add-on. SWB research shows that affective experience is one component of how people experience their lives, while Indonesian research demonstrates that gratitude, mindfulness, and emotion regulation can be associated with well-being in particular populations. Yet the framework does not medicalize every negative emotion or imply that wellbeing means uninterrupted happiness. A Maqāṣid-informed account is compatible with the idea that meaningful struggle, patience, care, and moral responsibility can coexist with temporary distress, provided life is not systematically damaged by preventable harms and deprivation (Diener et al., 2018; Warsah et al., 2023).

3.4. Ḥifẓ al-‘Aql: Knowledge, Critical Capacity, and Cognitive Flourishing

Ḥifẓ al-‘aql frames the intellect as a good that must be protected and developed. Its scope includes literacy, educational access, the ability to reason, freedom from cognitive harm, and opportunities to acquire and use knowledge responsibly. For quality-of-life measurement, this domain should therefore include more than years of schooling. It should assess whether respondents feel able to understand information relevant to their lives, make informed decisions, learn new skills, think critically, and contribute knowledgeably within their family, work, and community contexts. Such indicators link Maqāṣid to human capability without reducing intellectual flourishing to credentials alone (Ibn Ashur, 2006; Yusof et al., 2019).

The subjective side of ḥifẓ al-‘aql includes perceived competence, autonomy in learning, confidence in judgment, and satisfaction with access to knowledge. These assessments are especially relevant in a digital environment in which information abundance does not guarantee discernment. A person may possess formal education while feeling unable to evaluate misinformation, participate in decisions, or apply knowledge meaningfully. The framework thus treats cognitive flourishing as both a social entitlement and a lived sense of agency. This interpretation is consistent with Indonesian well-being research that identifies education, meaningful life, and the quality of social relationships as relevant to happiness, while also acknowledging that educational attainment does not mechanically produce satisfaction (Nandini & Afiatno, 2020; Victoriana et al., 2023).

3.5. Ḥifẓ al-Nasl: Family Continuity, Care, and Relational Dignity

Ḥifẓ al-nasl is often translated as preservation of posterity, but a quality-of-life application should read it more broadly as the protection and flourishing of family continuity, care, kinship responsibility, and future generations. The relevant concern is not whether respondents conform to a single household form; it is whether they have access to respectful, safe, and supportive relationships and whether children, dependents, and older family members are protected from neglect and harm. This makes relational dignity central to Muslim quality of life and prevents family from being operationalized only through marriage status or fertility (Ibn Ashur, 2006; Yusof et al., 2019).

Indicators for this domain should capture perceived support, conflict resolution, caregiving burden, intergenerational trust, and confidence that dependents can develop safely. They should also allow respondents to report family strain without stigma. SWB theory reinforces the relevance of these questions because close relationships are among the most consistent correlates of life evaluation and emotional experience, while Indonesian studies identify internal and external relationships as salient to happiness. A Maqāṣid-SWB framework consequently evaluates both the availability of relational supports and the perceived quality, fairness, and meaning of those relationships (Diener et al., 2018; Nandini & Afiatno, 2020).

3.6. Ḥifẓ al-Māl: Material Security, Stewardship, and Economic Dignity

Ḥifẓ al-māl addresses the protection, acquisition, circulation, and ethical use of wealth. In quality-of-life research, it calls attention to income security, employment quality, debt vulnerability, housing and food security, property protection, and fairness in economic opportunity. However, the relevant issue is not wealth accumulation without limit. Maqāṣid frames wealth as a means for sustaining life, family, social responsibility, and justice. This permits economic indicators to be included without allowing them to dominate the entire measurement model (Auda, 2008; Rasool et al., 2020).

The subjective dimension of ḥifẓ al-māl should include perceived financial security, ability to meet essential obligations, confidence in managing shocks, and satisfaction with the fairness and dignity of one's work or livelihood. Kadji and Widiyanti's (2023) Indonesian analysis found that the wealth dimension had the strongest association with life satisfaction among Muslim volunteers, which confirms that material security matters. Nevertheless, the same result should not be interpreted as proof that wealth is sufficient for flourishing. The proposed framework treats economic security as necessary but not independently decisive because severe deficits in health, knowledge, family relations, or moral agency cannot be treated as fully offset by higher income (Kadji & Widiyanti, 2023; Diener et al., 2018).

