

## **On the Methodology of Islamizing the Social Sciences**

**Ibrahim A. Ragab**

**Abstract:** *It is argued in this paper that the Islamization of the social sciences should be seen—for conceptual and for pragmatic reasons—as the heart of the Islamization of Knowledge (IOK) movement. If that position is accepted, the importance of efforts to clarify the specific methodology for the Islamization of the social sciences becomes self-evident. An attempt is made here to suggest an outline for such a methodology, building on the pioneer work of Ismā'īl al-Fārūqī and on mainstream writings on IOK. The issue of the "starting point" for actual efforts at the Islamization of the social sciences is discussed in detail, particularly along with two major phases of this work, i.e., (a) generating an "integral theoretical framework" that combines insights gleaned from Islamic revealed knowledge and from the human sciences; and (b) validating that theoretical framework in well-designed research projects and professional practice field demonstrations. The implications of the suggested methodology for research and for theory building are discussed.*

It is almost self-evident that the Islamization of the social sciences—for a number of important epistemological and methodological reasons and for practical operational considerations—should be seen as the heart of the Islamization of Knowledge movement. This is attested to by the thrust of work of the pioneers of the movement since the 1977 International Conference on Islamic Education in Makkah and even, informally, decades prior to that important gathering.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, however, the literature in the last few years has seen some confusing

---

Dr. Ibrahim A. Ragab was Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, International Islamic University Malaysia, when the article was submitted. Currently he is Professor, Faculty of Social Work, Helwan University, Cairo. E-mail <iaragab@intoucch.com>. An earlier version of this paper was submitted to the International Conference on Islamization of Sociology and Anthropology, organized by the Department of Sociology & Anthropology, IIUM, November 1997.

signals regarding the place of modern social sciences in the Islamization of Knowledge discourse. The writings of Tāhā Jābir al-<sup>c</sup>Alwānī, an eminent Sharī'ah scholar, who has for a decade been at the helm of the International Institute of Islamic Thought (IIIT), have helped initiate these mixed signals. These writings have, by implication, been meant to steer mainstream thinking on Islamization of Knowledge away from its well-established focus on "Islamizing the social sciences" or modern sciences in general, to an almost exclusive focus on the "reformation of the Islamic (Sharī'ah) sciences." This may be an oversimplified reading of al-<sup>c</sup>Alwānī's rather complex, vaguely worded, arguments on the issue. But the above statement still fairly captures his position in some important ways. This attempt on his part has mystified the adherents to the basic mission of Islamization of Knowledge as clearly elaborated by the original formulations of the concept in the early eighties. Such original formulations, although championed by IIIT, were well received by a large number of intellectuals and students of society all over the Muslim world. Countless scholars and educationists became ardently committed to these formulations for the simple reason that they were seen as an adequate response exactly to the types of intellectual challenges they have themselves been grappling with—without much success—for decades. Any serious attempt at the redirection of the project should indeed take this vast constituency into consideration.

So, it may seem only appropriate that before we proceed to discuss the methodology suggested here for the Islamization of the social sciences, that we start by placing this whole issue in context. Once this issue is cleared out of the way, it would be possible for us to focus on our main task of presenting the general outline of the suggested methodology for the Islamization of the social sciences.

The paper will then move on to deal with the main subject by laying out certain "prerequisites" for any actual attempt to Islamize any social science subject, that is, the identification of the basic presuppositions underlying the Islamic worldview: how Islam conceives of God, man, society, and the universe? This will be followed by a discussion of the issue of the appropriate "starting point" for actual efforts at the Islamization of the social sciences. That is: should we have as our point of departure the concepts and mental categories which are currently in use in "modern" social sciences, or should we ignore these and go directly to concepts generated from Qur'ān and other Islamic sources instead? This, then, paves the way for a detailed account of the specific steps suggested for researchers who decide to engage in the

creative task of Islamizing a specific social science topic. The two major phases of this process, namely, generating an "integral theoretical framework" that combines insights gleaned from Islamic revealed knowledge and from the human sciences; and then validating that theoretical framework in well-designed research projects and professional practice field demonstrations.

### Two Pathways to Islamization of Knowledge

Most participants in the discourse on Islamization of Knowledge seem to agree that the core concept of Islamization is simply the "integration of Islamic revealed knowledge and the human sciences." The late Ismā'īl al-Fārūqī in his seminal paper on the subject in 1982 defined the concept of Islamization in the following way:

....to Islamize, is to recast knowledge as Islam relates to it.... i.e. to redefine and reorder the data, to rethink the reasoning and relating of the data, to reevaluate the conclusions, to reproject the goals—and to do so in such a way as to make the disciplines enrich the vision and serve the cause of Islam.<sup>2</sup>

As he elaborated on the process through which these objectives could be attained, he described certain "necessary steps" to be taken. The three major components or elements of the Islamization of Knowledge process, according to him, can be paraphrased as follows:

1. The mastery of the modern disciplines, a the critical assessment of their methodologies, research findings, and theories in the light of the Islamic worldview;
2. The mastery of the Islamic legacy, and a critical assessment of Islamic scholarship against: (a) a pristine Revelational perspective; (b) the current needs of the Ummah; and (c) modern advances in human knowledge;
3. Creative synthesis of the Islamic legacy and modern knowledge, the creative leap "to bridge over the gap of centuries of non-development."<sup>3</sup>

It is worth noting that he states that the logical order of the tasks summarized above, according to him, "defines the order of priority belonging to each..." thus clearly placing a special premium on the reformation of modern disciplines—which is seen as the *raison d'être* of Islamization of Knowledge. This is perfectly understandable, given al-Fārūqī's unique background. He had an exceptionally deep understanding not only of the philosophy of the social sciences, their

ontological and epistemological underpinnings, but also of Islamic scholarship (in a comparative perspective). This broad, balanced background allowed him to set the priorities right for the Islamization of Knowledge project. His logical, rational approach to the issue gained the Islamization project the wide intellectual acceptance and commitment that it today enjoys among Muslim scholars all over the world. It has to be remembered, however, that he always emphasized that the whole project should be based on a clear identification of the basic principles that comprise the Islamic worldview emanating from the concept of *tawhīd*. This has meant, among other things, the further "development" of traditional Islamic (Sharī'ah) sciences to be able to serve the higher purposes of the Islamization project. However, any balanced reading of his views should reveal that Islamic (Sharī'ah) sciences—in themselves—were not, for him, seen as the core cause of Ummatic problems as much as being in need of revitalization, to render them more relevant to the times, within a unified system of education.

