ISLAMIC DEVELOPMENT BANK
ISLAMIC RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE

AN ESTIMATION OF LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT

(A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON IDB MEMBERS OF OIC - 1995)

Morteza Gharehbaghian

1421H ***2000G***

بسم الله الرحمن الرحیم

In The Name Of God

AN ESTIMATION OF LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT

(A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON IDB MEMBERS OF OIC - 1995)

Morteza Gharehbaghian

Abstract

Sustainable development is targeted by many developing nations. In economic literature, development is defined as creating process of welfare and providing necessities for public to maintain opportunities and choices of a society. Nowadays, we not only use economic indicators to evaluate the level of development, but it is also necessary to introduce non- economic indicators such as hygienic, educational, demographic and other socio-cultural factors along with economic factors. In this way the socio - economic planners will be able to evaluate, analyze and design development policies.

For the last fifty years, medium term socio - economic development was planned and implemented in Islamic countries, and now it is necessary to evaluate all the efforts have been done for the planning and its internal and external effects. This paper tries to put light on the issue. We try to identify the standings of the member countries of the Islamic Development Bank (IDB) in terms of the degree of their development within the Islamic countries with of a quantitative analysis. In this research, the case of IDB member countries is taken for analysis by utilizing comparative study method with the help of a statistical technique.

The general outcome of this research indicates that West Asian members, enjoy better position as compared to the others if economic and non- economic factors are to be taken into consideration.

Introduction

Efforts to survive, progressing both in terms of moral and material issues, maintaining welfare, accumulating wealth, and eradication of poverty and promotion of a balanced development are the main goals of states. A

sustainable development not only maintain the economic growth but would also leads to a more justifiable income distribution, environment conservation and elimination of regional and social disparity.

In this research, with the help of taxonomy analysis technique, we try to estimate the level of development in Islamic member countries of IDB. The study is based on the statistics of the year 1995, because of the availability of data for some year ahead and lack of reliable data for the consequent years.

0verview

The main objective of the research is to find out the extent and comparative level of development in IDB member countries.

Based on following hypothesis, the IDB member countries are highly disparate and unhomogenized as far as development issues are concerned. Such a deduction is supported by appropriate statistical data regarding the countries under study. The indicators will be categorized into five groups, namely hygienic, demographic, educational, socio-cultural and finally economic strata.

For this research, statistical sources including UNDP, World Bank UNESCO,OIC, etc., and latest development literature are used. All the indicators are given the same degree of importance. Due to lack of data, some Islamic countries including Azerbaijan, uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgystan and Brunei are disregarded and 45 countries are taken into consideration.

Indicators are ranked vertically and for some indicators like mortality rate the inverse values of the matrix are considered.

Matrices in this study contain values of various indicators. The selected matrices must explain the targeted subjects. The row data hold different units of measures. For the unification of all indicators, the actual values are deducted from mean values and the result will be divided by standard deviation of the same indicator. After standardizing indices, an ideal index will be estimated and will be entered in a row below the standard matrix. By assuming the positive effects of all indices, we take maximum

value column as the ideal one, then the ideal development for all regions will be estimated.

$$C_i = (s(z_{ij} - z_{max\, i})^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

where i =No. of region

j= No. of indices

with the estimation of c^* $(i.e. c^* = c^* + 25)$

degree of development (f_i) are given as below:

$$f_i = \frac{c_i}{c^*}$$ where: c^* mean of c_i

s = standard error of c_i

The smaller value of $f_i (0 \langle f_i \langle 1)$ shows the region is more developed. For better expression of degrees of development, the values obtained are deducted from unity, and therefore, values approaching unity, are considered as better development indicators.

Concept of Development and its Indicators:

Development is considered as a multi - purpose concept, which aims at structural changes in social and economic affairs of a country. It considers accelerating economic growth, reducing inequality and eradication of absolute poverty. Development is a dynamic process, which starts from a specified historical era in the political and economic life of a society, which is concurrent with emergence of an acceptable degree of social justice and prosperity.