3.7. Three Measurement Planes and the Principle of Non-Compensation

Across all five domains, the framework proposes three measurement planes. The first is an objective and institutional plane that assesses resources, protections, opportunities, and exposures to harm. The second is a subjective evaluative plane that asks respondents to assess satisfaction, adequacy, safety, competence, trust, and meaning within each domain. The third is an ethical-relational plane that considers whether the domain supports dignity, responsibility, mutual care, and morally coherent agency. These planes should be interpreted together because each corrects the limits of the others: objective indicators detect structural deprivation, subjective indicators reveal lived experience, and ethical-relational indicators keep the framework connected to Maqāṣid's normative purpose (Ab Manan et al., 2021; WHOQOL Group, 1995).

A further result of the synthesis is the principle of non-compensation. A single aggregate score can obscure serious deprivation when high performance in one domain mathematically compensates for grave failure in another. For example, high income should not conceal exposure to violence, profound educational exclusion, loss of family safety, or inability to practice one's faith with dignity. A Maqāṣid-SWB index should therefore report domain scores separately, establish minimum thresholds for severe harm, and use composite scores only as secondary summaries. This approach is consistent with the Maqāṣid emphasis on safeguarding essential goods and with quality-of-life research that recognizes the multidimensionality of well-being (Ibn Ashur, 2006; Yusof et al., 2019).

The framework also cautions against equating a higher total score with moral superiority. Quality-of-life measurement should be used to identify unmet needs, inequalities, and opportunities for support, not to rank individuals according to their piety or social worth. The faith domain in particular must be administered voluntarily and confidentially, framed in terms of perceived access and meaning, and interpreted with humility. Such safeguards are necessary both for research ethics and for the conceptual integrity of Maqāṣid, whose concern with human welfare cannot be separated from justice, mercy, and the avoidance of harm (Auda, 2008; Rasool et al., 2020).

The framework acknowledges that Maqāṣid domains may conflict in practice. Following Ibn Ashur's hierarchy of necessities (*ḍarūriyyāt*), needs (*ḥājjiyyāt*), and embellishments (*taḥsīniyyāt*), the framework recommends that severe deprivation in any

necessity domain (e.g., life, faith, intellect) cannot be justified by gains in another domain (non-compensation principle). For moderate trade-offs in non-necessity areas, the framework suggests participatory deliberation with the affected community to determine contextual priorities. For example, a livelihood strategy that increases income but reduces family care time should be assessed through community-defined thresholds of relational dignity and economic security, rather than through a single aggregated score."

4. Discussion

The proposed framework contributes to the dialogue between Islamic social thought and contemporary well-being science by preserving a productive tension. SWB makes an indispensable contribution because people's own evaluations are morally and empirically important; no external observer can fully infer the felt quality of a life from income, education, or household structure. Maqāṣid makes an equally indispensable contribution because a population may report adaptation to unjust or harmful conditions, and because welfare involves social and moral goods that cannot be treated as mere preferences. The framework thus rejects the false choice between subjective happiness and normative justice (Diener et al., 2018; Ibn Ashur, 2006).

The relationship to eudaimonic approaches is particularly important. Contemporary well-being measurement increasingly recognizes meaning, purpose, and functioning alongside pleasure and life satisfaction. Indonesia's Happiness Index explicitly includes a meaning-of-life dimension, and research with Indonesian university students has shown a positive association between meaning in life and SWB. The Maqāṣid-SWB framework builds on this convergence but gives meaning a more structured social and ethical location: meaning is not only an individual psychological feeling, but may arise from faith, responsibility, learning, care, livelihood, and just participation in social life (BPS, 2021; Victoriana et al., 2023).