On the other hand, AbdulHamid A. AbuSulayman, a prominent co-founder of the project, has since the early 1960's been concerned with devising ways to solve the concrete, pressing, contemporary problems of economics and political science within the Islamic perspective. With a keen feeling of the intolerable backwardness into which the Ummah has fallen despite its great spiritual armament and material resources, he embarked on a lifetime quest for solutions to problems and challenges posed by modernity. He came to conclude that the main problem could be found in the "Crisis of the Muslim Mind."<sup>4</sup> The rift between the *‘ulamā’* (Islamic scholars) and the rulers (political leadership) has resulted in stagnation of Islamic scholarship, bereft of knowledge based on real life practices. It also resulted in societal institutions and practices bereft of the guidance of Sharī'ah—to the detriment of the Ummah. To him, both modern social sciences and traditional Islamic (Sharī'ah) sciences were indeed wanting—in radical ways. A major rethinking not only of the content but also of the methodologies of "both" is, according to him, needed to solve the Ummatic problems. His work on Islamization of Knowledge reflects this particular emphasis on the reformation of both Islamic and modern sciences, while retaining the basic concept of integrating them in meaningful ways that vigorously respond to the needs of the modern world.

In contrast to both al-Fārūqī and AbuSulayman, al-<sup>‘</sup>Alwānī, an Islamic scholar who specializes in *uṣūl al-fiqh*, seems to see

Islamization of Knowledge as something that squarely falls in the court of Islamic (Sharī'ah) sciences—almost exclusively. These sciences, to him, have well served their purpose for a long time, and are now in need of a radical overhaul. His famous six discourses (in the English translation), axes or pillars (in the Arabic original) which could be seen as representing, for him, the basic dimensions of Islamization of Knowledge methodology, clearly reflect that view. The task, as he sees it, is one of reconstructing or reinventing Sharī'ah sciences, or—as in the case of what is needed to activate the Qur'anic methodology—the effort is "more akin to discovery than to recovery."<sup>5</sup> He goes on to call for doing the same, if not more, deconstruction and reconstruction when it comes to dealing with the Sunnah. Early Islamic intellectual legacy cannot lay any claims for special advantage (*vis-à-vis* contemporary Muslims) in understanding scripture that stem from the fact it possibly understood scripture as it was understood by the Companions and *Tābi'īn* (the generation next to companions) in the early formative years of Islam. This fact could even be seen as a drawback, for their understanding only reflected the limited "knowledge ceiling" of the times, or were constrained by "the time-space" factor. "Dealing with Western Heritage" comes only as the sixth and last dimension, being mentioned in passing, with hardly anything of substance except a cautionary word against superficiality or imbalanced preconception of Western thought. The task of reformation of the social sciences is absolutely not on the agenda. The theme of "integration" of Islamic revealed knowledge and the social sciences is completely absent, if not seen as dangerous, in the later writings. The assumption, here, is that integration of Islamic revealed knowledge and the social sciences, which emanate from radically different, irreconcilable ontologies and epistemologies—according to his famous verbal pronouncement "are like water and oil— will never mix!"

In assessing the current scene of the Islamization of Knowledge literature and the place of the Islamization of the social sciences in that context, it is worth mentioning that the current confusion did not result from any broad-based acceptance of these later formulations by the (now, former) president of IIIT. The problem, however, is that some participants in the movement may take these later formulations as if they represent "the latest" or the most "up-to-date" developments in IIIT thinking in terms of where Islamization of Knowledge should be going. The fact, however, is that it is nothing more than a "different" reading, that departs from the general established mainstream of the

movement, and unfortunately, without a clear declaration of intent. The title of al-<sup>ʿ</sup>Alwānī's essay "The Islamization of Knowledge: Yesterday and Today" seems to only encourage that understanding. Moreover, in a recent interview he catalogues al-Fārūqī's writings among those whose work—although "representing a more progressive *ijtihād* in comparison with other previous or contemporaneous attempts," was inadequate, unable to achieve the "qualitative change needed." He goes on to say that what we need now is to be creative. This could be achieved through basing our work on universals and general principles; and in a holistic rather than piecemeal fashion. This, apparently, is a reference to the way he sees his own "six discourses." The implication, is that such an approach supercedes—if not nullifies—the approaches of "Yesterday!"

We have, however, to remember that the initial conceptualizations of Islamization of Knowledge, since inception, were basically concerned with the reformation of the "modern" social sciences. The reason is simply that these social sciences are steeped in the positivist and empiricist tradition, which reflects the Western ontology and epistemology—which in radical ways are at odds with the Islamic worldview. It may be equally true that there has always been a feeling that Islamic (Sharīʿah) sciences were also in need of rejuvenation or renewal (*tajdīd*). However, there has never been any resemblance of a consensus that the traditional Islamic (Sharīʿah) sciences or their methodologies have already served their purpose, or have become obsolescent. Neither has there been any serious suggestion (except on the part of certain known self-admitted former Marxists and fringe Francophone revisionists) that the task was one of reinventing new Islamic (Sharīʿah) sciences, to say nothing of making any claim that this is Islamization of Knowledge.

We can safely conclude that mainstream Islamization of Knowledge discourse still basically adheres to the time-tested core concept of "integration of Islamic revealed knowledge and the modern human sciences." But how do we "integrate" knowledge derived from these two types of historically separate disciplines? Each of these two groups of disciplines is firmly rooted in its own distinct ontological and epistemological assumptions, its divergent methodologies, to say nothing about their resultant findings. This is an issue that is indeed deserving of serious investigation. If we examine the educational backgrounds of the participants in the Islamization of Knowledge movement, we will immediately notice that most come from social

science disciplines, and some from Islamic revealed knowledge disciplines. It is improbable, and rather unrealistic, to expect that the two groups would—at this early stage of the development of the movement—come to view the task of "integration" from within a single, unified angle. It should be more tenable to expect that each group would address the general issue of integration from its specific vantage point, while at the same time attempting to connect with the other. So, social scientists would expectedly want to start by critically looking into their disciplines with a view to reforming them via incorporating—in a systematic and a creative way—insights gained from revealed knowledge sources. And conversely, Islamic (Sharī'ah) scholars would expectedly want to start by critically looking into their disciplines with a view to reforming them via incorporating—in a systematic and a creative way—insights gained from the social sciences. The assumption is that as the movement progresses and matures, more and more common grounds would be found. The common base would continue to broaden until one day all social science disciplines would turn out findings which come virtually Islamized; and all revealed knowledge disciplines would turn out subject matter that comes naturally and systematically availing itself of sound social science knowledge. At that point in time, one may hardly be talking about an "Islamization" process, for knowledge then would be naturally produced within the Islamic paradigm...in the same manner that the flourishing Islamic civilization in its heyday has done.