The classical economists consider development as " growth of national economy",[1] and neo-classical economists define Development as "growth of per capita GNP"[2]

Until recently, economists used to measure economic development by using economic variables such as national income, per capita income and other macroeconomic variables, but recent studies indicate that these variables may not prove to be a satisfactory indicators for the welfare of the society. The inaccuracies in system of national accounts and dominance of shadow economy may also be considered as other reasons for using more comprehensive approach. International agencies such as United Nations and UNESCO have studied the issues and tried to substitute socio- economic indices for traditional macro variables. Although the socio-economic indicators may be considered helpful in comparative studies, but due to limitations, inaccuracies in resulted statistics and difference in definition of concepts, the new methodology faces shortcomings. Thus. It is necessary to select suitable combination of indices for measuring economic welfare.

The indicators used in this paper based on the UNDP indices, i.e., methodology used by center of planning and Human Development as well as World Bank annual development indicators. we also tried to specify the most related and applied indices to compare the level of development in member countries the concept of which are as follows:

---

1 smith, Adam, Wealth of Nations,ed. Edwincanon. (New York: the Modern library, 1965)

2 Meier, G.M., Leading Issues in Economic Development,, oxford university press, 1984.

1- Hygienic and Environmental Criteria

From the beginning, the human kind was looking for an eternal life. Some may seek it from KHEZR Prophet. Despite public belief in this matter, the world opinions strongly search for better hygienic, health and measures preserving environment. The people in rural areas enjoy more solid and natural life away from pollution but deny having access to suitable medical care and social securities. On the other hand, urban population may gain access to modern health facilities and social cares but faces pollution and other obstacles, which are the result of an unbalanced development . A society may obtain the optimal condition of life expectancy if it enjoys advantages of both rural and urban living simultaneously.

The main criteria on this issue may be summarized as follows:-

1) life expectancy of men,
2) life expectancy of women,
3) percentage share of population having access to sanitary water,
4) percentage share of population enjoying environmental sanitation
5) the rate of infant mortality,
6) morality rate of mothers,
7) mortality rate of children below five years old,
8) the gross rate of birth,
9) the gross mortality rate,
10) total health care expenditure as percentage of GDP ,
11) rate of AIDS- infected adults.

2- Educational Criteria

Investment in human resources is a new phenomenon in economic literature. Over-emphasis on physical capital during the process of economic growth may not lead a society into a sustainable development. In recent years, many development economists studied the issue (Backer, T., Schultz, A.K., sen, A., etc.). Their research shows that rapid growth of physical

capital mainly depends on the rate of human capital formation through accumulation of knowledge, skills and productive capacities of the country.

Studies made by Teodore Schultz and others indicate that investment in education sector guarantees a sustainable growth for the economy. His case study for the United States shows that human capital investment (i.e. education and health care) contributed more than physical capital investment during the process of industrial growth[3]. Even classical economists like Smith, Marshall, etc. also emphasized on this critical issue.

Most economists consider the low investment in human capital as the main challenge of growth in developing countries. So long as these countries facing deficiencies in applying science and technology as a result of lacking technical skills, their productivity of labor and capital would remain low, and therefore, their economic growth would be costly and slow.

The physical capital can be more productive and efficient when it is combined by optimal level of human capital. In this study we summarize the education criteria as being composed of the two following indices.

1) the literacy rate (for men and women)

2) share of women in labor force

3- Population Criteria

Population affects development process from two opposite directions. Firstly, population may be considered as a potential power factor for a society. On the other hand, rapid population growth brings about shortages for scare resources. On the basis of law of diminishing return to factors of production, over-population leads to decrease in labor productivity, per capita income, tax capacity and decline of other socio-economic standards. Moreover, the nature and distribution of population would also affect process of economic development.

For the purpose of this study we consider the following population indices:

(1) population growth rate,

[3] Schultz., T.W., Investment in Human Capital, AER, March 1961.

(2) urban population growth rate,

(3) percentage of population above 60 years, and

(4) rate of growth of labor force.

4- Socio - cultural Criteria

Development of communication and mass media can improve welfare of society as well as growth potentialities of an economy. Although there is limitation on quantification of social criteria, but we try to select a list of more reliable indicators which a society may achieve during development process. The related indices are as follows:

1) number of telephone lines,

2) number of mobile sets,

3) number of fax sets,

4) total newspaper subscriptions,

5) percentage of population using TV,

6) percentage of people using radio set.

5- Economic Indicators

Traditionally economic indicators such as national income and per-capita income are used for evaluating an economy. Let us examine the shortcomings of these variables.