The framework should not be read as an attempt to Islamize established psychological scales by attaching Arabic labels to pre-existing items. Such a practice would risk conceptual superficiality. For instance, financial satisfaction may capture part of *ḥifẓ al-māl*, but it does not automatically measure stewardship, economic justice, or freedom from exploitative vulnerability. Likewise, life satisfaction may correlate with *ḥifẓ al-dīn*, but

it does not independently assess whether a person can pursue religious commitments with knowledge, dignity, and non-coercion. A valid instrument must therefore develop domain-specific items through linguistic, cultural, theological, and psychometric inquiry rather than simple relabeling (Ab Manan et al., 2021; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

The Indonesian setting offers a constructive site for future testing because subjective well-being has already been measured nationally and because Islamic institutions, family networks, educational settings, philanthropic organizations, and halal economic practices constitute recognizable social contexts. The framework could be used in household surveys, studies of Muslim students, evaluations of zakat or waqf programs, community health initiatives, and assessments of local development. In each application, the instrument should retain core domains while adapting concrete indicators to the population under study. A student instrument, for example, may give more attention to learning agency and family support, whereas a livelihood study may prioritize work dignity, debt security, and access to social protection (BPS, 2021; Kadji & Widiyanti, 2023).

Operationally, future measurement should begin with a participatory item-generation phase. Researchers should conduct interviews and focus groups with diverse Muslim respondents, religious scholars, psychologists, social workers, economists, women's groups, youth, and persons with disabilities. Their task would be to identify what each Maqāṣid domain means in everyday language, which experiences represent flourishing or harm, and which questions are culturally clear without being invasive. Draft items could then be examined through cognitive interviews, translated using established cross-cultural procedures, pilot-tested, and evaluated using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. This sequence is necessary because a conceptually attractive framework may still fail if its items are ambiguous, coercive, or insensitive to local variation (Snyder, 2019; WHOQOL Group, 1995).

A second implication concerns the use of subjective indicators in policy. Self-reported satisfaction should neither be dismissed as private sentiment nor elevated as the sole criterion of public success. When paired with objective Maqāṣid conditions, subjective responses can reveal where people feel secure, respected, hopeful, capable, or excluded. Conversely, objective indicators can identify circumstances in which apparently acceptable satisfaction scores coexist with unequal access, normalized deprivation, or

constrained aspirations. This dual reading is particularly valuable for programs that claim Islamic social objectives, because it asks whether assistance supports both material adequacy and a participant's sense of agency, dignity, and meaningful social belonging (Diener et al., 2018; Yusof et al., 2019).

The framework also clarifies the place of religion in well-being research. It does not assume that all religious effects are positive or that spiritual life can be represented through a uniform practice score. Instead, *ḥifẓ al-dīn* is understood as a domain of access, moral orientation, and perceived coherence. This makes it possible to examine both supportive and constraining religious experiences. It also permits different Muslim communities to articulate what spiritual flourishing means in their own contexts, while retaining the broader Maqāṣid commitment to protection of faith, life, intellect, family, and wealth. Such plural sensitivity is preferable to an instrument that confuses measurement with surveillance (Auda, 2008; Warsah et al., 2023).

Several limitations should be stated clearly. First, the article is a conceptual synthesis and has not tested the proposed framework with respondents. Second, the five-domain articulation of Maqāṣid is influential but not the only possible formulation; contemporary scholars differ in how they expand, prioritize, or systematize Maqāṣid. Third, the framework may require additional attention to ecological conditions, disability, political participation, digital safety, and social inequality if it is used for contemporary development assessment. These limitations should prompt empirical refinement rather than rejection of the framework's central insight: Muslim quality of life is best measured through a dialogue between normative goods and lived evaluation, not by either approach alone (Ibn Ashur, 2006; Auda, 2008; Rasool et al., 2020).

Unlike the Capability Approach, which focuses on freedom to achieve functionings without specifying which functionings are intrinsically valuable, Maqāṣid provides a substantive normative account of human goods derived from Islamic ethical traditions. Unlike the HDI, which privileges material and educational proxies, the Maqāṣid-SWB framework includes relational, spiritual, and moral dimensions as co-equal with economic indicators. Unlike the OECD Better Life Index, which treats well-being dimensions as broadly universal, this framework is culturally grounded for Muslim populations while retaining space for subjective evaluation. This framework therefore fills a gap by offering

both normative grounding and subjective evaluation within a single, culturally intelligible measurement model."