We may conclude this discussion now by suggesting that, in the short run, we can indeed think of two legitimate "pathways" to the Islamization of Knowledge, which are bound to converge in the long run—God willing. The first pathway is that of the reformation of the social sciences. Social scientists are expected (after taking stock of the Islamic worldview) to critically reexamine their disciplines' major theoretical frameworks, methodologies, and research findings; and to move in the direction of the utilization of revealed knowledge sources—even at their current level of development—to their fullest. The second pathway is that of the reformation of revealed knowledge disciplines. Islamic (Sharī'ah) scholars are expected (on the basis of a coherent, purified Islamic worldview) to critically reexamine their disciplines' methodologies and cumulative scholarship; and to move in the direction of utilization of Islamized social science scholarship to its fullest. Needless to say that—at this stage of development of the Islamization of Knowledge movement—it would be self-defeating to

claim that either pathway precludes the other. Any progress achieved at one front will definitely help achieve the objectives pursued by those on the other front, and ultimately help achieve the goals of the whole Islamization project.

An important difference, however, should be noted between the two pathways that stems from the differences between the two types of disciplines. Social scientists can instantly start the process of utilization of the Holy Qur'ān and Sunnah, and the Islamic legacy derived from them immediately. They do not have to wait indefinitely for the fruition of the still very ill defined proposals for the reconstruction of Islamic (Sharī'ah) sciences. It is my contention that certain social science disciplines (especially psychology, sociology, anthropology, education, communication, social work, and psychotherapy) can very productively use Islamic (Sharī'ah) sciences at their current level of development. Such Islamic scholarship has hardly been tapped yet, with its treasures yet untouched.

Other disciplines, particularly economics and political science, may have to negotiate a hard bargain with Sharī'ah sciences, which has developed over centuries specific pronouncements that are hard to reconcile with "modern" practices in these fields. The gravest obstacle to reconciliation here stems from the facile, sometimes crude attempts to force solutions to current "modern" problems on Sharī'ah sciences, rather than honestly "negotiate" a healthy, balanced understanding of the problems from both sides. The problem is that this approach inevitably calls for finding out, and experimenting with, creative alternative solutions. Through field demonstrations, certain practices will certainly emerge which satisfy the requirements for modern transactions while keeping up with the spirit of Sharī'ah. But this in turn calls for the political will to create and experiment with such alternative institutions—something the well-meaning scholars on both sides hardly command.

But when it comes to the utilization by scholars from the Islamic (Sharī'ah) sciences of social science theories and findings, the situation becomes somewhat different. Social science literature can hardly be utilized as it is without a rigorous critique and a process of sifting out what is usable—a task that should be carried out by social scientists. However, certain components of the social sciences could be directly utilized with minor modifications, such as certain research methods and data collection techniques.



### Islamic Ontology and Epistemology

The essence of the "Islamization" process is the systematic movement from the other-than-Islamic ontology and epistemology to the Islamic ontology and epistemology. That essential change is the foundation upon which the methodological shift is based. Therefore, it is essential for the Islamizers—before undertaking any actual substantive attempt at Islamization—to take stock of the Islamic ontological and epistemological assumptions. Of special importance to the Islamic worldview are the Islamic concepts of God, man, society, and cosmic order. This is an absolute prerequisite for any attempt to "Islamize" a social science discipline, a subject, or even one social science concept.

There is no shortage of material written about different aspects of Islam as a religion and a way of life. However, most of the reference materials on Islam and the Islamic worldview, encyclopedic or monographic, do not lend themselves readily for use by Muslim social scientists embarking on the Islamization of their disciplines. That immense body of Islamic scholarship needs to be carefully identified, codified and clearly stated in the form of deductive systems of propositions, which allow for the derivation of more propositions to be used in the theory building phase of the methodology. In his classic treatise on the Islamization of Knowledge, al-Fārūqī<sup>6</sup> put together what he called the "First Principles of Islamic Methodology." Under this heading, he provides us with a unique account of what may constitute the essence of the Islamic worldview, written in concise, terse prose that should serve as an excellent beginning for future work in that respect. In that exposition, he identifies the following principles:

1. *The Unity of Allah (SWT)*, is the first principle of Islam and everything Islamic. Allah is absolutely one, absolutely transcendent, Creator, who is in command of everything, Judge of everything. He created humans in the best of forms, endowed them with faculties to recognize Him and acknowledge His works. Being indebted to Allah for every blessing they have, humans know that He is worthy of all their love and obedience. Everything one does should be dedicated to Him.
2. *The Unity of Creation*, follows from the unity of Allah by logical necessity. Hence unity means: (a) Cosmic order: Creation is an integral whole precisely because it is the work of one creator Whose order and design has infused every part of it. The consistency or unity of cosmic order allows us to cognize the permanence of things and the repetition of events as causal relations. Material, social and ethical realities obey and fulfil the laws infused by Allah in all His creation.

(b). Creation as kingdom of ends: Everything is created with precise divine measure that subjects everything to a system of ends, with God being the ultimate end. All things serve a purpose, and all purposes are interrelated as means and ends to one another, which makes the world one telic system, vibrant and alive, full of meaning. The system of ends is meant to provide a theater for man's life and ethical endeavor. Man is created for a life of service to his Creator, who granted the world to him, with the duty of working out the divine patterns in it. (c) *Taskhīr* (subservience) of creation to man: Creation has the needs of humanity built into it.

3. *The Unity of Truth and The Unity of Knowledge*: Unity of truth devolves from God's absolute unity. If God is one, truth cannot be many. God knows the truth and conveys it in His revelation. Revelation cannot be different from observed reality, which He also created. "This logical equivalence of reason, truth and reality with the facts of revelation is the most critical principle epistemology has known." The unity of truth thus precludes any ultimate contradiction between reason and revelation. Apparent or illusory discrepancies may result from flawed research of aspects of reality or from misinterpretation of revelation... and should call for reexamination of data or reexamination of interpretation.