Firstly, national accounts consider only monetized segment of economy, but many activities particularly in developing countries take place in shadow economy or in unofficial sectors. Furthermore, the System of National Accounts (SNA) neglects the inflationary pressures, rate of population growth, distribution of income and wealth, environmental considerations, and other side effects of industrialization. Moreover, there are difficulties in measuring transfer payments. On the one hand it considers income of a group of society and on the other hand, it is a part of public expenditure. Use of per - capita index in real term may compensate some shortcomings.

The classical version undermines the distribution and environmental issues.

In this paper we consider a set of economic factors such as:

1) The annual rate of growth of GDP,
2) Growth rate of gross domestic investment,
3) Growth rate of foreign assets,
4) Growth ate of GDP deflator index,
5) Growth rate of CPI,
6) Growth rate of exports,
7) Share of gross domestic investment in GDP,
8) Share of industrial value added in GDP,
9) Share of national saving in GDP,
10) Share of export in GDP,
11) Share of imports in GDP,
12) Ratio of exports to imports,
13) Share of food in total import,
14) Growth rate of per-capita income,
15) Inverse of defense share in GDP,
16) Per-capita product of electricity,
17) Share of energy consumption in GDP,
18) Share of domestic energy production in total energy consumption.

Conclusion

On the basis of Taxonomy statistical analysis, level of development varies between zero and unity $(0\langle f_i \langle 1)$. If it approaches unity, it indicates the ideal condition for that given country. The tables in every section rank

the level of development of member of Islamic Development Bank. Moreover, the average standard error and under - development line is measured for all samples.

Few countries or regions comparatively have extensive difference (i.e. positively or negatively) with other member states. Therefore, the degree of development for them is highly deviated from normal values, e.g., the economic development of Kuwait as compared to Central African and Southern Asian countries. By using Taxonomy analysis techniques, the extreme cases are excluded from ranking list.

1- Hygienic Development

As it is clear from table 2, the UAE, Kuwait. Qatar, Bahrain, S. Arabia, I.R. Iran, Jordan and Oman possess respectively the rank of 1,2,3,6,8,10 and 11 among all concerned states. In overall view, countries in the offshore of Persian Gulf holding better position than other member states. The African members are in worse levels, even for an oil producing country like Nigeria. About 84 to 98 percent of people in Kuwait, I.R. Iran, Saudi Arabia and UAE have access to solid water as compared to 24 percent in Chad.

2- Educational Development

As education indices are concerned, Lebanon and the UAE hold the best position respectively and the least position held by Burkinafaso.

West Asian states, as a whole, comparatively score a better position than other member does and African countries again hold the worst condition. Female education is also follows the same result.

3- Demographic Development

As it is clear from table No. 4, Qatar scores the highest degree and Comoros possesses the least development. On the other hand, Afghanistan and Albania with negative score are ill - matched with other member states. The result obtained in this category differs from other sections. It may be due to social underdevelopment in relatively advanced states.

4- Socio - Cultural Development

For this criterion, Oman scores the highest degree and Borkinafaso is holding the least. the Asian states ossess the first twenty ranks. A high disparity is observed between the member states (i.e. with 0.242 standard deviation). The estimation shows 5 countries scored less than 0.273 as compared to Oman 0.938 degree of development.

5- Economic Development

Due to deficiencies of data, we took only 35 countries of member states into consideration. Countries like Kuwait and UAE are ill - matched with other countries, i.e., they scored more than unity and Saudi Arabia, Oman, Turkey, Malaysia and I.R. Iran scored highest degree respectively. The least developed country with respect to economic criteria, is Mozambique and Benin. By this evaluation a high disparity is also noted between the level of development, i.e., standard deviation estimated 0.1907. It is observed that economic development is positively correlated with the saving share in GDP, growth of exports, electricity generation and inversely correlated with the share of food in total imports.

6- Non - Economic Criteria of Development

This criterion includes hygienic, educational, demographic and socio- cultural indicators of development. For estimation purpose we used the data of all 45 countries in which Kuwait and Oman ranked first and second respectively and Sierra Leone scored the least degree. While using this criteria Arab Gulf States stood at highest rank and Africans scored the lowest degree.