5. Conclusion

This article has proposed a Maqāṣid-SWB framework that integrates normative Islamic ethics with subjective evaluation to measure Muslim quality of life. The framework's main contribution is a dual-assessment approach across five domains—religion, life, intellect, family, and wealth—using both enabling conditions and subjective appraisals, while upholding the non-compensation principle to prevent material gains from masking severe deprivation in other domains. This model offers a culturally grounded and ethically robust alternative to generic quality-of-life instruments, particularly for Muslim-majority contexts like Indonesia. Future empirical validation is required before the framework can be operationalized as a measurement index.

References

- Ab Manan, S. K., Ahmad Khalid, H., Saidon, R., Yahaya, A. M., & Abdul Wahab, M. H. (2021). Maqasid approach in measuring quality of life (QoL). *Journal of Fatwa Management and Research*, 26(2), 35-49. <https://doi.org/10.33102/jfatwa.vol26no2.399>
- Auda, J. (2008). *Maqasid al-shariah: A beginner's guide*. International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2021). *Indeks kebahagiaan 2021*. BPS-Statistics Indonesia.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Tay, L. (2018). Advances in subjective well-being research. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2(4), 253-260. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0307-6>
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>
- Ibn Ashur, M. al-T. (2006). *Treatise on Maqasid al-Shari'ah* (M. E.-T. El-Mesawi, Trans.). International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Kadji, D., & Widiyanti, D. R. (2023). Volunteers' well-being with the maqashid shariah approach: Evidence from charitable organizations in Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi & Keuangan Islam*, 9(1), 62-73. <https://doi.org/10.20885/JEKI.vol9.iss1.art5>

- Kamaliya, N., Setyowibowo, H., & Cahyadi, S. (2021). Kesejahteraan subjektif mahasiswa di masa pandemi Covid-19. *JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan)*, 5(2), 199-206. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jisip.v5i2.1949>
- Li, J.-B., Dou, K., & Liang, Y. (2021). The relationship between presence of meaning, search for meaning, and subjective well-being: A three-level meta-analysis based on the Meaning in Life Questionnaire. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 22(1), 467-489. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-020-00230-y>
- Nandini, D., & Afiatno, B. E. (2020). Determinants of subjective well-being: Evidence of urban Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan*, 18(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jep.v18i1.11687>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2013). *OECD guidelines on measuring subjective well-being*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264191655-en>
- Rasool, M. S. A., Yusof, M. A. M., & Ali, S. M. (2020). Wellbeing of the society: A maqāṣid al-sharī'ah approach. *Afkar, Special Issue*, 25-46. <https://doi.org/10.22452/afkar.sp2020no1.2>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Victoriana, E., Manurung, R. T., Azizah, E., Teresa, M., & Gultom, Z. A. (2023). Meaning in life and subjective well-being among university student. *Humanitas (Jurnal Psikologi)*, 7(2), 225-244. <https://doi.org/10.28932/humanitas.v7i2.6544>
- Warsah, I., Chamami, M. R., Prastuti, E., Morganna, R., & Iqbal, M. M. (2023). Insights on mother's subjective well-being: The influence of emotion regulation, mindfulness, and gratitude. *Psikohumaniora: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 8(1), 51-68. <https://doi.org/10.21580/pjpp.v8i1.13655>
- World Health Organization Quality of Life Group. (1995). The World Health Organization Quality of Life assessment (WHOQOL): Position paper from the World Health Organization. *Social Science & Medicine*, 41(10), 1403-1409. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(95\)00112-K](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(95)00112-K)
- Yusof, S. A., Budiman, M. A., Amin, R. M., & Abideen, A. (2019). Holistic development and wellbeing based on Maqasid al-Shari'ah: The case of South Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Journal of Economic Cooperation and Development*, 40(4), 1-22.