4. *The Unity of Life*: The Divine will is enacted in two ways; one is compulsory, expressed in terms of laws of nature, the other is voluntary, expressed in terms of moral laws entrusted to human beings honoured by the freedom of will. The latter is the essence of *amānah*, which renders moral life higher and nobler than the natural world's obedience-by-necessity. Hence *khilāfah* consists basically in the fulfillment of God's prescribed moral laws. But religious practices in Islam are not confined to rituals. All human activities become divined if their motivation is for the sake of God, and that they are performed with justice and righteousness. This leads to the development of culture and civilization with the assurance of peace and protection of life and property. That is why Sharī'ah is comprehensive, encompassing all human activities, with no separation of the sacred or religious from the secular.

5. *The Unity of Humanity*: The One Creator stands in absolutely the same creatorly relation to all humans, and conversely, humans must stand in absolutely the same creaturely relation to the Creator. Differences in colour and race do not have any ontological value. All humans are one and the same, only deeds distinguish them. The nobler

among men are those who are more virtuous.

The lengthy summary above is meant partly in appreciation of the work that has been done, but more importantly, it is meant to sensitize us to the parameters of the work that "has yet to be done" before we can start any serious efforts to Islamize the social sciences. The above principles indeed provide a map for research efforts in this area, which represents "the infrastructure" upon which the whole endeavor of the Islamization of the social sciences could be built. It may be worth adding here that special attention needs also to be given to research on "human nature," "human relationships," and "societal arrangements" as seen in the Islamic perspective.

Even a cursory inspection of the attempts at the Islamization of specific social science subjects in the past few years shows clearly that researchers—whatever their specialty—normally find themselves in an unenviable situation. To do research on their chosen subject in their chosen field, they need to be quite clear on what Islam has to say about human beings—the focus of study in the social sciences. But the literature on that particular subject is scanty and inconsistent in many ways. Most of the time writings on human nature come as preliminaries—very limited in their scope and depth—to the substantive work at hand. Faced with this situation, the researcher finds that he has no choice but to do the same, offering his own (shallow) preliminary treatment of the subject of human nature before embarking on his "real" work! And the cycle is thus continually perpetuated. Hence the need for special institutional efforts of a magnitude on par with the importance of the issue.

### **Revealed or Social Science Terminology**

If we examine the major dimensions of the process of Islamization of Knowledge as elaborated by al-Fārūqī (as discussed above), we get the feeling that the methodology for Islamization should indeed be a rather straightforward, almost intuitive process. Know all that there is to be known in social science literature that is relevant to your subject, critique it from the Islamic perspective, to find out which concepts are still valid and relevant. Move on to the Islamic sources, do the same, thus generating insights that reflect what Islam has to say on the subject. Then, synthesize the result of both into a unified Islamic perspective on your subject of choice. The conceptualization, however, still is far too general. The third component in particular, i.e., the "creative synthesis" of the Islamic legacy and modern knowledge,

which admittedly constitutes the most crucial task in the Islamization process, is still the most difficult one to deal with. We are left here without specific guidelines as to how this feat could be achieved. That task is understandably a very demanding one. How can we reconcile the two divergent realms of knowledge? And how can we combine their respective methodologies? How can we synthesize them into one unified scheme of scientific investigation, without infringing on any intrinsic, inviolable tenets of either one?

The solution seems to lie squarely in the all too familiar strategy of the "dialectical relationship between theory and research."<sup>7</sup> The methodology for achieving that synthesis of Islamic revealed knowledge and the social sciences could be attempted basically in two distinct, but closely related phases. In the first phase, insights from both sources of knowledge are integrated into a unified "theoretical framework." In the second phase, hypotheses derived from that theoretical framework are to be validated in well-designed research and professional practice projects. Each of these major phases of the Islamization process will be discussed in detail below.

But once we start thinking about "integrating" insights from both sources of knowledge into a unified "theoretical framework" in phase 1, the question immediately arises as to which set of concepts, technical terms, and mental categories in general, should serve as our starting point. It is generally agreed upon that once integration is achieved, the issue would automatically disappear. But this is a long-term expectation, because it is only within the longer time frame, that a new breed of concepts and technical terms would emerge, reflecting the uniqueness of the integrated work. Therefore, it should be clear that our discussion in this section basically applies to the short to middle-range time perspective. In this context, we can identify two general positions advocated in the literature. These two positions could be roughly characterized as:

1. Using modern social science concepts as the point of departure for the Islamization exercise.
2. Using Islamic revealed knowledge concepts as our point of departure.

Although each of these positions clearly has its own advantages, each also has its drawbacks. We will start by a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of each of these two positions. That exposition will be followed by some suggestions for reconciling the two positions into a unified scheme.

### *1. Modern Social Science Concepts as the Point of Departure*

The major advantage of starting from modern social science concepts, technical terms, and classificatory systems is that they simply are familiar to trained social scientists who have spent their lives studying and using them throughout their careers. They are the tools of their trade. They have agreed-upon definitions. They fit into neat analytical schemes. They are indeed relatively developed, thanks to decades of diligent research (but this does not say anything about their relevance or validity). They are encoded into systematically thought-out and well-presented textbooks. The adherents to this position would feel more comfortable moving from the familiar concepts to explore equivalent concepts used by early Muslim scholars who left us specific contributions relevant to the modern discipline. It sounds only logical to them to use these concepts as an initial launch pad towards searching the Qur'ān and Sunnah for concepts that would cover the same area (but of course from a divine perspective). Then they can supposedly move gradually—but knowingly—to modify and/or replace these systems of concepts with ones which reflect the progress of work done in the arena of Islamization-oriented research without artificially straining the latter.

The main drawback that may seem inherent in this strategy is the ever-present danger of researchers falling in the seductive trap of unjustifiably adopting modern social science mental categories and conceptual schemes. This would indeed be a trap that renders the whole exercise worthless. It would give credence to the (basically unjustified) criticisms leveled at the whole Islamization of Knowledge movement as one of putting Islamic names to questionable modern social science content.<sup>8</sup> Although this may indeed be a possibility, it should never be seen as an inevitability. It is indeed insulting to assume that Muslim social scientists committed to the Islamization of their disciplines are all unthinking, unintelligent, sloppy types, who are perpetually condemned to a life of unwittingly falling in these intellectual traps. Even in situations where that may be the case for some, others would definitely be motivated to help ensure that such situations are duly corrected through scholarly interchange among peers.