TABLE 1

An Overview of Member States of IDB

Country	Currency Unit	Male Female Ratio × 100	Population Density Per K m^2	Size of Country m^2	The year Of UN membership	Language	Region
Algeria	Dinar	100	11	2381741	1962	Arabic	North Africa
Egypt	Pound	97	55	1001449	1945	Arabic	"
Libya	Dinar	92	3	1759540	1955	Arabic	"
Morocco	Derham	100	58	446550	1956	Arabic	"
Sudan	Pound	99	10	2505813	1956	Arabic	"
Tunisia	Derham	98	51	163610	1956	Arabic	"
Cameroon	Frank	101	26	475442	1960	French	Central Africa
Chad	Frank	103	5	1284000	1960	French	"
Gabon	Frank	103	5	267667	1960	French	"
Comoros	Frank	97	255	2235	1975	French	East Africa
Djibouti	Frank	99	18	23200	1977	Djibouti	"
Gambia	Dalasi	102	78	11245	1965	English	"
Mozambique	Metica	102	20	801590	1975	Portugue	"
Somalia	Shilling	102	12	637657	1960	se	"
Uganda	Shilling	101	83	235880	1962	Arabic English	"
Guinea	Frank	99	24	245857	1958	French	West Africa
Guinea Bissau	Frank	103	27	26125	1974	English	"
Mali	Frank	103	8	--	1960	English	"
Mauritania	Frank	102	2	1025522	1961	Arabic	"
Niger	Frank	102	6	1267000	1960	French	"
Nigeria	Nyra	102	121	923768	1960	English	"
Senegal	Frank	100	38	196722	1960	French	"
Sierra Leone	Lion	103	59	71750	1961	English	"

....**TABLE 1**

Country	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Benin	Frank	102	43	112622	1960	French	South Africa
Burkinafaso	Frank	103	34	274000	1960	French	“
Albania	LeK	95	115	28748	1955	Albanian	South Europe
Brunei	Dollar	95	47	5765	1984	Malay	South East Asia
Malaysia	Dollar	98	56	329749	1957	Malay-Chinese	“
Indonesia	Rupee	101	99	1904569	1950	Indonesian	
Kazakhstan	Ruble	--	--	2717300	1992	Kazakhi	Central Asia
Kyrgysistan	“	--	--	198500	“	Kyrgysi	“
Tajikistan	“	--	--	143100	“	Tajiki-Uzbaki	“
Turkmenistan]	“	--	--	488100	“	Turkmeni	“
Uzbekistan	“	--	--	447400	“	Uzbeki-Russian	“
Afghanistan	Afghani	95	95	652090	1946	Pashtoo-Farsi	“
Bengladesh	Taka	94	825	143998	1944	Bengali	South Asia
I.R. Iran	Rial	97	34	1648000	1945	Farsi-Azari	“
Maldives	Rufia	92	748	298	1965	Maldives	“
Pakistan	Rupee	92	145	796095	1947	Urdu-English	“
Azerbaijan	Ruble	--	--	86600	1992	Azari	West Asia
Bahrain	Dinar	75	762	678	1971	Arabic	”
Iraq	“	96	45	438317	1945	Arabic	“
Jordan	“	95	42	97740	1995	“	“
Kuwait	“	97	118	17818	1963	“	“
Lebanon	Pound	105	264	10400	1945	“	“
Oman	Rial	90	7	212458	1971	Arabic	“
Qatar	“	55	35	11000	“	“	“
S.Arabia	“	81	7	2146690	1954	“	“
Syria	Pound	98	70	185180	“	“	“
Turkey	Lira	96	78	779452	“	Turkish	“
UAE	Derham	52	19	83600	1971	Arabic	“
Yemen	Rial	102	--		--	Arabic	“

TABLE 2

RANK AND DEGREE OF Hygienic DEVELOPMENT IN 1995 ISLAMIC WORLD

Country	Degree	Rank
U.A EMIRATES	0.9141	1
KUWAIT	0.9141	2
QATAR	0.9110	3
BAHRAIN	0.9109	4
MALAYSIA	0.9109	5
SAUDI – ARABIA	0.9075	6
ALBANIA	0.9064	7
IRAN	0.8651	8
TUNISIA	0.8936	9
JORDAN	0.8933	10
OMAN	0.8925	11
TURKEY	0.8923	12
SYRIA	0.8922	13
LEBANON	0.8874	14
LIBYA	0.8869	15
EGYPT	0.8851	16
MALDIVES	0.8734	17
ALGERIA	0.8711	18
INDONESIA	0.8684	19
MOROCCO	0.8674	20
IRAQ	0.8563	21
PAKISTAN	0.8557	22
CAMEROON	0.8484	23
GABON	0.8480	24
MAURITANIA	0.8449	25
SUDAN	0.8400	26
DJIBOUTI	0.8383	27
UNDERDEVELOPMENT LINE		

..... **TABLE 2**

RANK AND DEGREE OF Hygienic DEVELOPMENT IN 1995
ISLAMIC WORLD

Country	Degree	Rank
UNDERDEVELOPMENT LINE		
UGANDA	0.83061	28
COMOROS	0.82660	29
NIGER	0.82209	30
BANGLADESH	0.82188	31
SENEGAL	0.81539	32
BURKINAFASO	0.80923	33
BENIN	0.80586	34
GUINEA BISSAU	0.80510	35
GAMBIA	0.79699	36
GUINEA	0.79613	37
SOMALIA	0.78342	38
MALI	0.77743	39
YEMEN, REP.	0.77360	40
AFGHANISTAN	0.76161	41
MOZAMBIQUE	0.75674	42
CHAD	0.75135	43
SIERA LEONE	0.72888	44
NIGERIA	-0.29008	45

AVG	0.83463		
STD	0.09632		
MAX	0.91412	**U.A.EMIRATES**	1
MIN	0.72888	**SIERALEON**	44

TABLE 3

RANK AND DEGREE OF Educational DEVELOPMENT IN 1995
ISLAMIC WORLD

Country	Degree	Rank
LEBANON	0.93961	1
U.A. EMIRATES	0.91296	2
JORSAN	0.89561	3
MALDIVES	0.88455	4
BAHRAIN	0.88125	5
QATAR	0.85972	6
OMAN	0.84106	7
MALYSIA	0.79752	8
ALBANIA	0.79714	9
INDONESIA	0.79028	10
TURKEY	0.78919	11
KUWAIT	0.77909	12
LIBYA	0.76968	13
.I.R. IRAN	0.72200	14
SYRIA	0.70227	15
TUNISIA	0.63893	16
SAUDI ARABIA	0.63799	17
ALGERIA	0.60188	18
IRAQ	0.58776	19
CAMEROON	0.56409	20
GABON	0.53804	21
UNDERDEVELOPMENT LINE		

....**TABLE 3**

RANK AND DEGREE OF Educational DEVELOPMENT IN 1995
ISLAMIC WORLD

Country	Degree	Rank
UNDERDEVELOPMENT LINE		
UGANDA	0.50357	22
NIGERIA	0.49814	23
COMOROS	0.47200	24
SUDAN	0.47004	25
EGYPT	0.46552	26
GUINEA, BISSAU	0.45801	27
CHAD	0.36615	28
DJIBOUTI	0.36055	29
MOROCCO	0.35352	30
PAKISTAN	0.31225	31
YEMEN, REP.	0.31067	32
MOZAMBIQUE	0.25725	33
GAMBIA	0.25289	34
MAURITANIA	0.24566	35
SOMALIA	0.24383	36
BANGLADESH	0.21403	37
GUINEA	0.20981	38
SIERA LEONE	0.20586	39
AFGHANISTAN	0.20457	40
SENEGAL	0.19683	41
BENIN	0.18802	42
MALI	0.15653	43
NIGER	0.02776	44
BURKINAFASO	**0.01466**	**45**

AVG	0.50931		
STD	0.26638		
Max	0.93961	**LEBANON**	1
Min	0.01466	**BURKINAFASO**	45

TABLE 4
RANK AND DEGREE OF Population DEVELOPMENT IN 1995
ISLAMIC WORLD

Country	Degree	Rank
QATAR	0.983	1
KUWAIT	0.9821	2
GUINEA	0.9787	3
BANGLADESH	0.9776	4
SIERA LEONE	0.9775	5
GUINEA, BISSAU	0.9774	6
EGYPT	0.9771	7
INDONESIA	0.9764	8
MOROCCO	0.9763	9
GAMBIA	0.9762	10
SUDAN	0.9754	11
MOZAMBIQUE	0.9751	12
IRAQ	0.9750	13
SYRIA	0.9741	14
BAHRAIN	0.9741	15
TUNISIA	0.9740	16
MALAYSIA	0.938	17
UGANDA	0.9737	18
SENEGAL	0.936	19
ALGERAL	0.9736	20
MALI	0.9733	21
MAURITANIA	0.9728	22
TURKEY	0.9729	23
PAKISTAN	0.9724	24
NIGERIA	0.9723	25
DJIBOUTI	0.9723	26
CAMEROON	0.9723	27
BENIN	0.9719	28
I.R. IRAN	0.9719	29
LEBANON	0.9714	30
BURKINAFASO	0.9710	31
CHAD	0.9710	32
NIGER	0.9697	33
UNDERDEVELOPMENT LINE		