### *2. Islamic Sources as Point of Departure*

The basic advantage of this approach is that the terms used in this case emanate directly, or are at least intimately related to, the Islamic frame

of reference. They are basically derived from the divine sources. They have an inherent validity, even certainty in some cases, a quality lacking in concepts derived from sciences of human origin. This approach guarantees protection from embracing "modern" concepts steeped in a radically different ontology and epistemology in an indiscriminate fashion.

The main problem with this strategy stems from the fact that the florescence of early Islamic scholarship of the past had been long discontinued for long, thus leaving us with Islamic concepts whose development has been stunted as they were centuries ago. Once we embark on using these concepts as our starting point, we are faced with the existence of a big gap that separates them from what we know today. This is not to say that one can never find some concepts with a potential to cross the gulf separating the two types of conceptual schemes. But if previous work (attempting to translate concepts across the gulf) is any indication of what to expect, it is clear that we would, unfortunately, end up with forced, artificial results sometimes bordering on the ridiculous. We have to remember that most of the great Muslim thinkers of the past produced voluminous encyclopedic works, with relevant social science ideas splashed throughout, with no conscious effort at systematizing them in ways that render them directly usable by contemporary trained social scientists.

As far as the Noble Qur'ān is concerned, we also have to realize that its *Surahs* and verses are not meant to be chapters in social science textbooks, although they certainly contain an immense wealth of learning that should enrich these sciences. Qur'anic terms indeed provide profound insights into the dynamics of the forces—especially the spiritual factors—that determine human behavior (which may constitute the *raison d'être* of Islamization of the social sciences). But the task of bridging the gap between these terms and other terms in current use in the social sciences seems to be beyond most Muslim social scientists of today. On the other hand, Qur'anic terms have to be elaborated and continually developed to help produce the total conceptual armament of social science concepts, which means that we still have to work out these concepts ourselves anyway. Therefore, it may still be advisable for contemporary social scientists, for practical (although not the most desirable) reasons to start from where they are, heeding all the requirements and the caveats elaborated on above, but then move as diligently as they can to catch up with the Qur'anic terminology. The same seems to equally apply to Ḥadīth.

### *3. Some Suggested Pointers*

It is hardly appropriate to exclusively recommend one or the other of the two approaches outlined above. It may be reasonable at this point to suggest that the researcher's background, especially the degree to which he is familiar with Islamic sources, would be a decisive factor. To the extent that he is knowledgeable and comfortable with these sources, the difficulties alluded to above should certainly be minimized, while they will hardly disappear. In such cases, he will be able to see through the separators between the two different systems of concepts. In this way he should be able to continually move from one to the other with relative ease. It should be helpful to take the following into consideration, whichever the starting point are opted for:

- a. Special attention to situations where one detects inconsistencies, overlapping, or gaps in his systems of concepts, whatever their source may be. This should call for a fuller review of the whole scheme.
- b. Intellectual courage cannot be overemphasized when it comes to situations where the researcher feels that he has to abandon an established modern social scientific concept. The only rule here is that the researcher should be sure that he has sufficient reasons to do so, while at the same time being open to review the situation once again in light of new evidence to the contrary.
- c. Modern social science concepts should not gratuitously be discarded solely because of their "un-Islamic" origin, nor Islamic words be adopted solely because of sentimental considerations. The judge in all cases should be the explanatory value of the concept in the overall Islamic "theoretical framework."
- d. In the early stages of the research effort, it may be useful to juxtapose the two types of technical terms. In reporting research it may be necessary to put the equivalent term between parentheses until the time comes when substantial agreement on the connotations of each is achieved.

### **The First Phase: Integral Theorizing**

As was alluded to earlier, the methodology of Islamization of the social sciences could be conceptualized in terms of the "dialectical relationship between theory and research." In this section, we will describe the basic steps that may be followed in the first phase, the aim

of which is to develop a unified, "integral" theoretical framework. In the next section, we move on to describe the process of "validation" or verification of these theoretical claims in research projects and professional field demonstrations. This validation should be seen as part and parcel of the Islamization process, without which we would be left with mere "theoretical" assertions, with unknown truth-value. Now how do we go on the business of developing these integral theoretical frameworks? This could be approached through the following three steps.

*Step 1 : Critical Review Of Relevant Social Science Literature*

This task should not basically be very different from doing a thoughtful review of the literature on the subject, but then it goes far more beyond that. A "normal" science review of the literature simply starts from the "received" view within the specialization, hardly questioning the ontological and the epistemological assumptions upon which the whole paradigm is based. The exercise here, however, is more conscious and much more critical. The researcher can thus proceed as follows:

*1. A systematic review:* A comprehensive review of all relevant social science literature should be undertaken, with the aim of identification of any conceptual frameworks and research findings that pertain to the subject studied. The search would not stop at the well recognized and the well-accepted "normal" science views. Special attention should be given to the marginal, dissenting views within the concerned discipline. More often than not, such marginalized contributions reflect an awareness by researchers of the systematic "omissions" of the discipline, what is seen as "anomalies" by mainstream researchers who embrace the reigning positivist/empiricist paradigm. Those dissidents may possibly have laid their hands on the valid but missing pieces of the puzzle, thus being especially valuable for the Islamization exercise.

*2. Rigorous critique:* A critique of both types of contributions (normal science, and critical views) from the vantage point of the Islamic perspective (that is, the distinctive Islamic epistemology and ontology, especially as it relates to conception of God, man, and society). It should be remembered at this point that no serious critique of relevant modern social sciences contributions would be possible without full awareness of the broader issues of: (a) The factors that affected the historical development of the social sciences in general, and the specific discipline we are dealing with in particular; (b) The distinctive ontological and epistemological assumptions that inform them; and (c)



The general Islamic critique of these sciences and their findings.

3. *Sifting material*: Selecting the concepts, observations, and empirical generalizations, which have stood the test of that rigorous critique, from those which failed the test. This process, and the expected result from it, is discussed in some detail elsewhere.<sup>9</sup> Suffice it here to say in brief that: (a) Research findings should be the least controversial. Research findings, after all are the incontrovertible outcomes of rigorous, painstaking, systematic investigation, which have withstood the test of correspondence with objective reality, despite the fact that they are also produced within the framework of particular theoretical orientations. (b) Analytical tools and models should normally be seen as neutral tools and formal constructs, to be filled in with whatever pieces of information deemed theoretically appropriate by the analyst. They can be seen basically as good servants to any master. They could thus be developed and modified—as needed—in light of the new Islamic paradigm. (c) But theories and theoretical frameworks are understandably the most problematic constituent part of modern social sciences as far as the Islamization of the social sciences is concerned. Theories translate the "imagination" emanating from the guiding paradigm into abstract constructs, thus reflecting and "magnifying" its shortcomings as well as its merits. Here, we must be duly cautious and it would not hurt even to be overly skeptic. A process of systematic examination, evaluation, and sifting out should guide our search for what is useful of the so-called theories found in social science literature before accepting any for inclusion into the Islamized scheme.

*Step II : Critical Review of Relevant Islamic Material*

The researcher emerges from Step I equipped with a clear delineation of the parameters of the subject under study as conceived of in modern social science. Moreover, the theoretical scene should now also be transparent, with truth-values assigned to each available shred of theory. Specific concepts are also identified, along with research findings of relevance. The researcher is now ready to search Islamic revealed knowledge sources. Once again, we are reminded that starting from the modern social science concepts is only tolerated in the initial stages of the development of the Islamization project. Researchers should be always aware that the classification systems adopted in modern social sciences would be a reflection of their ontological and the epistemological underpinnings, just as they may—in all fairness—reflect logical/rational considerations.

Therefore, it would be dangerous to accept as universal or as final

even the current boundaries defining social science disciplines. Merryll Davies convincingly argues that Islamic terminology should replace the familiar traditional social science concepts.<sup>10</sup> She reports that "What the literature has begun to make clear is that the singularity of the terminology is necessary to the development of the [Islamization] discourse. You need the concepts as different packages of ideas, because that is precisely what they are." She also approvingly refers to those who would argue that instead of sociology, anthropology, economics, politics.. etc., that we use concepts generated from an Islamic perspective such as the Khaldounic term *'ilm ul-'umrān*.<sup>11</sup> While one may indeed agree with the basic thrust of the argument, the timing and the practicality of such radical transformations at this early stage of development of the project is rather questionable. On the contrary, it could be argued that prematurely jumping to conclusions today, about what may need work for, say, thirty years from now, would only invite half-baked ideas hardly supportable at the current level of scholarship.

Let us now move to describe the specific procedures that may be followed in terms of the utilization of Islamic revealed knowledge sources. The order of the following steps is set by the logical order of importance of the sources. However, the researcher may find it more practical to start with concepts found in early Muslim scholars' contributions and move retrospectively to search the Noble Qur'ān and Ḥadīth databases using these keywords. It is also advisable to start by looking into any previous Islamization efforts done about or close to the subject, whatever their estimated value may be. The least that one may find is a reference to a useful previous work done before. Such works also may serve a sensitizing function by bringing to our attention specific Qur'anic keywords that should help in the Qur'anic search. In some cases one may find references to certain important early works of relevance that we were not aware of. From these, one may move to search other early Muslim contributions, and from these to the Qur'ān and Sunnah, and so on. Let us move now to describe the specific procedures that could be logically followed:

1. *Search the Qur'ān*: Look for keywords that directly or indirectly refer to aspects of the phenomenon under study. Search by subject could also be helpful. Identification of all verses that include these keywords and subject searches should follow. Qur'anic concordances or especially electronic databases on CD-ROM can enormously facilitate the searches. Standard exegeses should then be consulted for

acceptable interpretations of these verses. It has to be pointed out here that this particular task should be approached with due appreciation of what is being attempted here. Interpretation of the Divine book cannot be approached sloppily or be subjected to idiosyncratic, personal readings, let alone whimsical eccentricities attributed to some *ṣūfis*, for scientific research is a public rather than a personal matter. Neither should social scientists venture their uneducated and possibly misinformed opinions as interpretations of the Holy Book, on the assumption that they are scholars in their own right. To be able to contribute their own readings of the verses they have to either first equip themselves to the task, or be content to accept the scholarship of those who are already qualified.

2. *Search the Ḥadīth*: Look for comparable keywords and subjects as above in various compilations of Ḥadīth. Identify the relevant Ḥadīths. Examining books of explanations of Ḥadīth should follow, thus helping gain access to the details of the Prophet's applications of Qur'ānic concepts, and gain insights that reflect the Prophetic perspective.

3. *Works of Muslim Scholars*: Search of the work of prominent Muslim scholars, past and present, which deal directly or indirectly with the subject. Such contributions should also be assessed to determine whether they indeed have any intrinsic value of their own, value that transcends their specific time and space. Early Islamic scholarship is particularly important for it represents early attempts at "integrating" Islamic revealed knowledge and human inquiry of the general area under study. It should hopefully help in bridging the gap between scriptural keywords and humanly generated terminology at their time.

4. *Develop a Conceptual Framework*: The combination of insights gained from the Qur'ān and Sunnah, their accepted interpretations, and relevant Islamic scholarship into one coherent conceptual framework, which represent what Islam has to say on the subject. It should be useful here to present the material developed, at this point, to learned scholars specialized in revealed knowledge to get their feedback. This is meant to help safeguard against errors in understanding scripture that may elude the unspecialized researcher. However, he can still override the objections if he feels—after honest and thoughtful examination of the evidence—that he has good reasons to do so. It goes without saying that the researcher should still expect to be open to criticism by other scholars once he publishes his results.

*Step III : Development of the unified "integral" theoretical framework*

This step crowns the work done until this point. It is also the most challenging, and the most creative one. The difficulty here stems from the fact that the researcher may have to tread uncharted terrain. He normally proceeds without the benefit of precedents. It is here that we would be attempting to combine the sifted-out insights generated from both Islamic revealed knowledge sources and "valid" human experience. Creative work defies codification into habitual, orderly routines. All we can offer here are some logical steps that the researcher may take with reference to the different structural components of the theoretical frameworks he deals with:

1. *Cataloguing and Organizing*: This should include all valid social science research findings and concepts that withstood the verification and assessment process. This basically pertains to validated observations, empirical generalizations, and possibly an assortment of concepts salvaged and freed from their reductionist, secularized, theoretical orientations.

2. *Rearrangement and Reinterpretation*: All of these social science research findings and concepts, should be reinterpreted in a way that reflects the theoretical insights gained through the previous steps, for example: (a) The coherent conceptual framework derived from the Islamic sources; (b) Whatever middle-range social science conceptual frameworks that withstood the rigorous critique as described above, with the necessary shifts in direction.