.**TABLE 4**

RANK AND DEGREE OF Population DEVELOPMENT IN 1995 ISLAMIC WORLD

Country	Degree	Rank
UNDERDEVELOPMENT LINE		
LIBYA	0.9682	34
YEMEN, REP.	0.9679	35
JORDAN	0.9661	36
SOMALIA	0.9657	37
U.A.EMIRATES	0.9651	38
SAUDI ARABIA	0.9644	39
OMAN	0.9637	40
GABON	0.9618	41
MALDIVES	0.9608	42
COMOROS	0.9550	43
AFGHANISTAN	-0.0649	44
ALBANIA	-0.1094	45

AVG	0.9694		
STD	0.0141		
MAX	0.9831	**QATAR**	1
MIN	0.9550	**COMOROS**	43

TABLE 5

RANK AND DEGREE OF Socio - Cultural DEVELOPMENT IN 1995 ISLAMIC WORLD

Country	Degree	Rank
OMAN	0.938	1
KUWAIT	0.895	2
LEBANON	0.859	3
U.A.EMIRATES	0.424	4
BENIN	0.707	5
MALAYSIA	0.664	6
SAUDI ARABIA	0.468	7
TURKEY	0.467	8
BAHRAIN	0.420	9
JORDAN	0.416	10
CHAD	0.364	11
QATAR	0.351	12
I.R. IRAN	0.329	13
EGYPT	0.326	14
TUNISIA	0.285	15
SUDAN	0.283	16
MOROCCO	0.283	17
LIBYA	0.281	18
SYRIA	0.279	19
UNDERDEVELOPMENT LINE		

. **TABLE 5**

RANK AND DEGREE OF Socio - Cultural DEVELOPMENT IN 1995
ISLAMIC WORLD

Country	Degree	Rank
UNDERDEVELOPMENT LINE		
CAMEROON	0.2521	20
YEMEN, REP.	0.2379	21
ALGERIA	0.2367	22
INDONESIA	0.2202	23
IRAQ	0.2199	24
MAURITANIA	0.1582	25
GABON	0.1557	26
ALBANIA	0.1399	27
MALDIVES	0.1156	28
GAMBIA	0.1142	29
MALI	0.1092	30
SENEGAL	0.1073	31
GUINEA	0.1057	32
UGANDA	0.0947	33
PAKISTAN	0.865	34
COMOROS	0.0860	35
AFGHANISTAN	0.0775	36
NIGERIA	0.0710	37
DJIBOUTI	0.0661	38
SIERA LEON	0.0583	39
NIGER	0.0551	40
GUINEA, BISSAU	0.0384	41
BANGLADESH	0.0363	42
MOZAMBIQUE	0.0350	43
SOMALIA	0.0348	44
BURKINAFASO	0.0249	45

AVG	0.2728		
STD	0.2424		
MAX	0.9379	**OMAN**	1
MIN	0.0249	**BURKINAFASO**	45

TABLE 6

RANK AND DEGREE Of Economic DEVELOPMENT IN 1995
ISLAMIC WORLD

Country	Degree	Rank
KUWAIT	1.1543	----
U.A.EMIRATES	1.0150	----
SAUDI ARABIA	0.9179	1
OMAN	0.5688	2
TURKEY	0.4404	3
MALAYSIA	0.4154	4
I.R. IRAN	0.2624	5
JORDAN	0.2611	6
LEBANON	0.2605	7
SYRIA	0.2329	8
GABON	0.2173	9
INDONESIA	0.2122	10
EGYPT	0.1883	11
TUNISIA	0.1781	12
ALGERIA	0.1654	13
UNDERDEVELOPMENT LINE		
PAKISTAN	0.1133	14
MOROCCO	0.1118	15
CAMEROON	0.0759	16
YEMEN, REP.	0.0577	17
NIGERIA	0.0565	18
SENEGAL	0.0528	19
GAMBIA	0.0515	20
MAURITANIA	0.0505	21
BANGLADESH	0.0457	22
GUINEA	0.0442	23
MOZAMBIQUE	0.0367	24
BENIN	0.0358	25
MALI	-0.0062	----
SIERALEON	-0.0205	----
NIGER	-0.0245	----
BURKINAFASO	-0.0254	-----
UGANDA	-0.0255	-----
GUINEA.BISSAU	-0.0320	-----
CHAD	-0.0310	-----
ALBANIA	-0.0358	-----