3. *Statement of the Results*: Concluding statement of such synthesis in the form of clear, formal propositions. These propositions would be used as the building blocks for a coherent deductive system, which lends itself to the process of deriving hypotheses for testing in research and practice in the Second Phase described below.

**The Second Phase: Validation through Research and Practice**

The development of the "integral theoretical framework" would constitute quite an achievement in and by itself, for it is supposed to represent the best that we have achieved as a result of the integration of Islamic revealed knowledge and human endeavor in understanding the subject under study. However, these formulations can hardly be seen to be true *a priori*. The fact that they are based on verses from the Qur'ān and valid Hadīths does not render them sacred, for the simple reason that we normally do not base our integral theorizing on a single verse from the Qur'ān or one valid Hadīth with a definite

meaning. The process of integration is only a human effort at arriving at a coherent understanding of the subject. In doing that, we have to make layers over layers of decisions to select and choose among the large number of options open to us. A researcher has to use his human judgement to make the following decisions: (a) To select among the Qur'anic verses those seem to him to be relevant to his subject. He may erroneously miss some important verses; (b) To select among the Qur'anic *Tafsīr* (interpretation) of the chosen verses; (c) To select among the valid *Hadīths*, and then to choose among the different explanations of these *Hadīths*; (d) To creatively relate all of the above, and to weave them together to generate a coherent framework that appears to him to be the most logical.

Over and above all of these layers of decisions on how to put together material from Islamic revealed knowledge sources, the researcher is expected to make comparable decisions with regards to social science material, and then yet to combine both. This human input in the development of the "integral theoretical framework" renders these Islamic-oriented frameworks closer to being plausible hypotheses rather than sacred tenets. It thus becomes imperative on us to subject these formulations to the most rigorous tests in reality, to check on their truth-value—in conformity with the time-honored ethos of science. Through self-correction, scientific inquiry based into the Islamic perspective would surely advance—in the best interest of all humanity. This could be done through the following:

1. *Hypothesis Testing*: Hypotheses derived from the "integral theoretical framework" should be tested in "total reality" which includes both the sensory and the super-sensory aspects of the world: *‘Ālam al-Ghayb* and *‘Ālam al-Shahādah* (see below).
2. *Validation*: Validation through testing of the hypotheses could take place in: (a) Well-designed pieces of research; and (b) Controlled practice episodes within the helping professions (such as social work and counseling).
3. *If Hypotheses are Confirmed*: If the hypotheses derived from the integral theoretical framework are confirmed, our confidence in that framework increases. This also means the arrival at new validated observations, which would be added to the repository of the known facts. This would lead to further development and internal differentiation of our integral theory—as is the case with normal science activities.

4. *If Hypotheses are not Confirmed:* If our hypotheses are not confirmed, that means either: (a) That our understanding or interpretation of revelation included in our integral theoretical framework was, in fact, incorrect to start with. This calls for a review of each and every decision we made to select from the different sources of Islamic scholarship described above; or (b) That our research methods and our research procedures were indeed wanting. All details of research design and data collection have to be vetted for flaws or discrepancies from standard methodological procedure.

5. *No Contradiction:* As a general rule, we do not expect any real contradictions between valid scripture (or correct interpretation of revelation) on the one hand, and corroborated facts on the other. That would be contradiction in terms, because God who revealed scripture is the same God who created the world and its underlying laws. In this way true understanding of revelation is expected to neatly correspond to what is known for fact (see al-Fārūqī's First Principles above).

6. *Theory to Research:* On the basis of the above, the natural cycle of movement from integral theory to research, to modification of theory, to a new round of research and so on, will continue in a way that leads to the gradual (or revolutionary) progress of science.

An important point that deserves special attention here is that our hypotheses will be tested in "total reality," which means both the empirical and the non-empirical; the sensory and the super-sensory in Sorokin's terminology.<sup>12</sup> Methods and data collection techniques geared to the study of the non-empirical (with comparable levels of precision as those currently in use in the study of empirical aspects of reality) have to be devised. If the "spiritual factors" are indeed at the heart of the Islamic perspective's interpretation of human behavior, special consideration has to be given to the development of tools designed to tap these "inner signals which, though weaker than basic needs can yet be 'heard' " according to Maslow.<sup>13</sup> We have also to remember that we do not have to study the unseen aspects of the world "directly," but that our focus may rather be on the "interaction" of the non-empirical with the empirical.

This may mean honing some of our current methods and techniques to make them sensitive enough to be able detect these "inner signals." It may also require some redirecting of our present techniques to gear them to the new focus. Or it may mean devising totally new methods and techniques capable of penetrating into the newly targeted phenomena (if that term is applicable!). Ford calls for "different

research designs, different measurement approaches, and different mathematical models for analyzing of data...to fit the nature of the phenomena being studied."<sup>14</sup> Hermeneutics could provide part of the answer, but not all of the answers. Siporin tells us that "The hermeneutic approach seeks to apprehend, interpret, and explain the objective truth of knowledge, reality, people, and action in terms of subjective and intersubjective human meanings and felt experience. [This] understanding...takes place in transactional processes of mutual self-reflexivity and empathic acceptance...and open dialogical relations between people."<sup>15</sup>

The volume edited by Peter Reason and John Rowan titled *Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook*<sup>16</sup> provides a wealth of information on a collection of such promising methods. Work on such methods was further developed and reported in Reason's more recent works<sup>17</sup> and especially his book on Participation in Human Inquiry.<sup>18</sup> Recently, Judi Marshall and Peter Reason<sup>19</sup> expressed their position as to these *New Paradigm Research Methods* in terms of alignment with an emerging worldview, "which sees us living within an interactive and participatory cosmos...Thus subjective and objective are engaged in a continuing dance of creative, participatory...knowing. A number of methods of inquiry such as cooperative inquiry, action inquiry, participatory action research...have been developed which are congruent with the emerging worldview." A more recent volume by John Heron goes one further step towards spelling out the stages and techniques "of cooperative inquiry" and discussing issues of validity and reliability in detail.<sup>20</sup>

## Conclusion

In this paper, we have attempted to provide what is hoped to be a navigation chart for Islamizers embarking upon the Islamization of a specific subject that currently falls within the parameters of social sciences. For some readers the methodology for the Islamization of the social sciences may seem to be very demanding, complex, or even prohibitive. A pioneer of Islamization of psychology has recently expressed impatience with what he sees as overemphasis on methodology.<sup>21</sup> However, when one considers the ambitious goals of the Islamization of Knowledge movement as a "scientific revolution" in the making, it immediately becomes clear that this is not indeed a simple or simplistic task. No shortcuts will do.

One example may illustrate the point. With the understandable

concern of academics in certain "Islamic Universities" about the danger of using standard Western-type textbooks, a lot of effort, time, and resources have been spent to produce instant "Islamized" textbooks. It has now dawned on everybody that such attempts, notwithstanding the sincere and diligent efforts of the contributors, could not be seen as "Islamized." They may in the short run serve a stopgap function. They represent—by all means—commendable, important efforts in their own right—but in no way do they come close to being "Islamized" textbooks. Textbooks only register and codify the findings of the best research and theory building efforts in their respective fields. And these research and theory building efforts within the Islamization of Knowledge perspective have not even been seriously attempted. Which underlines the central place of the methodology, whatever the complexity, whatever the costs in terms of time, manpower, or resources. Once again, no shortcuts! Prolific publishing of a sundry collection of booklets and articles or even of large tomes do not an "Islamized" textbook produce. Only serious, well-planned, institutional and individual coordinated efforts, based on sound methodologies will be capable of doing the job.

Although the individual researcher's eye-view has been adopted in this paper, it should be clear by now that the Islamization of the social sciences is not an individual effort (although creative work is basically an individual undertaking). It should be always remembered that the "infrastructure" needed for even the beginnings of an effort to Islamize a limited subject within the social sciences should indeed be an institutional or at least organized team effort. Areas such as the elaboration of the Islamic ontology and epistemology, human nature, the Divine *Sunan* (laws, natural and social) can hardly be attempted by individual researchers, normally busy trying to study subjects of "direct" relevance to their respective fields. However, the methodology suggested above can still be applied to the study of specific subjects, possibly by individual researchers, however with less than optimal results of course.

Finally, I would like to point out that the material presented in this paper basically reflects (my reading of) the mainstream Islamization of Knowledge literature as it has evolved over the years, with special reference to al-Fārūqī's work. Whether this proves adequate to the task remains to be seen. The purpose of presenting this material is, hopefully, to generate broad discussion and exchange of ideas on that vital subject. It is only through critical assessment and reexamination



that there would be any hope for the advancement of the Islamization project. Settling these matters of methodology through scholarly exchanges by people dedicated to the Islamization of Knowledge as a cause, not as a function, should—God willing—help pave the way for serious research efforts capable of achieving the noble goals of that movement.

### Notes

1. See for example; Isma'īl al-Fārūqī, and Abdullah Omar Nasseef ed., *Social and Natural Sciences: An Islamic Perspective* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1981); Munawar Ahmad Anees, and Meryll Wyn Davies, "Islamic Science: Current Thinking and Future Directions," in Ziauddin Sardar ed., *Revenge of Athena: Science, Exploitation, and the Third World* (London: Mansell, 1988); Jamal Barzinji, "History of Islamization of Knowledge" (International Seminar on Islamization of Knowledge, Muhammadiyah University of Malang, Indonesia, December 1996); Leif Stenberg, *Islamization of Science: Four Muslim Positions Developing an Islamic Modernity* (Norway: Lunds University, 1996); and Louay Safi, "Islamization of Knowledge: An Integrated Model of Scientific Inquiry" (Paper presented at the National Seminar on Knowledge and the Issue of Islamization, International Institute of Islamic Thought, Malaysia, May 1997).
2. Isma'īl Raji al-Fārūqī, *Islamization of Knowledge: General Principles and Workplan* (Herndon, Virginia: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 1982), 15.
3. *Ibid.*, 38-45.
4. AbdulHamid AbuSulayman, *Crisis in the Muslim Mind* (Herndon, Virginia: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 1993).
5. Ṭāḥā Jābir al-ʿAlwānī, *The Islamization of Knowledge: Yesterday and Today* (Herndon, Virginia: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 1995), 15; also see the Interview conducted by *Al-Mustaqillah*, November 1996.
6. al-Fārūqī, *Islamization of Knowledge*, 22-38.
7. Ibrahim A. Ragab, "Islamic Perspectives on Theory Building in the Social Sciences," *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 10 (1993) 1: 1-22.
8. Ziauddin Sardar, "Islamization of Knowledge : A State of the Art Report," in Ziauddin Sardar ed., *An Early Crescent: The Future of Knowledge and the Environment in Islam* (London: Mansell, 1989); also his, "Islamization of Knowledge, or the Westernization of Islam?" *Inquiry* (1984): 39-45.
9. Ibrahim A. Ragab, "Creative Engagement of the Modern Social Sciences:

A Significant Component of the Islamization Effort," *Intellectual Discourse*, 5 (1996)1: 41-50

10. Merryl Wyn Davies, "Rethinking Knowledge: Islamization and the Future," *Futures* (April 1991).

11. *Ibid.*, 242-243.

12. Pitrim A. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age* (Oxford: Oneworld, 1941); also his, *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1985).

13. Abraham Maslow, *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature* (New York: Penguin, 1971), 318.

14. Donald Ford, "Reexamining Guiding Assumptions: Theoretical and Methodological Implications," *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 31 (1984): 465-466.

15. Max Siporin, "Current Social Work Perspectives on Clinical Practice," *Clinical Social Work Journal* 13 (Fall, 1985): 212.

16. Peter Reason, & John Rowan ed., *Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research* (New York: John Wiley, 1981).

17. Peter Reason, "Innovative Research techniques," *Complementary Medical Research* 1 (1986)1: 23-39; and Peter Reason, "Reflections on Sacred Experience and Sacred Science," *Journal of Management Inquiry* 2 (1993) 3: 273-283.

18. Peter Reason, ed., *Participation in Human Inquiry* (London: Sage Publications, 1994).

19. Judi Marshall and Peter Reason, "Call for the Conference on the Emerging Approaches to Inquiry," <mnbspwr@ management.bath.ac.uk > .

20. John Heron, *Cooperative Inquiry: Research Into The Human Condition* (London: Sage Publications, 1996).

21. Malik Badri, "Is the Islamization of Psychology Really Necessary?" Paper presented at the International Seminar on Counseling and Psychotherapy in an Islamic Perspective, organized by the Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, August 1997.