AVG	0.1591		
STD	0.1907		
MAX	0.9179	**SAUDI ARABIA**	1
MIN	0.0358	**BENIN**	25

TABLE 7

RANK AND DEGREE Of Non - Economic DEVELOPMENT IN 1995
ISLAMIC WORLD

Country	Degree	Rank
KUWAIT	0.9970	1
OMAN	0.9851	2
U.A.EMIRATES	0.9808	3
LEBANON	09681	4
MALAYSIA	0.9671	5
SAUDI ARABIA	0.9395	6
BAHRAIN	0.9392	7
QATAR	0.9315	8
TURKEY	0.9283	9
JORDAN	0.9239	10
I.R. IRAN	0.9123	11
TUNISIA	0.9043	12
SYRIA	0.9030	13
ALBANIA	0.9028	14
LIRYA	0.8994	15
EGYPT	0.8958	16
INDONESIA	0.8752	17
INDONESIA	0.8752	18
MOROCCO	0.8725	19
MALDIVES	0.8685	20
IRAQ	0.8577	21
CAMEROON	0.8537	22
BENIN	0.8533	23
SUDAN	0.8472	24
UNDERDEVELOPMENT LINE		

TABLE 7

RANK AND DEGREE OF Non - Economic DEVELOPMENT IN 1995
ISLAMIC WORLD

Country	Degree	Rank
UNDERDEVELOPMENT LINE		
GABON	0.8416	25
PAKISTAN	0.8365	26
MAURITANIA	0.8325	27
DJIBOUTI	0.8179	28
UGANDA	0.8164	29
COMOROS	0.8123	30
SENEGAL	0.7990	31
BANGLADESH	0.7960	32
NIGER	0.7939	33
GUINEA BISSAU	0.7849	34
GAMBIA	0.7810	35
BURKINAFASO	0.7789	36
GUINEA	0.7787	37
YEMENREP	0.7780	38
CHAD	0.7673	39
SOMALIA	0.7616	40
MALI	0.7603	41
AFGHANISTAN	0.7439	42
MOZAMBIQUE	0.7345	43
SIERA LEON	0.7087	44
NIGERIA	-0.2069	45

AVG	0.8425		
STD	0.1090		
MAX	0.9970	**KUWAIT**	1
MIN	0.7087	**SIERALEONE**	44

Bibliography

1- International yearbook of Industrial Statistics 1997, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, Vienna.

2- Human Development Report 1997, Published by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP).

3- The state of population, United Nations Population Fund (UNPF), 1997.

4- World Statistics Pocket-book 1995, United Nations, New York, 1995

5- World Development Indicators, 1997, the World Bank.

6- Meier. G. M., Leading Issue in Economic Development, Oxford, 1984.

7- Major Socio-Economic Indicators of Member state of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, 1996

8- Todaro Michel, Economic Development in the Third World,3rd ed. Longman, New York, 1985.

9- Hicks, Norman and Streetn, Paul, Indicators of Development, the Search for a Needs Yardstick, World Development, 1979.

10- Smith, Adam, Wealth of Nations, ed. Edwin cannon. (New York, The Modern Library, 1965).

11- Meier.G.M, Leading Issues in Economic Development (,) Oxford University Press, 1984.

12- Boeke, J.H. ,Economics and Economic Policy of Dual Societies, 1953-Higgins, B., Economic Development.

13- Myint, H., Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Countries, and Economics of the Developing Countries, 1971.

14- Myrdal.G., Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Regions, 1957

15- Gharebaghian, Morteza, Economics of Growth and Development Vol.12 (in Persian), Tehran, 1992.

16- Asadi, Morteza and Gharebaghian, Morteza, Trade and Development, Tarbiat Modarres University Press, 1996.

[1] smith, Adam, Wealth of Nations,ed. Edwincanon. (New York: the Modern library, 1965)

[1] Meier, G.M., Leading Issues in Economic Development,, oxford university press, 1984.

[1] Schultz., T.W., Investment in Human Capital, AER, March 1961.